The ‘new impersonal’ construction in Icelandic*

JOAN MALINC1 and SIGRÍÐUR SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR2
1Brandeis University, Venlo Center, MA-023, Waltham, MA 02454-9110, USA
(E-mail: malinj@brandeis.edu);
2University of Iceland, Árnagarður v. Saðargötu, IS-101 Reykjavík, Iceland
(E-mail: sigrisig@hi.is)

Key words: Icelandic, impersonal constructions, impersonal passive, passive, syntactic change

Abstract. This paper reports the results of an extensive study of a syntactic change currently underway in Iceland. The new construction appears to contain a morphological passive auxiliary and participle which is able to assign accusative case to a postverbal argument. The study was designed to track the development of this ongoing change and to test the hypothesis that the innovative construction in fact involves the reanalysis of passive morphology as a syntactically active construction with a phonologically null impersonal subject. This syntactic change seems to parallel the completed development of the -me construction in Polish and the autonomous form in Irish.

1. Introduction

In this paper we report the results of an extensive study of an innovative syntactic construction that is developing in the language of young Icelandic speakers. Because this construction is based on passive morphology and appears to have the same discourse function as the traditional passive, it has been dubbed the ‘new passive’ (Kjartansson 1991). We argue that despite the passive morphology, the construction is in fact syntactically active and thus will rename it the ‘new impersonal.’
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We begin by describing the morphological properties of both the standard passive and the innovative construction. The traditional passive in Icelandic can be categorized into the three types illustrated in (1). The Icelandic passive exhibits the well-known distinction between structural and lexical case. The accusative object of an active voice verb becomes nominative in the passive voice, as illustrated in (1a); lexically-assigned inherent case is preserved under NP-movement, as illustrated in (1b). In either case, NP-movement to subject position is obligatory. Given that Icelandic is a V2 language, the subcategorization of these NPs is not obvious from the word order, for detailed argumentation, see Zaezen, Maling and Thráinsson (1985), Sigurðsson (1989/1992). As illustrated in (1c), an agentive intransitive verb may also form a morphological passive; this is the so-called ‘impersonal passive.’ The expletive pað ‘it’ is used as needed to satisfy the Verb-Second Constraint.

(1) The Canonical Passive

a. Stúkan var lámð í klesu.
   \textit{the.girl-NOM was hit-f.sg.NOM in a mess}
   Nominative Passive

b. i. Henni var hrint í skólanum.
   \textit{she was pushed-neut.sg in the school}
   Oblique Passive

   ii. Kennarans var sakað.
   \textit{the.teacher-GEN was missed-neut.sg}

   b. * Pað var dansuð í kringum jólaféð.
   \textit{it was danced-neut.sg around the Christmas tree}
   Impersonal Passive

The innovative construction takes the form in (2); the examples correspond to the sentences in (1). The sentences in (2) are sharply ungrammatical in the standard language, as shown by the results of our study, where over 70% of the youngsters (n = 1695) judged sentence (2a) to be acceptable, as compared to only 4% of the adults (n = 200).

(2) The Innovative Construction:

a. Pað var lámð stúkuna í klesu.
   \textit{it was hit-neut.sg the.girl-f.sg-ACC in a mess}
   ‘New Passive/Impersonal’

b. Pað var hrint henni í skólanum.
   \textit{it was pushed her-DAT in the school}
   ‘New Passive/Impersonal’

In the standard passive, if the verb governs Accusative case on its object in the active voice, that argument will bear Nominative case in the passive, and agreement of the finite verb and passive participle is obligatory, as illustrated in (1a); this is true whether the argument appears preverbally in subject position or whether it occupies some postverbal position (as in (3a)). In the innovative construction, however, that argument remains in situ in object position and continues to be marked Accusative, as illustrated in (2a). If the verb assigns a lexical/inherent case, either Dative or Genitive, that case is preserved in the new passive, as shown in (2b). This is not surprising since oblique case is preserved under NP-movement in the standard language as well, as illustrated in (1b). However, as illustrated in (2), the underlying object remains in object position even if it is definite. This is significant since in general, postposed subjects in Icelandic must be indefinite in both passive and active voice sentences, as illustrated by the contrasts in (3) and (4).

(3) The Definiteness Effect on postverbal (VP-internal) subjects

b. Pað var seldir margir bilar f. ger.
   \textit{it were sold mpl. many cars mpl-NOM yesterday}
   Passive voice

b.* Pað var seldir bilmarr
   \textit{it were sold mpl. the cars mpl-NOM yesterday}
   Intended: ‘There were the cars sold yesterday’

(4) a. Pað hafa loksins flutt strákar inn í húsið.
   \textit{it have finally moved boys-ACC into the building}
   ‘Some boys have finally moved into the building. Active voice

b. Pað hafa loksins flutt strákarinn inn í húsið.
   \textit{it have finally moved the boys-ACC into the building}
Thus, if the postverbal NP in sentences like those in (2) is in fact the grammatical subject of a passive, then the innovative construction systematically violates the Definiteness Effect (see Safrir 1985; Sigurðsson 1989/1992).

To summarize, there are three syntactic innovations of note in the new construction as compared to the standard passive. These are listed in (5):

(5) Three syntactic innovations in the ‘new passive’ as compared to the standard passive:

a. Accusative rather than nominative case on the underlying object
b. Lack of NP-movement to subject position
c. Lack of any Definiteness Effect

The innovative construction cannot be interpreted as simply a change in the syntactic behavior of lexically case-marked NPs since the change affects structurally case-marked objects as well. Nor is the lack of the Definiteness Effect a general feature of the grammar of speakers who use the ‘new impersonal’, as some linguists have speculated (Gudmundsdóttir 2000, p. 171, fn. 77). Our data show that this speculation is incorrect (see section 5.1 below). One of the ungrammatical control sentences on our questionnaire contained an active voice verb with a definite nominative NP in object position. The acceptance rate for this sentence was under 3% even though such sentences would be perfectly grammatical if the postverbal nominative NP were indefinite, as illustrated in (3a) and (4a).

2. Theoretical discussion. Two hypotheses

How should this innovative construction be analyzed? Is the new construction a passive with postposed subject and expletive það despite the fact that it violates the Definiteness Effect? Or is it really a syntactically active construction despite the fact that it is built with auxiliary vera ‘to be’ and the past participle of the main verb just like the canonical passive? The underlying representations under these two hypotheses are sketched in (6a, b), respectively:

(6) Two Hypotheses

a. [3° e |, Tns,Agr,Pass] [vp V NP] Canonical Passive
b. [3° pro |, Tns,Agr] [vp V NP] Active Impersonal

The first hypothesis is that it is a variant of the canonical passive, with an empty category e in subject position but without NP-movement. The second hypothesis is that this is a syntactically active impersonal construction with a phonologically null pro [+human] subject. The crucial difference between the two analyses is whether or not a theta role is assigned to subject position. If the innovative construction is simple a variant of the canonical passive, then no theta role is assigned to subject position; the innovative construction would then differ only in that the normally obligatory NP-movement fails to apply, and the underlying object somehow receives accusative case in situ. If, on the other hand, it is a syntactically active impersonal construction, then the subject position is filled with a phonologically null pro which is assigned both the subject theta role and nominative case. Under either analysis, expletive það will be inserted at S-structure as needed to satisfy the Verb-Second Constraint; this pleneatic það is nonreferential and does not bear a theta role.

Sobin (1985) proposes an analysis of the first type for the Ukrainian -nato construction; Maling (1993) argues that an analysis of the second type is correct for the Polish counterpart as well as for the Irish autonomous construction (see also Lavine 2000; Blevins 2001). We propose that the second type of analysis is the best one for the innovative Icelandic construction. Both in this paper, and in Maling and Sigurðsson (1997), which reported the results of a small pilot study, our hypothesis is that the Icelandic ‘new passive’ represents the first stages of the reanalysis of the canonical passive morphology from passive to syntactically active. As sketched in (6b), our working hypothesis is that the null pro in this construction is an external argument which gets interpreted as an ‘unspecified human subject’ (in the terminology of Relational Grammar). We will, therefore, refer to the innovative construction as the ‘new impersonal’ rather than the ‘new passive.’ Under the analysis sketched in (6b), the pro subject is assigned both a theta role and nominative case. In effect, the examples of the ‘new impersonal’ illustrated in (2) are normal transitive clauses. The appearance of accusative case on the postverbal object in (2a) is therefore entirely expected, as is the observed lack of the Definiteness Effect (cf. Sigurðsson 1989, ch. 6), which applies only to subjects.

It is worth noting that a similar syntactic development has occurred independently in a number of languages. As discussed in Maling (1993), the Irish autonomous form and the Polish -nato construction each developed from a canonical morphological passive. In both these languages, the innovative construction has the syntactic properties listed in (7) in addition to the overt morphological properties of accusative case-marking and non-

(7) **Syntactic Properties of Impersonal Constructions with thematic subject**

a. No agentive by-phrase is possible.

b. Binding of anaphors (reflexive and reciprocal) is possible.

c. Control of subject-oriented adjuncts is possible.

d. Nonagentive (“unaccusative”) verbs can occur in the construction.

On the other hand, the accusative-case assigning -no/to construction in Ukrainian has none of the syntactic properties listed in (7). It is clear, therefore, that no conclusion about the syntactic analysis can be based solely on the overt morphological fact that accusative case is assigned to the underlying object. Rather it is necessary to investigate the syntactic behavior of the construction in some detail.

As cross-linguistic background to our study of the innovative Icelandic construction, we first compare and contrast the syntactic properties of the cognate Polish and Ukrainian -no/to constructions illustrated below.² In (8) through (10), we illustrate for Polish the syntactic properties listed in (7). The canonical passive illustrated in (8a) coexists with the participial -no/to construction illustrated in (8b).

(8) **Two so-called passive constructions in Polish**

a. Świątynia była zbudowana w 1640 roku.
   
   *church-NOM was built-f.sg. in 1640 year*

   Canonical passive

b. Świątynię zbudowano w 1640 roku.
   
   *church-ACC built-IMP in 1640 year*

   Impersonal “passive”

The syntactic behavior of the canonical passive in (8a) contrasts sharply with that of the participial -no/to construction in (8b). As shown in (9), the canonical passive has all the expected syntactic properties of a true passive. As shown in (9a), an agentive by-phrases can occur; as shown in (9b), bound anaphors are not allowed; as shown in (9c), the non-thematic

(9) **Properties of the canonical passive in Polish**

a. Jan był obrabowany przez nią.
   
   *John-NOM was robbed-f.sg by then*

   Agentic by-phrase

b. *Swoja własna ojczyzna była chwalona.
   
   REFL own fatherland-NOM was praised-f.sg*

   Bound anaphors

c. Jan był obrabowany po pijanem.
   
   *John-NOM was robbed-f.sg while drunk*

   John was robbed while drunk. [John was drunk]

   Subject Control

d. i. *Ważędzie było tańczone.
   
   everywhere was-neut.sg danced-neut.sg

   Intended: There was dancing everywhere

   Unergative

   ii. *Dawniej było umeranie młodo.
   
   before was-neut.sg died-neut.sg. young

   Intended: In the old days, people died young.

   Unaccusative

As illustrated in (10), the -no/to construction differs in each of these four syntactic properties, exactly as expected if it has a fully thematic subject.² For these reasons, we have glossed the -no/to suffix in Polish as IMP (for impersonal). As shown in (10a), no agentive by-phrase is allowed. As shown in (10b), the thematic external argument can bind anaphors in non-subject positions. As shown in (10c), the null thematic subject can serve as a syntactic controller for the same adjuncts which are disallowed in the canonical passive. And, finally, as illustrated in (10d), intransitive verbs

---

¹ The forms -o- and -e- in Polish and Ukrainian are allomorphs of the past passive morpheme; the -e- once the neut.sg. inflection, is now invariant. See Lavine (2000, ch. 3) for discussion of the morphological status of this ending.

² Lavine (2000, p. 118f) provides further grammatical contrasts between canonical verbal passives and the -no/to construction in Polish based on psych-predicates.
can occur in this construction, not only agatives but also unaccusatives. Note that the contrast between (9dii) and (10dii) would be unexplained if both constructions were analyzed as passives.

(10) **Properties of the -nato passive in Polish**

a. Jana obrabowano (*przez nich*) Agentive by-phrase
   John-ACC robbed-IMP (*by them)
   They robbed John (*by them).

b. i. Zamknięto się w fabryce. Bound anaphors
   locked-IMP REFL in factory
   They locked themselves in the factory.

ii. Chwalono swoją własną ojczyznę.
   praised-IMP REFL own fatherland-f.sg.ACC
   They praised their own fatherland.

c. Jana obrabowano po pijanemu. Subject control
   John-ACC robbed-IMP while drunk
   They robbed John while (they were) drunk.

d. i. Tańczono wazelnie. Unergative intransitive
   danced-IMP everywhere
   There was dancing everywhere.

ii. Dawniej uznawano malol. Unaccusative intransitive
   before died-IMP young
   In the old days, people died at a young age.

The -nato morphology, originally a passive participle, can now attach to unaccusative verbs, including the copula and raising verbs, as shown in (11):

(11) **-nato with unaccusative verbs in Polish**

a. Zdawano się nas nie zauważyć.
   seem-IMP REFL us not notice-INF
   They seemed not to be noticing us.

b. Przed wojną bywano w Grand Hotelu.
   before war be-IMP in Grand Hotel
   Before the war, people frequented the Grand Hotel.

The only lexical restriction is a semantic one: the understood subject must be [+human]. Thus unlike the canonical passive, the -nato construction does not observe the 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law (1AEX) of Relational Grammar (Perlmutter and Postal 1984), which rules out passives of unaccusative predicates. To summarize, despite its historical origins as a morphological passive, the innovative -nato construction in Polish now behaves syntactically like French on-sentences except that the impersonal pronoun subject is null.

Now observe that the Ukrainian counterpart discussed by Sobin (1985) differs from the Polish construction with respect to all these syntactic properties (cf. Billings and Mailing 1995; Lavine 2000, 2001); hence, we gloss the cognate -nato suffix in Ukrainian as PASS. The agentive by-phrase is realized in Ukrainian as a bare NP in the Instrumental case.

(12) **Syntactic properties of the Ukrainian -nato construction**

a. Mojim mylym mene zradženo.
   my-INST beloved-INST me-ACC betrayed-PASS
   I was betrayed by my beloved.

b. *Svoju žinku bulo obmaneno.
   self’s wife-ACC was deceived-PASS
   (Lavine 2000, p. 144, ex. (61a)) Bound Anaphors
   Intended: Someone deceived his wife.

c. *Povernuvšys’ domu, hroši bulo znajdeno.
   returning home money was found-PASS
   (Lavine 2000, p. 90, ex. (5b)) Subject Control
   Intended: Having returned home, the money was found.

d. *Urerto/Zaxvoroto/Prijatato. Unaccusative intransitives
   died-PASS/get.sick-PASS/arrived-PASS

These properties follow automatically from the assumption that the Ukrainian -nato construction is like the canonical passive in that no theta role is assigned to subject position and differs only in the fact that it retains the ability to assign accusative case, in violation of Burzio’s Generalization. We assume that the verb can assign accusative case to the object because nominative case is assigned to a null expletive subject.2

Unlike Polish, the Ukrainian construction allows the occurrence of the passive auxiliary bulo ‘was’. Lavine (2000, ch. 3.2; 2001) takes the lack
of an auxiliary verb to be the crucial factor underlying the syntactic reanalysis of *-na/to in Polish. He hypothesizes that this inflectional ending was reanalyzed from a passive participle to a tense-marking auxiliary, a proposal which he refers to as the Aux Hypothesis, according to which Polish *-na/to is a “new, unanalyzable meronym with the dedicated function and distribution of an auxiliary” (Lavine 2000, p. 140). As we shall see, comparison with Icelandic suggests that the presence or absence of an auxiliary is not what determines the syntactic properties of the construction as passive or active. The auxiliary does, however, make it possible for the Ukrainian construction to mark different tenses and even to occur in contexts requiring an infinitival form, as illustrated in (13a) from Shevelov (1953, p. 145), cited by Sobin (1985, p. 659, ex. (21)). The cognate Polish construction is restricted to a past tense reading and, as illustrated in (13b), lacks an infinitival form.

(13) a. ... maje bυty pokazano nyżku. Ukrainian
    will be-INF shown-PASS series-ACC
    a series will be shown

b. *Serie ma być pokazano. Polish
    series-ACC will be-INF shown-IMP

Lavine points to another difference with respect to control of the PRO subject of infinitivals. Only the Polish *-na/to construction can provide a controller for the embedded PRO, as illustrated in the following examples.

(14) a. Na wzgórzu zaczęto [PRO budować dom]. Polish
    on hill begin-IMP build-INF house-ACC
    They began to build a house on the hill.

b. *U místě počali [PRO budovatí novú cerkvu]
    in city begin-PASS build-INF new church-ACC
    They began to build a new church in the city.

Though Lavine notes that Ukrainian may be developing an overt expletive subject, *tena, which is found more frequently in the spoken language (Shevelov 1963, p. 168). See also Brings (1993). Lavine (2000, ch. 3.1.2.1), on the other hand, considers the expletive status dubious and argues that in the cited examples, *tena is best analyzed as a fully referential neuter singular pronoun.

Although elementary school teachers certainly recognize and correct this construction, the school system as a whole has (yet) begun to marshal its forces against this construction as they have against the so-called Dative sickness (*págyfallágyki), which began around the turn of the century (Svavarðstór 1982). Sigurdsson (1989, p. 355) gives an example of the new construction containing a 3rd person pronoun object and notes (fn. 60) that the new impersonal is much better with reflexive verbs. Finally, numerous examples of the new impersonal can be found in Kjartanson (1991), by far the most extensive discussion of the construction prior to our own studies. We developed a questionnaire designed to test the predictions of our hypothesis that the “new impersonal” is on the way to becoming a syntactically active construction with a phonologically null pro subject, and to track the development of this innovative construction. Our questionnaire was a revised version of a pilot study conducted in the spring of 1996 and reported by Malin and Sigurjónsdóttir (1997). The questionnaire was distributed to 1,731 tenth graders (age 15–16) in 65 schools throughout Iceland.

3. The study

We now turn back to Icelandic. The “new impersonal” has received only scant attention in the linguistic literature. To our knowledge, the construction was first noted by Bernðösdóttir (1982, p. 212), who cited three examples with 1st person sg. pronoun objects, accusative mig and dative mér. Hálfdanarson (1984, p. 31) provides the example in (15) as an example of a “language error,” a usage to be corrected.

(15) Language Error #174: (Hélgí Hálfdanarson 1984, p. 31)
    Heyrst befur: það var sagt konum að fara.
    Heard: it was told him to leave.
    FORM: CORRECT: He
    var sagt að fara.
    was told to leave.
    Leðirúmm þetta
    Let’s correct this in children’s
    hjá börnum.
    speech.

We included one such sentence on our questionnaire: *Mér laungur í 63 nine-DAT longs for ice-cream*. The acceptance rates for this sentence were 32% (Elísafell), 16% (Ísafjörður), and 4% (Reykjavík).
Iceland (see Figure 1) in the fall and winter of 1999–2000; this number represents 45% of the 3861 tenth-graders who took the national exams in the spring of 2000. The questionnaire was also given to 205 adult controls in various parts of the country.

The questionnaire contained 68 test sentences. There were 17 control sentences, both grammatical and ungrammatical. The remaining 51 sentences contained examples of the innovative construction in different syntactic environments. We tested transitive verbs governing accusative and dative case but not genitive since so few verbs governa genitive case on their objects. The sentences were presented in random order. An experimenter visited each class and instructed the subjects in how to fill out the questionnaire. For each sentence, subjects were asked to check one of two options, shown in (16). The instructions appeared at the top of the first page of the questionnaire and were also presented orally by the experimenter.

(16) **English translation of instructions at top of questionnaire**

Put an X in the appropriate column.

Yes = this is something one can say.

No = this is something one cannot say.

![Map of Iceland](image)

*Figure 1. Map of Iceland.*

After excluding subjects who made more than one error on the ungrammatical control sentences, we have results from 1695 students, 845 males and 850 females, and 200 adults. All the results reported here are based on these subject numbers unless noted otherwise. In (17) we show the distribution of subjects across the country.

(17) **Number of subjects in each geographical region of Iceland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical area</th>
<th>Adolescents</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vesturland</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestfirðir</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norðurland</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austurland</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestmannaeyjar</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suðurland</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suðurnes</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Reykjavík</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Reykjavík</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,695</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population of Iceland is approximately 286,000; the population of Greater Reykjavík is approximately 178,000, more than half the population of the country. Since there was a striking difference in the results according to location of the schools tested, we divided Greater Reykjavík into Inner and Outer Reykjavík to make this difference even clearer. Inner Reykjavík is the area west of the river Ellidaá and north of Fossavogur; it consists of the old downtown city center and the newer western part of the city, including the independent municipality of Seltjarnarnes. See Figure 2.

4. **Results**

As expected, many students judge the “new impersonal” as something they might say. The table in (18) shows the geographic variation in the acceptability rates for the “new impersonal” in the test sentences containing animate accusative and dative objects, simple examples of the innovative construction like those shown in (2).
Geographical variation in acceptance of “new impersonal” with animate objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical area</th>
<th>Accusative Objects</th>
<th>Dative Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents Adults</td>
<td>Adolescents Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesturland</td>
<td>68% 3%</td>
<td>73% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestrirörð</td>
<td>63% 3%</td>
<td>68% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norðurland</td>
<td>55% 3%</td>
<td>60% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austurland</td>
<td>51% 4%</td>
<td>58% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestmannaeyjar</td>
<td>65% 5%</td>
<td>71% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudurland</td>
<td>60% 1%</td>
<td>68% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Súðurnes</td>
<td>69% 7%</td>
<td>75% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Reykjavík</td>
<td>53% 1%</td>
<td>60% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Reykjavík</td>
<td>28% 1%</td>
<td>35% 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our results reveal a statistically significant relationship between geographical region and the acceptability judgments. There was a clear difference between Reykjavík and the rest of the country; the difference was even more striking once we divided Reykjavík into two parts which we have called Inner and Outer Reykjavík. Subjects in Outer Reykjavík were nearly twice as likely to accept such examples of the “new impersonal” as subjects in Inner Reykjavík, and moreover this effect is highly significant. For sentences with accusative animate objects (9 sentences), the difference between Inner (M = 0.28, SD = 0.27) and Outer (M = 0.52, SD = 0.32) was highly significant, t(520.641) = 9.636, p = 0.000 (2-tailed). For sentences with dative animate objects (3 sentences), the difference between Inner (M = 0.35, SD = 0.34) and Outer (M = 0.50, SD = 0.37) was highly significant, t(581) = 8.119, p = 0.000 (2-tailed).

However, the difference between Outer Reykjavík and the rest of the country, excluding Inner Reykjavík, was not significant. For sentences with accusative animate objects, the difference between Outer Reykjavík (M = 0.52, SD = 0.32) and the rest of the country (M = 0.51, SD = 0.35) was not significant, t(616.842) = -0.394, p = 0.694 (2-tailed); for sentences with dative animate objects, the difference between Outer Reykjavík (M = 0.60, SD = 0.37) and the rest of the country (M = 0.57, SD = 0.39) was not significant, t(607.914) = -1.018, p = 0.309 (2-tailed). This result justifies our combining Outer Reykjavík and the rest of the country into a single group labelled Elsewhere. Henceforth, the results for adolescents are divided into two groups, Elsewhere vs. Inner Reykjavík. For adults, however, there was no significant effect between geographical region and acceptability judgments, so for adults we report a single mean score. In the tables below, we report the results for adults in the right-most column; in the middle column are the results for adolescents in Inner Reykjavík, where the innovative construction is less advanced; and the results for all other adolescents are in the first column, labeled “Elsewhere.”

4.1. Morphological case

One of the well-known properties of Icelandic is that lexically case-marked NPs behave syntactically exactly like NPs bearing syntactic case; they differ only in that lexical case is preserved under NP-movement. Thus we might expect the same to be true of the “new impersonal.” However, Kjartansson (1991, p. 18) speculated that the new construction was more

---

Footnote: The numbers reported here are averaged acceptability scores after converting ‘Yes’-responses to 1 and ‘No’-responses to 0.
common with verbs governing dative than with verbs governing accusative. Our results, shown by the data in (18), strongly support this observation. For adolescents, the difference between accusative (M = 0.54, SD = 0.33) and dative (M = 0.61, SD = 0.37) was highly significant, t(1691) = -10.928, p = 0.000 (2-tailed). Even for adults, the difference between accusative (M = 0.03, SD = 0.10) and dative (M = 0.06, SD = 0.15) was significant, t(199) = -2.717, p = 0.007 (2-tailed). This result is consistent with the observations for Ukrainian/Finnish that the change began with those forms where the morphological evidence of agreement is least obvious. Recall that for verbs governing dative objects, only the fact that a definite NP can occur in postverbal position marks a sentence as an example of the new construction; for verbs governing accusative objects, there are in addition the difference in morphological case and the consequent lack of agreement.

Although subjects consistently liked dative objects more than accusative ones, morphological case was clearly not always the deciding factor. Compare the near-minimal pair shown in (19), where the accusative (indirect) object was judged more acceptable by all groups.

(19) **Tridic verbs with ACC vs DAT indirect object and infinitival complement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC vs DAT on indirect object</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Reykjavik</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pað var beðð mig að vaska upp.</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nask</em> was asked me-ACC to wash up</td>
<td>I was asked to do the dishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pað var sagt mér að taka til.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>taka</em> was told me-DAT to clean up</td>
<td>I was told to clean up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It remains unclear to us what factors are at play here.

Our results also show that examples of the innovative construction were judged more acceptable if the object was animate, or, more precisely, [+human]. One might speculate that the higher acceptability of dative objects should be attributed to this preference for [+human] objects. As discussed by Barðdal (1993), many transitive verbs assign either dative or accusative, depending on the animacy of the object (see also Maling to appear). This is illustrated by the following examples taken from Barðdal (1993, p. 4, ex. (6a, b)).

(20) a. Kristín þrötti handlæðið.  
Christine washed the towel-ACC

b. Kristín þrötti barninu.  
Christine washed the child-DAT

However, our data show that the preference for animate objects held regardless of morphological case. The data for adolescents are shown in table (21). Note that the effect is strongest in inner Reykjavik, where the new construction is less well-established; subjects in inner Reykjavik were more than twice as likely to accept an example of the new construction if the object was animate than if it was inanimate.

(21) **Morphological case vs. animacy of object as factor in mean acceptability scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Reykjavik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anim</td>
<td>Inanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is striking that all of the examples of the innovative construction previously cited in the literature have human objects. Inanimate objects are not disallowed since such examples are attested (see (39c) below). However, it may be that the pragmatics of the innovative construction favor affected objects of highly transitive verbs in the sense of Hopper and Thompson (1980). Further research will be needed to test whether it is animacy or a high degree of transitivity that matters and to examine the discourse factors that govern the choice between the new construction and the canonical passive.

(39c) a. Det drackt mycket öl de kvällen.  
A lot of beer was drunk that evening.

b. *Det blev druckt mycket öl de kvällen.  
*bli-passive

s-passive

| 2×30 | was drunk much beer that evening |

It is interesting that animacy affects the choice between the s-passive and the s-passive in Swedish. If the affected argument is human, the s-passive may be used, if the patient is inanimate, the s-passive is either more likely or the only possible choice, as illustrated by the constraint in (a, b) from Engström (1999, p. 11).
4.2. Reliability of judgments

Regarding our results, it might be questioned whether 15- or 16-year-old adolescents are capable of making reliable grammaticality judgments. Any such objection can be countered by noting that for the control sentences, both grammatical and ungrammatical, adolescents gave similar responses to the adults. For the eleven grammatical control sentences, the mean acceptance rate in the various geographical areas ranges from a low of 89% to a high of 94% for adolescents, as compared to between 92% and 96% for adults. There is almost no difference between the different regions of the country, and there is no difference between Inner and Outer Reykjavík. One of the grammatical control sentences was the canonical passive shown in (22a). Our results show clearly that the adolescents accept the canonical passive just like adults do. Thus, our data show that for our subjects the innovative construction co-exists with the canonical passive, just as in Polish but unlike Irish where the innovative autonomous form drove out the canonical passive.

(22) Judgments on two control sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two control sentences</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Rvík</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ólafur var rekinn úr skólanum. 99% 96% 99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaf.NOM was driven from the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaf was expelled from school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Haraldur er enmða veiðt. 6% 6% 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harald-mass is still sick-neut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In (22b), we give one of the five ungrammatical control sentences that we tested. Our results show that subjects were paying attention to agreement since the neuter form of the adjective fails to agree with the masculine subject.7

---

7 It is worth noting some curious aspects of the results for ungrammatical control sentences. It may be that subjects paid less attention to word order than to agreement. One of the ungrammatical controls involved a V2 violation: I dag kunnast við lezion "Today the teacher is sick." A surprising 19% of the adolescents and 14% of the adults accepted this sentence. However, when adult subjects who accepted it were asked to read it back, they read it with grammatical V2 order. While this might be interpreted as reflecting an unconscious correction, it is noteworthy that Pompilio (2001) also found a surprisingly high acceptance rate for V2 violations. Further research is needed to determine how to interpret these results.

4.3. Sociological factors

Our data showed that there was no significant effect for gender on the acceptance of the new construction. However, there was a highly significant effect for the education levels of both mother and father at all levels (10 years of schooling, compulsory education), 14 years of school (menntaskóli, and university level) and for all geographical regions. The higher the level of parents' education, the lower the acceptance rate for the new construction. In (23) we show the acceptance rates for examples of the new construction with accusative animate objects as a function of mother’s education,8 where 1 = compulsory education (10th grade), 2 = 14 years of schooling (menntaskóli, Gymnasium), and 3 = university level.

(23) Acceptance of “new impersonal” as a function of mother’s education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical region</th>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
<th>Acceptance rate</th>
<th>Geographical region</th>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
<th>Acceptance rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vesturland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Suðurland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestfirðir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Suðurnes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norðurland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austurland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Inger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestmanne-eyjar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Since not all subjects provided information about their parents' education, these results are based on 1347 subjects and not 1695.
This is similar to the results among 11-year old children reported by Svavarðsdóttir (1982) in her study of dative sickness. Recall that adolescents in Inner Reykjavík were only half as likely to accept the new construction as adolescents in the rest of the country, as reported in the table in (15). We suspect that this reflects a sociological factor rather than a strictly geographic factor. Data from 1999 indicate that the populace of Inner Reykjavík has the highest percentages of university education in the country (Morgunblaðið, February 20, 2001). This might lead one to believe that the lower acceptance of the new construction in Inner Reykjavík is due to the higher levels of parental education in that area. However, a closer look at our data indicates that this hypothesis does not tell the whole story, since the acceptance rates are much lower in Inner Reykjavík than elsewhere in the country, independently of the education of the parents. For example, the percentage of ‘yes’ responses within Inner Reykjavík is only 33% for adolescents whose mothers completed only the compulsory level of education (10th grade) whereas the corresponding acceptance rates ranged from 53–73% elsewhere in the country. Multiple regression analysis shows that it is geographical region that affects the acceptability the most, independently of parental education. We will not pursue the reasons for these differences any further, other than to consider the possibility that it might be connected to the academic success of students and their test-taking abilities. Among the schools in Inner Reykjavík that we tested in our study were those schools which received the highest average scores on the national exams in the spring of 2000. However, the results of our questionnaire on the new construction in various syntactic environments indicate that this syntactic change is further developed in the countryside than in Inner Reykjavík. If this change began earlier outside of Reykjavík, then it would be natural that the percentage of positive responses should be lower in Inner Reykjavík than out in the countryside. The observed differences, however, are so great that other factors must be at play (see Sigurjónsdóttir and Maling 2002 for further discussion).

5. Testing individual predictions

5.1. Grammatical function of the postverbal NP: subject or object?

Recall that our predictions are that the innovative construction is in the process of acquiring the syntactic properties listed in (7). First, we included a few sentences to test whether the postverbal NP in the new construction

could possibly be analyzed as a grammatical subject. The data in (24) and (25) show clearly that the accusative NP cannot occur in subject position, namely between the finite verb and the participle, either in direct yes-no questions or in declaratives.

(24) **Accusative in subject position in direct questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative in subject position</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Var stúlkuna launið í klessu?</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Var lykana tekið af horum?</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Var nana skilið eftir heima?</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Var þig spurt margra spurninga?</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) **Accusative in subject position in declaratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative in subject position</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Í gur var Harald sött seið í skólan.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Þarf að veðr á sér í borgum.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have no explanation for the unexpectedly high acceptability of (24a). Possible factors that need to be investigated include the polyadicity of the verb and whether the pronoun is 1st, 2nd or 3rd person.
These results show clearly the the postverbal NPs are not postposed subjects of a passive voice verb but should instead be analyzed as objects of an active voice construction.

Another property that distinguishes subjects from objects is the Definiteness Effect, which constrains postposed subjects. Some linguists have speculated that the lack of the Definiteness Effect might be a general feature of the grammar of speakers who use the “new impersonal” (Guðmundsdóttir 2006, p. 171, fn. 77). Our data indicates that this speculation is incorrect, as shown in (26), where the acceptance rate is extremely low.

(26) **Definiteness Effect on postverbal (VP-internal) subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite Nomative NP in object position</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pað hefur komið Ólafur of seint í</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dö. has come Olaf too late in school in many days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaf has come to school too late for many days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that this is not an example of the new construction but an active voice sentence with a definite subject in the nominative case and expletive pað in sentence-initial position. Comparable sentences with indefinite subjects in VP-internal position are perfectly grammatical, as shown in (3a) and (4a). These results indicate that the postverbal NP in the innovative construction is a grammatical object, not a subject, and thus support the analysis sketched above in (6b).

5.2. **Agentive by-phrase**

Although overt agentive by-phrases are much less common in Icelandic than in English, they are grammatical in the canonical passive. To test whether subjects accept overt agentive by-phrases, we included in the control sentences two canonical passives with an overt by-phrase, one sentence containing a transitive verb governing a dative object, the other a verb taking an infinitival complement. The results shown in (27) indicate that by and large adolescents accept such sentences as fully grammatical, just like adults.

(27) **Agentive by-phrase in grammatical control sentences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agentive by-phrase in grammatical control sentences</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pað var sagt upp af forstjórunum. he-DAT was fired PRT by the.director</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pað var samþykkkt af öllum í it was agreed by all in bekknum að fara í keila, the.class to go bowling</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a syntactically active sentence, on the other hand, co-occurrence of an agentive by-phrase with the thematic subject (either overt or phonologically null) would constitute a Theta-Criterion Violation. Recall that in Polish, agentive by-phrases are fine in the canonical passive but robustly ungrammatical in the -no to construction, where native speakers report that a by-phrase is simply “redundant.” Thus if the innovative construction is syntactically active as we hypothesize, we predict that the presence of a by-phrase should be ungrammatical. The questionnaire contained two samples of the new construction designed to test this prediction. The results shown in (28) indicate that this prediction is largely confirmed; while not fully ungrammatical among speakers who accept the “new impersonal”, the by-phrase is significantly less acceptable than in the canonical passive.

(28) **Agentive by-phrase in the innovative construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agentive by-phrase</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pað var skotðuð blikkuð af bifídlaðirkjánum. he-DAT was inspected the.car by the.mechanic</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pað var sagt honum upp af forstjórunum. he-DAT was fired him PRT by the.director</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contrast is shown clearly by the minimal pair in (29a) vs. (29b), where (29a) is a canonical passive, and (29b) is unambiguously the new impersonal construction; both contain overt by-phrases. The sentence in (29c)
is an example of the new construction without a by-phrase. We wouldn’t expect adolescents in Inner Reykjavik to like (29b, c) very much with or without the by-phrase because these sentences are unambiguous instances of the new construction, but even here the presence of an agentive by-phrase clearly makes the sentence less acceptable.\(^\text{10}\)

\[\text{(29) Minimal Pair}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agentive by-phrase</th>
<th>Else-where</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Honum var sagt upp af forstjóranum. be-DAT was fired PRT by the.director</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Páð var sagt honum upp af forstjóranum. PRT was fired him by the.director</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Páð var sagt áður krókkunum áð fara heim.</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. Binding of anaphors

If the subject position in the “new impersonal” construction is a theta-position, then binding of anaphors in nonsubject positions should be possible since there is a thematic subject to bind such an anaphor. The questionnaire contained thirteen sentences designed to test this prediction, four with a plain reflexive sig, two with the compound self-anaphor.

\[\text{(30) Binding of sig-anaphors}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sig-anaphor</th>
<th>Else-where</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Svò var bara drifð sig á ball. then was just hurried REFL to the.dance</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Páð var haldið sig ínna dýra. PRT was kept REFL in doors</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Páð var skoðað sig um á svæðinum. PRT was looked REFL around the.area People looked around the area.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Páð var farði heim til sín.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This confirms Sigurðsson’s speculation (1989/1992, p. 235) that the new construction is best with reflexive verbs.\(^\text{13}\) This result is not surprising.

\[\text{10} \quad \text{As pointed out to us by Höskuldur Thomsen, it is not generally possible to have an agentive by-phrase with definite agent in ordinary passive voice phrases, as illustrated in (a) by:}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a) Páð var svoðavá mikrir bilar (*af hvítavíkorum).} & \quad \text{were inspected some car.NOM by the.mechanic.} \\
\text{b) Páð var sagt upp nógraga fóli (*af forstjóranum).} & \quad \text{PRT was fired many people-DAT by the.director.} \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{Although the new construction resembles passives like those in (a), the essential difference is that the postverbal NP in the new construction is definite rather than indefinite. Recall that the new construction is typically used to describe a specific event. We think that the understood agent in the new construction can refer to a specific individual, just like the object. Consider the example in (b), where the unnamed agent is most likely a specific individual:} \]

\[\text{II) Páð var sagt miðr áð fara heim.} \quad \text{PRT was told me to go home} \]

\[\text{For these reasons, we think that the test sentences in (28) bear on the hypothesis being tested.}\]

\[\text{13} \quad \text{Statistical analysis shows that a given speaker tends to either accept all of the example sentences in (30) or reject them all. If an adolescent accepts one of these sentences, then he/she is likely to accept the others. If an adult speaker rejects one of the sentences, then he/she is likely to reject the others. Note that the verbs in these examples are all obligatorily reflexive. In future studies we will compare the behavior of inherently reflexive verbs like leika or play with verbs like taka or take, which optionally take reflexive object.}\]

\[\text{ Sigurðsson (1989, p. 355), in 60} \text{ gives the following two examples:}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a) Það var leika sér á gagnagamantan. PRT was played REFL all day} \\
\text{b) Það var það þeir á laugamagnan. PRT was bathed REFL on Saturday} \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{The judgments indicated are Sigurðsson’s; note that in a pilot study in Hvassaleikhóli in Inner Reykjavik, only 1 out of 24 subjects judged (a) ungrammatical (cf. Björnsdóttir 1997).}\]
since in many languages, verbs with reflexive objects behave syntactically like intransitive verbs (Sells, Zenen and Zee 1987). Recall that, as reported in the table in (18), only 28% of adolescents in Inner Reykjavik accepted comparable sentences with nonreflexive accusative objects; in other words, subjects in Inner Reykjavik were twice as likely to accept a sentence with a reflexive object than a sentence with a nonreflexive accusative object. Even more striking is that between 30–40% of adult subjects accepted the examples with a reflexive object. Adults were four times as likely to accept a sentence with a reflexive object sig than to accept a sentence with a nonreflexive accusative object, which would unambiguously be an instance of the new construction (see the table in (18)). We suggest that this represents the first step in the reanalysis of the past participle from passive to syntactically active.

As illustrated in (31), self-anaphors were judged slightly less acceptable, and not surprisingly, reciprocals the least acceptable, as illustrated in (32). Both these types of anaphors require agreement in case and number.

(31) Binding of self-anaphors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-anaphor</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pað var horft á sjálfan sig í speglinum.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48% 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pað var bent á sjálfan sig á myndinum.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11% 13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(32) Binding of reciprocals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reciprocals</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pað var ekki hlustad á hverum annan á fundinum.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pað var hjálpað hverjum öðrum med verkefnin.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8% 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(33) Binding of possessive reflexives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive Reflexive</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pað var haldið með sinu líði.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>49% 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Á kvöldin var skoðað tölvupólitinn í the evening was checked i-mail sinn. SELF's</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Í morgun var hrint systur sinni this morning was pushed sister SELF's af hjólinu. off the bike</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Pað var klippt hárdi á dukkunni sinni.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Pað var oft kaflað broður sinn í sundlaugiani. in the pool</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3% 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in (33), the acceptability rates for the five examples containing possessive reflexives varied tremendously, from a high of 63% to a low of 5% outside of Inner Reykjavík. Note also the relatively high percentage of adults (36%) who judged (33a) acceptable. This example contains an intransitive verb and is therefore an instance of the impersonal passive. We suggest that speakers who accept the possessive reflexive analyze the impersonal passive as a syntactically active construction. Our data shows a kind of "step effect" whereby the acceptance rate increases from 36% for adults to nearly 50% for adolescents in Inner Reykjavík, to 53% for adolescents elsewhere in Iceland, suggesting that this analysis of impersonal passives is steadily increasing, independently of the new construction. Sentence (33b), which contains a transitive verb, is on the other hand clearly an example of the new construction, so it is not surprisi
that the acceptance rates for this sentence are much lower than for (33a). We suggest that the low acceptability of the examples in (33c–e) do not reflect the ungrammaticality of bound anaphors per se but rather the unnaturalness of the given examples under an impersonal reading: they would also be judged unnatural if mæður ‘one’ (lit. ‘man’) were used as subject.

5.4. Subject-oriented adjuncts

As is well-known, the implicit agent in a passive can license various kinds of agent-oriented adjuncts including purpose phrases, as illustrated in (34):

(34) a. Snjónum var mokað vandlega yfir hraeið.
   the.snow was shoveled carefully over the.carass

b. Mottan var barin af kappi.
   the.rug was beaten with a.beat

c. Búnum var hvolftr viljandi.
   the.boat was capsized on.purpose

(Zaenen and Maling 1984/1990, (4c))

However, certain other adjuncts seem to require a syntactic (subject) controller, as illustrated by the oddity of the examples in (35):

(35) a.?? Hundurinn var barin hágratandi.
   the.dog was beaten crying

b.?? Valinn var danssaðr skellihlejandi.
   the.waltz was danced laughing.uproariously

The grammatical subject in (35a), hundurinn ‘the dog,’ is not generally considered to be a suitable subject for the verb gráta ‘to cry’; in (35b) the grammatical subject is an inanimate noun, vals ‘waltz,’ which is not a suitable controller for the verb hlaða ‘to laugh’; hence the sentences are judged ungrammatical. Many speakers find it difficult to interpret the understood agent as the controller. The question then is whether such participial adjuncts can be used with passives of intransitive verbs, as illustrated in (36).

(36) Páð var danssað skellihlejandi á skipinu.
   I was danced laughing uproariously on the.ship

Sentence (36) should be ungrammatical in the standard language because there is no referential agent subject to serve as controller for the participial adjunct skellihlejandi. This was expressed by the intuition of one native speaker that “someone is missing.” On the other hand, we predict that speakers of the “new impersonal” should feel no such lack of an agent since, by hypothesis, the construction has a thematic subject to serve as syntactic controller for the participial adjunct.

The questionnaires contained three sentences designed to test this prediction, two impersonal passives formed from intransitive verbs (37a, b) and one from a transitive verb exemplifying the new construction (37c):

The results, shown in (37), largely confirm the expectation. Note that even in Inner Reykjavík, participial adjuncts with intransitive impersonal passives are accepted by approximately half the subjects. Not surprisingly, the third sentence with a transitive verb is judged much less acceptable in Inner Reykjavík where the innovative construction is less widespread, and by adults.

(37) Subject-oriented Participial Adjuncts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participial Adjuncts</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Inner Ryk</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Páð var mokið skellihlejandi í tím.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hláða was come laughing into class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Páð var farið hágratandi heim.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hláða was gone crying at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Páð var lesið minningar gæðinna grátaði.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hláða was read the.morning article crying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Hóskúlaður Thómasson (p.e.) points out that such sentences can be improved given suitable context.

(1) Í aftur 18 mánadarsókn þangað sagt þessi bræður voru súðustu after the.brother had told that the.she were last
danssaði danssað skellihlejandi.
dances danced laughing uproariously
What is surprising is that approximately 50% of adults also accepted sentences like (37a, b). Óláfdóttir and Ólafsdóttir (2000, p. 128) consider such sentences grammatical and suggest that such subject-oriented adjuncts "can be controlled by the underlying agent in impersonal passive sentences which do not contain a thematic subject." Our data indicates that there are actually two different groups of native speakers and presumably two different grammars. It is important to note that for both adolescents and adults, there is a highly significant correlation between the results for subject-oriented adjuncts and those for simple reflexives shown in (30). The more subject-oriented participles are accepted, the more simple reflexives are accepted.\(^\text{13}\) Although it is certainly possible to allow statements in the grammar to the effect that the underlying agent can be a controller for subject-oriented adjuncts, such a constraint would not capture the correlation between this and the acceptance of reflexive objects as our analysis does.

5.5. Unaccusative verbs

The canonical passive is subject to certain well-known lexical restrictions. In standard Icelandic, as in many languages, only verbs with external arguments form passives. These fall into two classes: (i) agentive verbs and (ii) most psych verbs with nominative subjects. One obvious consequence is that unaccusative verbs do not form passives (see Perlmutter 1978). It is commonly assumed that the passive morpheme is an argument which requires a theta-role (Baker 1988; Baker, Johnson, and Roberts 1989). Since by hypothesis, unaccusative verbs have no external theta-role, they cannot assign that theta role to the passive morpheme in \(\hat{I}\), which is external to VP. If, however, the innovative construction is semantically active, as we hypothesize, then we would not expect to find the same lexical restrictions as in the canonical passive. It is worth noting that in both Polish and Irish, where a similar syntactic development has already been completed, unaccusative verbs do occur with the relevant "impersonal" morphology provided that the understood subject is [+human].

Passives of unaccusative verbs are sharply ungrammatical in all the Germanic languages that allow intransitive verbs to form passives, including standard Icelandic. To test for changes in lexical restrictions in Icelandic, we constructed five sentences containing unaccusative verbs

---

\(^{13}\) For adolescents, the correlation was very significant \((r = 0.43, n = 1695, p = 0.000, 2\text{-tailed})\); for adults, the correlation was also very significant \((r = 0.532, n = 199, p = 0.000, 2\text{-tailed})\).
We assume that there must be some semantic difference among these unaccusative verbs that accounts for the variable behavior. Hóskuldur Thráinsson (p.c.) suggests that verbs denoting change of location are better than verbs denoting change of state. One might speculate that changes in the lexical restrictions on a particular morphology are the last stage in the real analysis from impersonal passive to a syntactically active construction. But note this in fact, adults like (38b, c, d) as much as the adolescents do, and crucially, they accept these examples of impersonal passives to a much greater extent than they accept definite postverbal objects. We return to this below in our speculations as to why this change is occurring in Icelandic.

6. Conclusions

The results support our hypothesis that what looks like a morphological passive is well along the way to being reanalyzed as a syntactically active construction with a phonologically null impersonal subject. Although the absolute numbers in the various geographical regions differ, namely Ínnaer Reykjavík versus Elsewhere, the relative acceptability judgments are mostly the same. This indicates that we are tapping into psychologically real linguistic intuitions. The obvious questions are: why is this innovation happening, and when did it start?

6.1. History of the construction

When did the innovation begin? The “new impersonal” apparently dates back only a few decades. Our data show that although the new construction is common among adolescents, most adults consider it ungrammatical. However, we have collected a few examples from speakers now in their forties and fifties. The oldest examples that we know of are from 1959 and 1968.

(39) a. Pað var bölustað ókkur.
    itexx was inoculated us
    We got inoculated. (girl born in Akureyri, 1951)

b. Pað var gefið móður námi.
    itexx was given me-DAT candy-ACC
    Someone gave me candy. (girl, born in Akranes, 1958)

c. Pað var mótmælt þessum vinnubrúðum.
    itexx was opposed these procedures-DAT
    People opposed these procedures.
    (male, born in Vestfirðir, 1942)

d. Pað var trúflað mig í
    itexx was disturbed me-ACC at [the]
    lok þáttarins.
    end [of] the program-GEN
    Someone disturbed me at the end of the program.
    (male, born in Norðurland, 1950)

e. Pað var jordið hann í gær.
    itexx was buried-neut.sg. him-ACC yesterday
    He was buried yesterday.
    (male, born in Norðurland, 1941)

A teacher recalls having heard his 8-year-old niece from Akureyri in Norðurland say the sentence in (39a) in 1959; the girl’s mother doesn’t think the construction was common at the time. A woman in Akranes, in Vesturland, recalls having been horrified when she heard her 10-year-old daughter say the sentence in (39b) in 1968, and reports that this construction was quite common among children in Akranes in the late sixties. The daughter remembers being corrected by her mother. When they moved to Reykjavík in 1972, they observed that the construction was hardly used at all in the capital city (Haraldsdóttir 1997, p. 22).

---

(i) Einn er burist og døið lýsir Íslandshald.
    still is fought and died for the Fatherland.
Since such coined readings do not bear on our hypothesis, we have deliberately chosen contexts which favor a nonverbalional interpretation, and not, e.g., the falling or dying of an actor on stage.

---

19 Thanks to Þórhallur Eythórsson for example (38). Note that the canonical passive of the ditransitive in (38b) would be Mér var gefið námi; because oblique NPs can be grammatical subjects in Icelandic, NP-movement of one of the two internal arguments is obligatory in the standard language.
Although the new construction is most noticeable in the spoken language of children and adolescents, it is also found in the speech of adults, as illustrated by the examples in (39c–e), which are recent examples brought to our attention by linguists and other observers of the language. The fact that all the speakers are from outside Reykjavik is consistent with our data showing that the new construction is more widespread outside of the capital city.

We have also collected examples from children, some of which are shown in (40).

(40) a. Þáð var fundið peyuna mina í dag.
    It was found sweater mine today.
    My sweater was found today. (Boy, 8 years old)

b. Þáð hefur verið gerð þér oft kókur.
    It has been given you often cookies.
    You have often been given cookies. (Boy, 8 years old)

c. í gær þegar þáð var gerð mó réysa þá...
    yesterday when it was given me cod liver oil, then
    Yesterday, when I was given cod liver oil, then...
    (Girl, 4 years old)

d. Tíger telur að þáð hefur verið rann honum.
    Tíger thinks that it has been kidnapped him
    Tíger, thinks that he, has been kidnapped. (Girl, 4 years old)

Especially interesting is the following exchange between a 3.2-year-old girl and her mother who were talking about a picture of a thief in a storybook (see Haraldsdóttir 1997, p. 23):

(41) Child: Þáð er bundið honum.
    It is tied him-DAT
    He is tied up.
    ...

Mother: Þvermið er þetta néð Katrinn?
    this is this with the guy
    What is it with this guy?

Child: Hann er bindaður.
    he-NOM is tied [up]

It is interesting that the child used the wrong object case in the “new impersonal” construction; the verb bindið ‘to bind, tie up’ governs accusative case in the adult language. Recall that we found a higher acceptance rate for verbs assigning dative than for verbs assigning accusative, both here and in our pilot study (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 1997). The child also used a weak past participial form, bindaður, instead of the correct participle bundinn for the strong verb binda. If the child’s second sentence is indeed a passive rather than an active with predicate adjective, then this discourse shows that the new construction co-exists in the grammars of children, just as it does in the grammar of adolescents, and suggests that the “new impersonal” and the standard passive are functionally equivalent.

6.2. Why in Icelandic?

The syntactic reanalysis from passive to active is neither unnatural nor unique since a similar diachronic development has occurred independently in both Polish and Irish. But why is it happening in Icelandic? It is clearly not foreign influence since none of the other languages commonly spoken by Icelanders has this construction. So this change cannot, for example, be blamed on English. Nor can it be blamed on the corrupting influence of the big city, a common theme in modern Icelandic literature. As far as we know, there are no indications that a similar change lies on the horizon in any other Scandinavian language.20

But we should speculate a bit on its origins in Icelandic. First, in all Germanic languages, the understood agent of an impersonal passive can only be interpreted as a human. In (42), the impersonal passives of the verb meaning “to whistle” can only be understood as describing human whistlers, not trains or teakettles.

---

20 As Martin Haegelmuth and Hjelm Hock (p.c.) have pointed out to us, there does exist a non-standard construction in German:

(42) Der Wind hat die Bücher gelesen.
    The wind ACC read books-ACC

Note that the construction seems to allow only determinerless nouns; since plural nouns don’t distinguish NOM from ACC in German, we claim that the nominal argument is ACC based on the lack of agreement and the theoretical knowledge that NOM and agreement are strongly correlated. Although this resembles the new Icelandic construction in that the finite verb fails to agree with the nominal argument, it differs in that the NP tends to be indefinite and anaphoric. Native speakers feel that this resembles noun-incorporation, a process which creates an intransitive verb which can then form an impersonal passive.
(42) The understood agent of an Impersonal Passive is necessarily [+human]

a. Það var flautað. (Icelandic)

b. Det visslades. (Swedish)

c. Es wurde gepfiffen. (German)

d. Er werd door de jongen/*de trean gefloten. (Dutch)

The understood agent of an Impersonal Passive is necessarily [+human].

As argued by Maling (1993), this semantic generalization, which also holds of the PRO-arb subject of uncontrolled infinitival subjects, sets the stage for the reanalysis of a thematically empty null subject as a fully thematic pro external argument. Note that the same semantic restriction holds of the personal passive in Icelandic.

(43) a. Sniðist eyðiðið húsíð.
the avalanche destroyed the house

b. *Húsið var eyðilagð í sniðóðinu.
the house was destroyed in the avalanche

c. Húsið eyðilagðið í sniðóðinu.
the house was destroyed in the avalanche

In the active voice, the subject of a transitive verb like eyðlað “destroy” can be a natural force such as fire, storm, flood, or avalanche. However, in a personal passive like (43b), the understood agent must be a human. This sentence cannot mean that the avalanche destroyed the house, a meaning which is rendered by the morphological middle in (43c). Sentence (43b) could only be interpreted to mean that some human destroyed the house during the avalanche or triggered an avalanche in order to destroy the house.

The reanalysis from passive to active impersonal can thus be seen as a simplification of the grammar. Passivization involves suppression of the external argument. Since external arguments can be natural forces (causes) as well as human agents, the restriction to [+human] agents that holds in Icelandic requires an additional stipulation. However, once the construction is reanalyzed as a syntactically active construction, the [+human] restriction is a natural one since thematic role, e.g., agent, is not a classificatory feature for pronouns whether overt or null. Pronouns can vary for person, number, gender, and animacy/+human but not for thematic role.

(44) Norwegian impersonal passives

a. Det ble danset av alle og enhver i bygda.

It was danced by everyone and all in the village

b. *Det ble hygget seg.

Intended: People had a good time.

*Det ble låst seg (selv) inne i fabrikken.

*It was locked (self) inside the factory

*Det ble lyttet til hverandres på møtet.

*It was listened to one another at the meeting

c. *Det ble danset lødende/grående/påfull/falte/fullt

Subject Control

Under krigen ble det forsvunnet Unaccusative verbs.
during the war it disappeared
	often uten spor.

often without a trace

So what is different in Icelandic? It is surely relevant that in the mainland Scandinavian languages, unlike Icelandic, the passive is not restricted to [+human] agents; this is illustrated for Norwegian in (45).

(45) Huset ble ødelagt i/av stormen. (Norwegian)
the house was destroyed in/ by the storm

Based on our study of the new impersonal in Icelandic, the first stage after the reanalysis seems to be the extension of the impersonal passive to inherently reflexive predicates; this then extends to non-inherent reflexives and other bound anaphors. Recall that, as shown in tables (30)–(33), even adult speakers accept bound anaphors in impersonal passives to a fairly high degree. Moreover, as shown in (37), many adults also accept control of participial adverbials, and many accept impersonal passives of presumably unaccusative verbs with unspecified human subjects. All of these
factors indicate that even in the standard language, passive morphology is associated with a human agent reading, which makes possible the reanalysis as an unspecified human subject construction. Furthermore, as noted by Sigurðsson (1989, p. 322, fn. 48), by-phrases are generally "ungrammatical or infelicitous in impersonal passives" in Icelandic.

Another factor contributing to the reanalysis is the existence of other impersonal subject constructions, for example, the modal or aspectual use of certain verbs: vera 'be', verða 'become, must', fara 'go', byrgja 'begin', hétta 'stop'. Sigurðsson (1989, p. 356) discusses the Impersonal Modal construction, illustrated in (46), and suggests that these also involve an arbitrary pro-subject.

(46) Impersonal Modal Construction
Pað verður [e] að kjösa hana. (Sigurðsson 1989, it must to elect her p. 356, ex. (26))

Someone has to elect her/We have to elect her.

It is striking that aspectual verbs like vera 'be', fara 'go', byrgja 'begin', hétta 'stop' form impersonal passives.21

(47) Pað var farðið [að PRO moka sajoninn] í gær.
it was gone to PRO shovel the snow-ACC yesterday

People began shovelling the snow yesterday.

(Sigurðsson 1989, p. 64, ex. (4a))

The attested example of the new construction shown in (48a) seems to be the functional equivalent of the impersonal passive of aspectual vera 'to be', the same verb used as the passive auxiliary.

(48) a. "Í gær þegar það var gefið mér lýsi, þá . . .
yesterday when it was given me cod liver oil, then . . .
girl, age 4:4

b. Í gær þegar var verðið að gefa (standard language)
yesterday when been to give
mér lýsi, þá . . .
me cod liver oil, then . . .

Yesterday when they were giving me cod liver oil, then . . .

21 Sigurðsson (1989, p. 57) accounts for this by hypothesizing that these aspectual verbs optionally select an external theta role.

It seems likely that such constructions in the standard language serve as models for the reanalysis of the impersonal morphological passive as a syntactically active impersonal construction.

In conclusion, our results show unambiguously that the new construction represents an ongoing syntactic change and not just the current fashion or fad in the language of children and adolescents. Although it is most common in the speech of the young, it is also found in the unguarded speech of adults. Although least accepted in Inner Reykjavík, the construction has spread throughout the country and has extended into a variety of syntactic constructions. We cannot emphasize too strongly, that we are reporting on a syntactic change that is still very much in progress. The results reported here are the first step in what we hope will be an ongoing project designed to track the development of this innovative construction.

Appendix – Test sentences on questionnaire

1. Pað var rekð Olaf úr skólanum.
   Í skólanum was driven Olaf-ACC from the school
   Olaf was kicked out of school.

   Í skólanum was driven the accent-ACC on the school
   The school was kicked onto the pile.

3. Pað var þegar í hópum.
   Í hópum was driven the group-DAT
   The group was kicked onto the pile.

4. Pað var Örðinn var þegar í hópum.
   Í hópum was driven the group-DAT
   He was kicked onto the pile.

5. í hópum var þegar í skólanum.
   Í hópum was driven the group-DAT on the school
   This morning someone/people arrived at school too late.

6. Svo var þegar útlitið sig á höll.
   Í hópum was driven the group-DAT
   So people just hurried off to the dance.

7. Í hópum var þegar útlitið sig á höll.
   Í hópum was driven the group-DAT
   Yesterday the teacher is sick.

8. Í hópum var þegar útlitið sig á höll.
   Í hópum was driven the group-DAT
   The school was kicked onto the pile.
9. Það var klippt húrin á duktunum sinni.  
*íð.ERC* was cut the.hair on the.doll REFL  
The hair on one's doll was cut.

10. Í dag var heimur heims til fæðrumana.  
*íð.* was home heimur-ACC home.ACC  
Today they phoned home to the parents.

11. Það var bent á sjálfum sig á myndinni.  
*íð.ERC* was pointed to self REFL in.the.picture  
People pointed to themselves in the picture.

12. Ín þrókku til þjónarins.  
*Ín.* is forward to Christmas  
I look forward to Christmas.

13. Það var hjálpa hverjum öðrum maður verkefnð.  
*íð.ERC* was helped each other-DAT with the assignment  
People helped each other with the assignment.

14. Var alltanna lanið í klusu?  
was the.girl-ACC beaten to pieces  
Was the girl badly beaten up?

15. Það var haldinum með sínu líði.  
*íð.ERC* was held with REFL room  
People rooted for their own teams.

16. Það var safnað peningum í fyrir ferð til útlendinga.  
*íð.ERC* was collected money-DAT for trip to abroad  
Money was collected for a trip abroad.

17. Það var sagt öllum kökkunnunum að fara heim.  
*íð.ERC* was said all the.kids-DAT to go home  
The kids were all told to go home.

18. Í gár var Harald sött sent í skólum.  
yesterday was Harald ACC sought late in school  
Yesterday Harald was picked up late at school.

19. Það var kemri skólfólgum lín í tíma.  
*íð.ERC* was come laughing in to class  
A fundúman was líní bref from skólsjóðum.  
at the.meeting was read letter from the.principal  
A letter from the school principal was read at the meeting.

20. Ín það hefur komið Ólafur.  
*íð.* has come Ólaf-NOM too late in school in many days  
For many days Olaf has arrived at school too late.

21. Það er í klokkunum tímarit.  
*íð.* is in the.hours  
It is now 2:15.

22. Það var þatnar barnin í klusu.  
*íð.ERC* was beaten-nom.sg. the.child-nom.sg. in pieces  
The child was badly beaten up.

23. Það var skiltu huna eftir heima.  
*íð.ERC* was left her-ACC behind at home  
She was left behind at home.

*Ín.* pushed me-DAT off the.bike REFL-3rd pers.  
You pushed me off his own bike.

25. Það var hóttu stópnað í súmunum.  
*íð.ERC* was disappeared missing in the.star.wars  
In star wars, people disappeared without a trace.

26. Var þig spurt margr upplaingar?  
*Ín.* asked many questions  
Were you asked many questions?

27. Það var hófði sig innan dyra út af övverum.  
*íð.ERC* was held. REFL within doors out of the.bad.weather  
People stayed indoors because of the bad weather.

28. Ólafur var rekinn úr skólum.  
Ólafur-NOM was driven out.of school  
Olaf was kicked out of school.

29. Í gár var tæpad öskum í fyrir frá heima.  
yesterday was taken driver’s license from him  
His driver’s license was taken from him yesterday.

30. Það var skólad tímarit um þrifvaskóðum.  
*íð.ERC* was examined the.car-ACC by the.mechanic  
The car was checked by the mechanic.

31. Það var þatnar þrafðar barnið sért býtinn.  
*íð.ERC* was read-nom.sg. the.poem-nom.sg. aloud for the.children  
The poem was read aloud to the children.

32. Mér þjóði í *í=j*,  
me-DAT longs for ice cream  
I want ice cream.

33. Það var skiltu barnin eftir hja önnu og af.  
*íð.ERC* was left-nom.sg. the.child-nom.sg. behind at granda and grandpa's  
The child was left behind at granda and grandpa's.

34. Það var farði henni um síðan.  
*íð.ERC* was gone home in REFL  
People went to their homes.
48. Það var sagt með að taka til
	
	n ígítu
	

tóku
	

49. Í morgun var þau sysur sinni af hjólinum
	

50. Það var hóft í sjálfan sig í speglum.
	

51. Það var dansð í kringum plattan.
	

52. Í tímanum var spurt mig margar spurningar.
	

53. Var það sagt þér að fara?
	
	

54. Það var farði hagráðum heim.
	

55. Var lýkama tekið af hómanum?
	

56. Það var dái í bollfyrstu.
	

57. Það var safnlyst til það í bekkrum að fara í veiði.
	

58. Það var skiljaðan einu eftir hinum.
	

59. Það var látt aftur skálana í þystum.
	

60. Hannið er en því veit.
	

NEW IMPERSONAL IN ICELANDIC
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