

Introduction: Morphosyntactic Change in Late Modern Swedish

Ida Larsson & Erik Petzell

Abstract: The chapters in this volume are concerned with morphosyntactic change in Late Modern Swedish, i.e. the period from the beginning of the 18th century and onwards. Although the period is interesting (considering e.g. standardization processes), it has previously received fairly little attention in the syntactic literature. The contributions in this volume cover different grammatical domains, including case and verbal syntax, word order and agreement, and grammaticalization in the nominal domain. In this introduction to the volume, we give a background to Late Modern Swedish. We briefly discuss the external factors that are particularly relevant for morphosyntactic change during the period, and give an overview of the morphosyntax of Late Modern Swedish. Finally, we provide a summary of the chapters that follow.

Keywords: Late Modern Swedish, morphosyntactic change, standardization, historical corpora, word order

1. Introduction

This volume deals with morphosyntactic change in Late Modern Swedish (LMS). In the traditional periodization of the history of Swedish, LMS is the last of four periods. The other three are Early and Late Old Swedish (EOS, LOS), and Early Modern Swedish (EMS); see (1) below.¹

¹ Traditionally, two older periods are also included: Ancient Nordic –800 (in Swedish: *Urnordiska*) and Runic Swedish 800–1225 (in Swedish: *Runsvenska*) (Wessén 1958:7–43, Bergman 1968:13–29). More recently, it has been suggested that LMS be followed by a third period starting around 1880: *Modern Nysvenska* (lit. ‘Modern New Swedish’); cf. the Swedish labels for EMS and LMS: *Äldre* (‘Elder’) and *Yngre* (‘Younger’) *Nysvenska* (‘New Swedish’) (Thelander 1988, Malmgren 2007). However, this suggestion has hardly had any practical consequences (yet), but is part of an ongoing theoretical discussion of periodization in Swedish historical linguistics (see Ralph 2000, Johansson 2007, 2010). Here, we use LMS in its traditional sense, viz. as a period starting in 1732 and leading up to the present. Throughout this volume, the language of today – i.e. the language that present-day native speakers have intuitions about – is referred to as present-day Swedish (PDS).

- (1) Early Old Swedish (EOS) 1225–1375
 Late Old Swedish (LOS) 1375–1526
 Early Modern Swedish (EMS) 1526–1732
 Late Modern Swedish (LMS) 1732–

The two earliest dates (1225, 1375) are approximations: 1225 represents the introduction of the Latin alphabet for writing Swedish (a process which started in the beginning of the 13th century), and 1375 represents a period of demographic and political change in Scandinavia (due mainly to the macabre effects of the Black Death, and the growing influence of the Hanseatic league in northern Europe). The two modern periods (EMS, LMS), on the other hand, both have starting dates that coincide with the year of appearance of an important publication: *Thet Nyia Testamentit på Swensko*, ‘The New Testament in Swedish’ (printed in 1526), and the groundbreaking weekly journal *Then Swänska Argus*, ‘The Swedish Argus’ (first issued in 1732), respectively.

Diachronic developments can in other words be traced in texts back to the early 13th century (and even further if we include the runic inscriptions). The oldest preserved Swedish text in the Latin alphabet is a medieval law, the *Elder Westrogothic law* (EWL, in Swedish: *Äldre Västgötalagen*). The EWL is the oldest of the laws of those provinces (Sw. *landskap*) that later became the Swedish kingdom.² It begins with a section on the role of religion in society, the beginning of which is given in (2).

- (2) *Her byriarz laghbok væsgöta*
 here begin.PRS.REFL law.book.M.SG.NOM westrogoth.M.PL.GEN
Krister ær fyrst i laghum warum þa
 Christ.M.SG.NOM be.PRS.SG first in law.M.PL.DAT our.M.PL.DAT then
ær cristna var oc allir
 be.PRS.SG christendom.F.SG.NOM our.F.SG.NOM and all.M.PL.NOM
cristnir konongær. böndær oc allir
 christian.M.PL.NOM king.M.SG.NOM farmer.M.PL.NOM and all.M.PL.NOM
bocarlar biscopær oc allir
 resident.men.M.PL.NOM bishop.M.SG.NOM and all.M.PL.NOM
boclærðir mæn. Varþær barn til kirkiu
 book.learn.PTC.M.PL.NOM man.M.PL.NOM be.PRS.SG child.N.SG to church.F.SG.GEN
boret oc bepiz cristnu.
 carry.PTC.N.SG and ask.PRS.SG.PASS christening.F.SG.ACC.

² There are medieval laws (as well as other texts) from regions that did not become part of Sweden until the mid 17th century (viz. Gotland and Skåne). Traditionally, early texts from these areas have been excluded from the history of Swedish.

<i>þa</i>	<i>scal</i>	<i>faþir</i>	<i>ok</i>	<i>moðer</i>	<i>fa</i>
then	shall.PRS.SG	father.M.SG.NOM	and	mother.F.SG.NOM	get.INF
<i>guðfæður</i>		<i>oc guðmoþor</i>		<i>oc salt</i>	<i>oc uatn.</i>
godfather.M.SG.ACC		and godmother.F.SG.ACC		and salt.N.SG.ACC	and water.N.SG.ACC
<i>þæt</i>	<i>scal</i>	<i>bærae</i>	<i>til kirkiu</i>	<i>þa</i>	<i>scal</i>
it.N.SG.ACC	shall.PRS.SG	carry.INF	to church.F.SG.GEN	then	shall.PRS.SG
<i>a prést</i>	<i>kallæ</i>	<i>han</i>	<i>skal</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>kirkiu</i>
on priest.M.SG.ACC	call.INF	he.M.SG.NOM	shall.PRS.SG	on	church.F.SG.GEN
<i>bole</i>	<i>boæ.</i>				
farm.N.SG.DAT	live.INF				

‘Here begins the law book of the Westrogothic. Christ is first in our law. Thereafter is our Christian faith and all Christians, king, farmers and all resident men, bishop, and all learned men. If a child is carried to church, and it is asked for christening, then father and mother shall get godfather, and godmother, and salt, and water. One should carry that to church. Then one should call for a priest. He should live at the parsonage.’ (EWL, 1220s, from Fornsvenska textbanken)³

The language of the Swedish medieval laws differs from present-day Swedish (PDS) in many ways. Among other things, EOS had a rich case system (cf. *a kirki-u bol-e*, ‘at church-GEN farm-DAT’), post-nominal possessives (*laghbok væsgöta* ‘law book Westrogothic’, *laghum warum* ‘laws our’), and lacked indefinite articles (*barn til kirkiu boret* ‘child to church carried’, *a prest kalla* ‘on priest call’). Moreover, overt pronominal subjects were quite rare: although referential pronouns were only occasionally omitted (cf. the overt *han* referring to *prést*, ‘priest’, in the last sentence), there were neither expletive nor generic pronouns (cf. *þa scal a prést kallæ*, lit. ‘then [one] shall on priest call’). As for the position of verbs, EOS still had OV-order (*han skal a kirkiu bole boæ* lit. ‘he shall on land of church live’), and sentence adverbials followed the finite verb in both main and embedded clauses (although there are no such examples in (2); see section 3.1.1 below).

Five centuries after the EWL, the grammatical system had gone through dramatic change, on all levels. Consider the introduction to *Argus* in (3) below, which, as noted, represents the beginning of the Late Modern Swedish period.⁴

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| (3) | <i>THEN</i> | <i>SWÄNSKA</i> | <i>ARGUS N:o I.</i> | <i>Ingen</i> | <i>lärer</i> |
| | the.C.SG | Swedish.DEF | Argus no 1 | no.one.C.SG | shall.PRS.SG |
| | <i>kunna</i> | <i>neka,</i> | <i>at ju</i> | <i>sådane</i> | <i>Skriffter</i> |

³ Many older Swedish texts are available through *Fornsvenska textbanken*, ‘the text bank of Old Swedish’: <https://project2.sol.lu.se/fornsvenska/>, which we will refer to as FTB. The same texts can be accessed through the corpus infrastructure Korp (Borin et al. 2012): https://spraakbanken.gu.se/korp/?mode=all_hist#

⁴ In the glosses, C refers to common gender; see further section 3.3 on the change from a three-gender system to a system with two genders. Present-day Swedish has a morphological distinction between the participial verb form used in perfects, the so-called supine form (SUP), and perfect participles (PTC) used e.g. in passives, but since this distinction is not yet established in the 18th century, the participles in examples like (3) are glossed as PTC; see further section 3.1.2 below.

be.able.to.INF deny.INF that MODPART such.PL writing.PL
hafwa stor nytta med sig, som, på ett angenämt och
 have.PRS.PL large.C.SG benefit with REFL that on a.N.SG pleasant.N.SG and
lustigt sätt, föreställa Lärdomar och Wettenskaper; Derföre
 amusing.N.SG manner present.PRS.PL learning.PL and science.PL therefore
hafwa och de gamla, under roliga Dikter,
 have.PRS.PL also the.PL ancient.PL during entertaining.PL poem.PL
liufliga Samtahl eller nöysamma Historier, underwisat
 delightful.PL conversation.PL or diverting.PL tale.PL instruct.PTC
Folket om Dygden, och likasom skiämtewijs förhållit
 people.DEF.N.SG about virtue.DEF.C.SG and almost jokingly impart.PTC
dem alfwarsamma Sede-Läror. I nyare tider, och än i dag,
 3PL.OBJ grave.PL moral-lesson.PL in new.COMP time.PL and even to day
se wi äfwen, hos kloka Nationer, sådane Skriffter
 see.PRS.PL we also at wise.PL nation.PL such.PL writing.PL
med mycken nytta utgifwas och älskas
 with much.C.SG benefit publish.PRS.PASS and cherish.PRS.PASS
 ‘The Swedish Argus No 1. No one can deny that such writings are indeed beneficial,
 that in a pleasant and amusing manner, administer Learning and Science. So the
 Ancients have instructed the People on Virtue through entertaining Poems, delightful
 Conversations and diverting Tales, and imparted grave Lessons of Morality in an
 almost jocular manner. In more recent times, and even today, we still find Writings
 of this kind, useful and cherished, published in wise Nations.’ (*Argus*, 1730s, from
 FTB)

Here, very little is left of the old case system (some forms linger in the pronominal system, e.g. *dem* ‘them’, which is an old dative, but in (3), and still today, it functions as a general object form), the modern article-system is fully in place (cf. *ett angenämt och lustigt sätt*, ‘a pleasant and jolly manner’), and possessives are pronominal. Moreover, referential *pro*-drop was no longer possible, and expletives were increasingly becoming the rule in the 18th century. Late Modern Swedish was a VO-language (cf. *underwisat Folket om Dygden* ‘instructed the people about virtue’), and in embedded clauses, the finite verb generally remained in the verb phrase, and it therefore followed sentence adverbials. However, some things remain stable over time. For instance, both EOS and LMS are V2 languages, which means that in main clauses, the finite verb always inverts with the subject, unless the subject itself was topicalized. This results in either SV- or (X)VS-initial word order, i.e. a surface order where V never comes later than in second position. Thus, we find SV (e.g. *han skal*, ‘he shall’ in (2), and *Ingen lärer* ‘No one should’ in (3)) and (X)VS (e.g. *Varþær barn*, ‘becomes child’ in (2), and *Derföre hafwa och de gamla* lit. ‘therefore have also the old’ in (3)) in both the EOS and the LMS texts.⁵

⁵ Many instances of the XVS structure are obscured in (2) due to the lack of overt subjects.

Many of the substantial grammatical changes that took place in the period between the texts in (2) and (3) have been investigated in the historical records. There are for instance studies of the shift from OV to VO word order (e.g. Delsing 1999, Petzell 2011, Sangfelt 2019), the loss of *pro*-drop (Håkansson 2008) and the emergence of expletives (Falk 1993), changes in embedded word order (Platzack 1988, Falk 1993, Håkansson 2011), grammaticalization of auxiliaries (Andersson 2007, Bylin 2013) and complementizers (Rosenkvist 2004), loss of case morphology (Delsing 1991, 2014, Norde 1997, Falk 1997, Skrzypek 2005) and the grammaticalization of (in)definite articles (Skrzypek 2009, Brandtler & Delsing 2010, Stroh-Wollin 2016). These studies typically consider the development of Swedish from the Old Swedish period until the early Late Modern Swedish period (i.e. the middle of the 18th century). They also concern changes that to a large extent can be observed in all of the Mainland North Germanic languages (cf. e.g. Holmberg & Platzack 1995).

As it is specified in (1), LMS continues into the present. Thus, in a way, it indicates the end of the history of Swedish. It is, of course, an absurd idea that history would have an endpoint. Nevertheless, the impression that LMS is too close to the present to be of interest or importance for historical linguistics has indeed shaped the output of this discipline in Sweden. Its main focus has always been on the earliest stages of the language (Wollin 1988, Haapamäki 2010). Naturally, such an inclination towards the archaic is understandable when the main objective is reconstruction of a proto-language. However, even diachronic research set in a generative framework, where the age of the linguistic source is irrelevant, has shown a strong tendency towards addressing the grammatical structure of old rather than recent, despite the fact that the latter is much more robustly documented in texts of various types. An important reason for this is simply that, as we have already seen, many interesting (and quite dramatic) things happen in the grammar of Swedish towards the end of the Middle ages.

History clearly does not end in 1732, but to date we know considerably less about morphosyntactic change from the middle of the 18th century and onwards than we do about earlier periods. This volume aims to remedy this. As we will see in the following, there are changes in word order, in the abstract system of case, in the distribution of adverbials, and so on, that take place in the Late Modern Swedish period, and grammaticalization processes continue into the present day. Moreover, the Late Modern Swedish period is interesting, for a number of reasons. This is when Swedish is established as a national standard language. New genres emerge, and the written language becomes more generally available to all speakers. We also sometimes find diverging developments in the different Mainland North Germanic languages, and some of the much-discussed differences between Danish, Norwegian and

Swedish (e.g. in argument placement, passives, particles, and participle morphology) are established during this period. In addition, during the 19th and 20th centuries, the traditional dialects undergo more dramatic changes than ever.

This anthology contains a collection of papers that all discuss morphosyntactic change in Late Modern Swedish. Some of the articles aim at completing our knowledge of previously studied phenomena, addressing the last remnants of a mediaeval system (e.g. lexical case or verbal agreement in archaic dialects). Others instead focus on changes that start in Early Modern Swedish or even later (e.g. the development of quantifiers). However, both groups may comprise the exciting task of analyzing linguistic development that is still ongoing, reflected in an unstable and varying present-day usage. The papers shed new light on both internal and external factors in language change; we will see effects of morphological change, of standardization processes, as well as of e.g. syntactic economy principles.

In this introduction, we provide some background to the Late Modern Swedish period. Section 2 gives an overview of some of the external factors that are relevant for morphosyntactic change during the period. In section 3, we present some central aspects of the morphosyntax of Late Modern Swedish. Section 4 gives an overview of the papers in the volume.

2. External factors in Late Modern Swedish

As noted above, the outer prerequisites for Swedish changed in the Late Modern Swedish period. In this section we give an overview of the external factors that might affect the development of Swedish morphosyntax during the period. Section 2.1 is concerned with the standardization of Swedish. In section 2.2, we briefly discuss the inter- and intra-individual variation that can be observed in the 18th and 19th century. Section 2.3 gives a short overview of the sources to Late Modern Swedish, with particular focus on the available electronic corpora that are used by the authors in this volume.

2.1. Standardisation and education

As shown in section 1, there are Swedish texts written with the Latin alphabet from the 13th century and onwards. However, the development of a standard language came much later (for a thorough description of this process, see Teleman 2002). It was not until the publication of the New Testament in Swedish in 1526 and its natural continuation in the entire Bible in 1541, that one uniform way of writing Swedish reached all the parishes of the realm. Spreading the

Bible in Swedish by employing the Gutenbergian printing technique was an important item on the agenda of the centralized Swedish state, which started to take its form in the beginning of the 16th century. In order to consolidate the emerging nation state, clearly distinguishing it from other similar states (in particular Denmark, with which Sweden had been in a union since the late 14th century), the governing elite (with King Gustav Vasa in the lead) resorted to both practical and spiritual means. In a way, the new Bible embodied both strategies. By adopting the reformed religion, the state gained full control of the church, which had to cut its ties to Rome, including all its institutions and, not least, its long-established presence in all local communities: men of the church now answered to the king in Stockholm, not to the pope in Rome. Of course, the primary objectives of the state when distributing a printed Bible were not linguistic – the point was rather to execute and demonstrate the power of a new and centralized Sweden. Nevertheless, the linguistic consequences for the written language were immense (Ståhle 1970).

As late as the early 18th century, the Bible of 1541 was still the most relevant prototype for written Swedish. There had been new editions of the Bible issued both in 1618 and in 1703, but the form of the original was kept more or less intact, with only a minimum of revisions (see Platzack 2005). By contrast, the state took quite radical measures in the domain of civil law towards the end of the EMS period, resulting in a new, albeit linguistically quite archaic (Wessén 1965), code of law for the nation: *Sveriges Rikes lag*, ‘the law of the kingdom of Sweden’ from 1734, which is still in effect in parts. However, neither law nor Bible came to play any significant role in the shaping of the written standard during the 18th century. Instead, new genres that were promoted by the age of enlightenment emerged as preferred models for standard Swedish. Although this new and secular standard was eventually codified in dictionaries (e.g. Sahlstedt’s *Swensk Ordbok*, ‘Swedish Dictionary’, from 1773) and normative pamphlets (e.g. Leopold’s *Afhandling om svenska stafsättet*, ‘Treatment of the Swedish orthography’, from 1801), it was through the distribution of new texts that the modern way of writing Swedish reached a wider audience. Consequently, productive publishers of the time had a massive impact on the spread of linguistic norm; one of the most prominent was Lars Salvius, whose efforts are described at length by Santesson (1986).

Exactly how many people had direct access to written text during the Late Modern period is hard to say. Although text consumption surely increased during the 18th century, most people lived in the countryside and were probably relatively unaffected by the development of intellectual life in the city. But judging from the detailed scrutiny of the population conducted by the church (by means of so-called *husförhör*, lit. ‘house interrogations’), most people were

listed as “being able to read” already by the end of the 17th century. However, this was probably a very rudimentary form of literacy, comprising reading from the Bible (or perhaps reciting it by heart) but not writing (Johansson 1981, Berg 1994). In the beginning of the 19th century, general education programs were launched, resulting in free schooling for all children from 1842, but school did not become obligatory until 1882.

Still, the mastering of the written code by the many is very much a matter of the 19th and especially the 20th century. Even with mandatory primary education, many left school only partially literate (as in the 1600s). For example, in a recording from the 1950s, part of which is transcribed in (4) below, an old Viskadalian⁶ woman (A) tells the interviewer (S) of her time in school at the end of the 19th century. She recalls that they would read various religious texts, but she never did learn how to write – it was simply not on the repertoire.

- (4) A: *Vi fingem läsa i testamentet å i kattjesen*
 we get.PST.1PL read.INF in testament.DEF and in catechism.DEF
å i bibelska [...] men att Dyber [...] han lärde
 and in Biblical but that Dyber he teach.PST
inte å skriva [...]
 not to write.INF
 ‘We got to read from the Testament, and the Catechism and the Biblical [...] but Dyber, he didn’t teach us to write’
 S: *Vem lärde det då?*
 who teach.PST that then
 ‘Who taught you that, then?’
 A: *Nä ja kan inte skriva nöe [...]*
 No I can.PRS.SG not write anything
 ‘No, I can’t write anything’

As we will see in the chapters that follow, standardization had consequences for morphosyntactic change in the Late Modern Swedish period. The papers by Valdeson and Kalm suggest that schooling may have played a role in the development of double object constructions and adverbial infinitives, respectively. Using the non-standardized variety of Övdalian as a point of comparison, Kalm argues that the elaboration of the written language led to the development of new grammatical possibilities. Standardization processes also clearly affected the direction of change, and the spread and establishment of new patterns (e.g. the new word order in particle constructions discussed in the paper by Larsson & Lundquist). The spread of the standard language also had consequences for the dialects. For instance, in his chapter on morphosyntactic variation in Viskadalian Swedish, Petzell argues that verbal person agreement

⁶ Viskadalen is a dialect area in the southwest of Sweden, along the southern reaches of the river Viskan (see Petzell 2017, 2018 and this volume for more details).

was reanalysed as part of tense, and that one of the driving forces behind the reanalysis was the introduction of the new standard word order in embedded clauses, which was incompatible with richly agreeing verbs. Finally, standardization naturally came with normative grammarians promoting or advising against certain constructions (see Teleman 2002, 2003, and references there, for a discussion of language planning and policy in LMS). In her chapter on passive ditransitives, Falk relates the actual usage to contemporary recommendations in normative dictionaries.

2.2. Variation

Grammatical change in the development from Old to Late Modern Swedish led to considerable linguistic variation both within and across speakers, on all linguistic levels. Since there was no fully established standard yet, there was still considerable variation also in the written language in the beginning of the Late Modern Swedish period. As for the spoken language, the late 1700s and early 1800s stand out as a pinnacle of dialectal diversity. However, already towards the end of the 19th century, dialect levelling and the spread of a spoken standard more or less wiped out the varying linguistic landscape of old in just a few generations (Nilsson & Petzell 2015).

In the development of the standard language, the spoken language of the upper classes in the area around Stockholm (Central Sweden) played an important role. The 17th century author Georg Stiernhielm states explicitly that he prefers this variety to other dialects, and in his treaty on Swedish, Sven Hof (1753) makes similar comments (see further Widmark 2000:26). Language change in Early and Late Modern Swedish can also often first be observed in informal texts by authors of Central Swedish origin. Many innovations have early attestations in the memoirs by Agneta Horn (born 1629), an upper-class woman without formal education. For instance, she is the first to show evidence of a change in the word order in particle constructions, discussed by Larsson & Lundquist in this volume. Moreover, she has a stronger preference for the auxiliary *ha* ‘have’ (rather than *vara* ‘be’) in perfects with unaccusative verbs than many of her contemporaries (cf. Larsson 2009 and see below); in the written standard, *ha* is established as the norm in the second half of the 18th century (see Johannisson 1945, Larsson 2009:247, Table 7.4). With respect to clause structure, Horn is also largely modern. In her memoirs, there are only sporadic occurrences of the old OV order (Petzell 2011), and subordinate clauses generally have the modern order between finite verb and sentence adverbial (Falk 1993; see also 3.1.2 below). In addition, the first ever instance of an inverted expletive (as in PDS), indicating true subjecthood, comes from her (Falk 1993).

Texts like Horn's memoirs give us good insights into the contemporary spoken language. The variation also shows up in theatre plays from the time (see e.g. Widmark 1970 and cf. below). In the play *Några mil från Stockholm* 'A few miles from Stockholm' by Adolf Fredrik Ristell (1787), we can observe for instance that the subject form of the third person plural pronoun is *de* in the stage directions, in line with the PDS written standard, but in the dialogue, the form *di* is used. The object forms of the first and second person singular pronouns are *mäj* 'me' and *däj* 'you' in the dialogue – as in the present-day spoken standard – and not *mig* and *dig*, which is the written standard. Moreover, forms like *trägåln* 'garden' for PDS *trädgården* and *Dränningholm* for the name 'Drottningholm' ('the queen's islet'), in addition to *vanlia* 'usual' for PDS *vanliga* reflect the pronunciation of the upper classes in Central Sweden at the time. Assimilated forms like *dränning* rather than *drottning* 'queen' and *trägål* rather than *trädgård* 'garden' used by Ristell (as well as Horn a century before) are considered highly dialectal in the present-day language. During the 20th century the unmarked pronunciation has changed to one that is closer to the written language. Today, the unmarked pronunciation is closer to the written form: the *ttn*-sequence is pronounced as two segments ([t]+[n]) rather than one ([n:]), and the *-rd*-sequence is pronounced as a retroflex *d* ([ɖ]) rather than a retroflex *l* ([ɭ]).

According to the guide to pronouncing Swedish by Lyttkens & Wulff from 1889, many of the forms used by Horn and Ristell that are perceived today as highly dialectal (or rural) were still considered unmarked in the late 1800s.⁷ However, during the 20th century, a new spoken standard emerged. Lacking access to the prestigious spoken language of high society in Stockholm, primary school teachers had started to promote a way of speaking that was very close to the written letter, thereby being easy to acquire. Previously, such written-like speech, as it were, had been reserved for public announcements (Widmark 1970), and it was considered unfit for everyday conversations by contemporary intellectuals (Cederschiöld 1897, Noreen 1903). Nevertheless, the strategy of the schoolteachers was successful (Widmark 2000). At the same time, they discouraged the use of traditional dialects, aiming at a common spoken code for all in the modern and equal social-democratic Sweden. As a consequence, spoken Swedish of the late 20th century was probably less varied than ever before; see Nilsson & Petzell (2015) for more details (including comparison with Norwegian and Danish). However, by no means was dialectal diversity eliminated altogether, as can be seen in the papers by Kalm and Petzell,

⁷ Thus, assimilating various dental clusters into geminate *nn* (as *drottning* → *dränning*, 'queen', *vändning* → *vänning*, 'turn') was considered perfectly neutral. However, the *l*-pronunciation of the sequence *rd* (indicated by the spelling *trägål*) appears to have been outdated in the spoken language of educated people already by the 18th century (Hof 1753).

where archaic dialects of today (or at least of a quite recent yesterday) that deviate considerably from the standard language play an important role.

2.3. *New genres and more data*

The Late Modern Swedish period offers substantially more data for the historical linguist than earlier periods: old genres remain, new emerge, and more texts are preserved. In letters and diaries from the 18th century, we can observe the linguistic variation of the time. In addition, there are, as noted, also a growing number of plays with dialogue that attempts to mimic the spoken language (see e.g. Widmark 1970, 2000 and Thelander 2007). The project *Swedish drama dialogue during three centuries* (Melander Marttala & Strömqvist 2001) has collected a corpus of 45 plays from the period 1725–2000. The corpus contains more than 800 000 words, and it is divided into intervals of 25 years. For the study of morphosyntactic change, it is clearly useful to have access to sources which reflect the spoken language as closely as possible (see Magnusson 2007:69–74 for discussion), and the corpus of Swedish drama dialogue provides us with perhaps the best possible sample. Several of the papers in this volume use this corpus.

The production of non-fiction flourishes during the 18th century, with texts about science, gardening, cooking and so on. In the 19th century, the production of fiction undergoes a veritable explosion. Some of these texts can be accessed in the corpus of Swedish prose fiction 1800–1900 (the spf-corpus). This corpus includes all Swedish original novels and short stories published in separate editions in the years 1800, 1820, 1840, 1860, 1880 and 1900, and includes altogether more than 16 million tokens.⁸ The spf-corpus can be accessed through the language infrastructure Korp (Borin et al. 2012), which also contains letters, newspaper prose, older laws, as well as other older and modern corpora (of varying quality) with older fiction and non-fiction.⁹ Here, there is, for instance, a corpus with 56 novels from the period 1840–1930 (*Äldre svenska romaner*, ÄSv, ‘older Swedish novels’). The corpora make new methods available, and the possibilities are explored in the paper by Valdeson in this volume. Valdeson uses the Korp infrastructure to investigate the frequencies of double object constructions at different times. Among other things, he uses a measure of productivity, referred to as *lexical variation*, which considers how many different verbs occur in the double object constructions or how many different objects can occur with a specific verb.

⁸ Texts from a few additional years are also included in the corpus, specifically 1841–44, 1898–99, and 1901.

⁹ <https://spraakbanken.gu.se/korp>

Another important source to Early and Late Modern Swedish, is the Swedish Academy Dictionary (SAOB).¹⁰ It provides a thorough description of the Swedish vocabulary from 1526 to the present. In this volume, data from SAOB are used in Falk's discussion of passivization of ditransitive verbs, as well as in Delsing's account of the grammaticalization of the quantifier *mycket*, 'much'. We also give examples taken from SAOB in section 3 below.

In addition to the written sources of Late Modern Swedish, there are different types of sources to the spoken language. There is a large number of recordings of traditional dialects from the middle of the 20th century: The Institute for language and folklore has approximately 25 000 hours of dialect audio from all over Sweden, the Americas (mostly from the North), Finland, and Estonia. In the Americas, Swedish is a heritage language (see e.g. Larsson et al. 2015), in Estonia it was (until the 1940s – see Rosenkvist 2018), and in Finland it still is, a minority language. Most of these early recordings are digitized, but only sporadically transcribed and therefore searchable to a very limited extent (Berg et al. 2019). In this volume, Petzell investigates word order in recordings of Viskadalian Swedish from the 1940s, 1950s 1960s simply by listening to the audio files. The institute also harbours a vast collection of phonetically precise, handwritten dialect texts from the late 1890s and early 1900s (Sellberg 1993:431–432; SOU 1924:27:30ff.). In this introduction, we give some examples from such a dialect text to illustrate (among other things) morphosyntactic archaisms (see 3.4). Recently, promising attempts have been made to transfer the handwritten texts to a digital (and thereby searchable) format by employing so-called HTR (handwritten text recognition) technique (see Petzell 2019, 2020).

3. Late Modern Swedish Morphosyntax

In this section, we give a very brief overview of the morphosyntax of Late Modern Swedish, as a backdrop to the studies in the following chapters. We focus on central aspects of the grammar, particularly on phenomena that are relevant in the chapters that follow, and phenomena that have previously been shown to change during the Late Modern Swedish period. Among other things, we will not discuss V2-order or binding of reflexives, which seem to have been stable throughout the Modern Swedish period.¹¹ For clarity, we employ a fairly standard model of

¹⁰ SAOB can be accessed here: www.saob.se

¹¹ Tingsell (2010) shows that there is some inter- and intra-individual variation in the distribution of reflexives in 18th century Swedish, and that the variation is very similar to what is found in multilingual urban settings in present-day Swedish.

phrase structure, where the clause is divided into three domains: the verbal domain (VP), the inflectional domain (IP), and the C-domain (CP), where features relating to finiteness, clause type and illocutionary force are found (cf. Platzack 2010 Faarlund 2019).

3.1. *Verbal morphology and verb placement*

Section 3.1.1 is concerned with verb placement in embedded clauses and subject-verb agreement. In section 3.1.2, we give a summary of some changes in the Swedish tense system that take place partly in the Late Modern Swedish period. 3.1.3 gives a brief overview of the history of Swedish infinitival structures headed by *att*.

3.1.1. *Embedded word order and agreement*

As stated above, the V2 word order of Swedish main clauses has been stable for many centuries (see also Alving 1916). By contrast, in subordinate contexts, the position of the finite verb has changed since the Middle ages. In EOS, the verb preceded sentence adverbials as in (5a) below, indicating verb movement out of the VP to somewhere in the I-domain. In present-day Swedish, the finite verb of subordinate clauses instead remains in the VP, where it is preceded by sentence adverbials as in (5b). Today, V can move out of the VP in a subordinate clause only in a limited set of *that*-clauses where the complementizer can take an entire CP as its complement. Such embedded V-to-C is possible only when the content of the subordinate clause can be interpreted as asserted by the speaker, as in (5c); see Julien (2015), Petzell (this volume) and Sangfelt (this volume) for more details.

- (5)
- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| a. | <i>ther the mågho äy aff gånga</i>
where they may.3PL not off go.NF
'from where they must not deviate'(K-styr:3) | V-to-I |
| b. | <i>huset där vi inte ville bo</i>
house.DEF where we not want.PST live.INF
'the house where we didn't want to live' | V in situ (PDS) |
| c. | <i>hon sa att han ville inte äta den</i>
she say.PST that he want.PST not eat.INF it
'she said that he did not want to eat it' | emb. V-to-C (PDS) |

According to Falk (1993:176), the modern subordinate clause word order of (5b) becomes the dominant order in Swedish texts during the end of EMS, reaching over 80% with the generation of authors that were born during the last decades of the 16th century. Then, in LMS, the proportion stabilizes above 90%.

Starting with Kosmeijer (1986), many scholars have argued that the order in (5a) (which is still the normal order in Icelandic) is dependent on the presence of agreement morphology on finite verbs (which Icelandic has); this is usually labelled the Rich Agreement Hypothesis (RAH). As for Old Swedish, the RAH makes the correct prediction (V-to-I should occur), since finite verbs agreed in both person and number with their subjects: for instance, a weak verb like *läsa*, ‘read’, had four forms in the present tense in OS: *läser* (SG), *läsum* (1PL), *läsin* (2PL) and *läsa* (3PL).

In the dominant Swedish dialects (i.e. those surrounding Stockholm), the person distinction seems to have been lost towards the end of the 15th century (Neuman 1925), and number during the 17th century (Larsson 1988). In other words, the rapid spread of the modern word order reported by Falk (1993) coincides with the final loss of (number) agreement in the spoken language of most Swedish writers. Consequently, Falk takes number agreement to be a necessary prerequisite for V-to-I-movement. In addition, and drawing on earlier work by Platzack (1985) and Platzack & Holmberg (1989), she ties the loss of (number) agreement to two other syntactic changes that take place towards the end of EMS, namely the loss of stylistic fronting and the loss of verbal licensing of null expletives.¹²

Others, most notably Rohrbacher (1999) and Koenenman & Zeijlstra (2014), have maintained that the number agreement of EMS would not have been enough to trigger V-to-I. Based on what we know of other varieties that employ V-to-I, the crucial threshold is expected to be the loss of person agreement. If V-to-I was lost with person agreement, the old word order that still lived on until the 17th century must have been derived by some other mechanism. Koenenman & Zeijlstra (2014) suggest that an increased use of embedded V-to-C (as in (5c)) could have been one way of holding on to the old word order when it was no longer possible to generate it by moving V to I (cf. Heycock et al. 2010 for a similar approach to archaic word order in Faroese).

However, as stressed by Gärtner (2019), in order for the V-to-C analysis to be more than just an ad hoc solution to save the RAH, it must be shown that embedded V-to-C was a much more widespread phenomenon in EMS than in it is today. After all, in PDS, embedded V-to-C is possible only in a subset of all subordinate clauses, whereas V-to-I came with no such restrictions. In fact, embedded V-to-C was indeed possible in EMS in contexts where it is completely ungrammatical today (see 3.2.1 below for examples). This lends support to

¹² Alexiadou & Fanselow (2002) instead argue that stylistic fronting of adverbials was reanalysed as an instance of the new word order. Such a reanalysis was originally proposed by Pettersson (1988), whose paper (in Swedish) Alexiadou & Fanselow were clearly unaware of.

Koenenman & Zeijlstra's (2014) proposal that the old word order lived on for quite some time in a new guise.

In this volume, Petzell argues that the 19th century development of the southern Viskadalian dialect is a mirror image of the standard Swedish development. In this dialect, person agreement of old is still intact. Nevertheless, the standard word order has been the dominating order since the 19th century. At first, this appears to falsify the RAH. However, what has happened (according to Petzell) is that the agreement morphology has been reanalysed as part of tense. Thus, elements of the old grammar are preserved, but within a new category.

3.1.2. The Swedish perfect

Present-day Swedish has the rather exotic possibility of omitting finite forms of the temporal auxiliary *ha* 'have' in all types of non-V2-clauses (see e.g. Julien 2002, Andréasson et al 2004, Bäckström 2019, and references there); an 18th century example is given in (6), where the position of the auxiliary is marked by Ø. As far as is known, this possibility of auxiliary omission is impossible in all of the other North Germanic languages.

- (6) *Det ser nu så rasande förnämt ut i Sverige [...]*
it look.PRS.SG now so terribly pretentious out in Sweden
sedan det Ø blifwit ont efter penningar
since it become.PTC pain after money
'It now looks so terribly pretentious in Sweden, since there has been a shortage of money' (*Argus*; from Johannisson 1945:172)

There are a few scarce examples of *ha*-omission from the 15th century, but omission does not become common until the 17th century. It is frequent in texts from the beginning of the Late Modern Swedish period, and in some texts (e.g. *Argus*) a large majority of the relevant examples lack an overt finite auxiliary (see Johannisson 1945:184, Bäckström 2019:87). In a recent study by Bäckström (2019), *ha*-omission is viewed as a syntactic loan from German (cf. Johannisson 1945, and see Breithbart 2005 on older German). Larsson (2009) and Sangfelt (2017) tie the possibility of *ha*-omission to the loss of V-to-I movement (cf. the change in embedded word order above).

There are a couple of other changes in the temporal-aspectual system during the Late Modern Swedish period, which also result in differences between Swedish and the other North Germanic languages. Firstly, Swedish develops a particular participial form only used with auxiliary *ha* 'have' to form the perfect tense; this form is often referred to as the *supine* (Sw. *supinum*). In present-day Swedish, strong verbs form have supine forms that are

morphologically distinct from the neuter singular of past participles; cf. the passive in (7a) with the perfect in (7b). The supine form was gradually established in the 18th century, but it is not fully in place in the written language until the 19th century (see Platzack 1981, Larsson 2009:422f., Bäckström 2019). Not all present-day dialects make the distinction between supine and past participle morphology.

- (7) a. *det var skrivet*
 it was write.PTC.N.SG
 ‘it was written’ (Äsv, 20th century)
 b. *fastt du inte har skrivit på så länge*
 although you not have write.SUP for so long
 ‘although you haven’t written for so long’ (Spf, 19th century).

In the 17th century, the possibility of having *vara* ‘be’ + a participle of an unaccusative verb became more restricted (see Johannisson 1945, Larsson 2009, 2015; cf. McFadden & Alexiadou 2005 for a similar development in English). This possibility still remains in Norwegian and Icelandic, and in Danish the construction has grammaticalized into a *be*-perfect (see Larsson to appear). *Vara*, ‘be’, was still (marginally) grammatical with some groups of unaccusatives at the beginning of the 18th century; examples from the 16th and 17th century are given in (8). In present-day Swedish, *ha* ‘have’ is the only option with active participles of all types of verbs, modulo some dialectal variation (see e.g. Larsson 2014, and 3.4. below). Both *ha* and *vara* were possible with unaccusatives in older Swedish; the examples in (9) have *ha*.

- (8) a. *Så seer man här tilgått wara*
 so sees one here about.go.PTC be
 ‘one sees that things have happened in this way here’ (16th century; from Larsson 2009:156)
 b. *Jost Cursel [...] och andra lifländare mera, som vore aff*
 Jost Cursel and other Livonians more who were of
 godh villia medh redne
 good will with ride.PTC
 ‘Jost Cursel [...] and several other Livonians who had ridden along out of free will’ (17th century; from Larsson 2009:262)
- (9) a. *Kan man wel merkia huru thå haffuer tilgått*
 can one well notice how then has about.go.PTC
 ‘One can well notice how things then have happened’ (16th century; from Larsson 2009:156)
 b. *haffver herr Nils Bielke [...] rididt till herttigen*
 has sir Nils Bielke ride.PTC to duke.DEF
 ‘has Sir Nils Bielke ridden to the duke’ (17th century; Larsson 2009:263)

3.1.3. Infinitivals

In PDS, the infinitive marker *att* is more or less restricted to control infinitives; it does not occur in ECM-contexts and only with a limited set of raising verbs (Teleman et al. 1999/3:572, 597).¹³ This restriction appears to hold for earlier stages as well although there are sporadic examples from OS and EMS where *att* occurs in the complement of a modal (Lagervall 2014: 149–157, Kalm 2016:133–134) as well as in ECM constructions (Kalm 2016 136–137). However, compared to the other Scandinavian languages, the implicature *att* + infinitive → control infinitive seems fairly robust in Swedish. By contrast, in Icelandic, some modals are obligatorily constructed with *að* (the Icelandic equivalent to *att*), and in Norwegian, both raising constructions and ECM constructions involve *å* (the Norwegian equivalent); see Kalm 2016:45 and Faarlund 2019:248–251 for more comparative details.

In OS, *att* (often spelled *at*) formed a tight unit with the infinitive, presumably cliticizing to the left of the verb (Falk 2010a). This unit could be preceded as well as followed by other elements, which is shown in (10). Here, the object (*gest*, ‘guest’) precedes the infinitival complex (*at=husla*), and the comparative adverbial (*sum bondæ*, ‘like a farmer’) follows it.

- (10) *præster ær skyldugher gest at husla sum bondæ*
 priest is required guest to give.communion as farmer
 ‘it is the duty of the priest to give the communion to a guest as he does to a local farmer’ (EWL; from Falk 2010b:33)

In the beginning of EMS, it became increasingly common for elements to intervene between *att* and the verb, as in the example in (11) below, where there is a PP between *att* and the infinitive. Such intervention can be seen as an indication that *att* had been reanalysed as heading a non-finite clause rather than an infinitival phrase. This development from infinitive marker to non-finite complementizer appears to affect the realisation of *att*: in OS, *att* was optional in many contexts where it is mandatory today. The stricter demand for an overt *att* started manifesting itself in texts at around the same time as the reanalysis from proclitic to complementizer would have taken place (Falk 2010a:35).

¹³ For instance, with *verka*, ‘seem’, *förefalla*, ‘appear’ as well as with passives like *ses*, ‘see.PASS’, and *förmodas*, ‘presume.PASS’, there is never an *att* involved (see (i)). However, with *börja*, ‘start’ (see (ii)), *att* is optional and with *se ut*, ‘look like’, *att* is even mandatory ((iii)).

- (i) *Hon verkade/föreföll/sågs/förmodades (*att) springa i den riktningen*
 she seemed/appeared/see.PST.PASS/presume.PST.PASS to run in that direction.DEF
 (ii) *Det har börjat (att) sitta fåglar på staketet där*
 it has begun to sit birds on fence.DEF there
 (iii) *Det ser ut *(att) regna vid horisonten*
 it sees out to rain by horizon.DEF

- (11) *lustigt att om sommersz tydh spaszera.*
 amusing to in summer.POSS time stroll
 ‘amusing to stroll in the summer time’ (17th century; from Kalm 2016:144)

Still, the categorical status of *att* is hardly the only factor determining whether it can be omitted or not. Neither in Danish, where *att* is still a proclitic, nor in Norwegian, where *att* can be either a proclitic or a complementizer, is *att* optional. Compared to these two languages, PDS is very liberal when it comes to *att*-omission (see Faarlund 2019:248–251 for details). For the better part of the EMS period, proclitic and complementizer *att* lived alongside each other (just like they still do in Norwegian). According to Kalm, proclitic *att* (as in 10) became obsolete towards the end of EMS (2016:145).

A recent development in the history of Swedish control infinitives regards the possibility of embedding the infinitival structure under a preposition. Such embedding did occur already in OS under the directional preposition *till*, at least partly to reinforce a purposive reading (Kalm 2016:204ff); eventually, *till* developed into an alternative infinitive marker (Kalm 2016:210). However, it is not until LMS that control infinitives start combining with more prepositions, thus conveying a wide variety of adverbial meanings. The emergence of these adverbial infinitives in LMS is the topic of Kalm’s paper in this volume.¹⁴

3.2. *Argument placement*

In this section, we look in turn at the placement of subjects (3.2.1) and objects (3.2.2) in Early and Late Modern Swedish.

3.2.1. *Subject placement*

As argued by Håkansson (2008), specIP has been a dedicated subject position since Late Old Swedish, although it is not until the end of Early Modern Swedish that specIP is obligatorily filled (Falk 1993, and this volume). However, EMS subjects could still surface in a position where we do not find them anymore, viz. after the finite verb, resulting in surface VS order, in certain embedded contexts; see (12) below. In (12a), the VS string appears in the second conjunct of a *that*-clause, and in (12b), it follows a relative pronoun. Both these uses of VS are ungrammatical today. Presumably, the difference is linked to a more liberal use of embedded

¹⁴ There are also other changes in infinitival constructions in the Modern Swedish period. In particular, ECM-constructions appear to have had a wider distribution in older Swedish than they do in the present-day. However, this remains to be investigated.

V-to-C in EMS (see 3.1.1 above). The present-day system is established during the beginning of the Late Modern period (Petzell 2013).

- (12) a. *[han] sade at hon nu har någ råt om migh och*
 he said that she now has enough care.PTC about me and
skule hon nu inte längre inbila sig något herewäle öfwer mig.
 should she now not longer imagine.INF REFL any dominance over me
 ‘he said that she has now cared for me enough and she shouldn’t imagine that she could dominate me any longer.’ (Horn *1629)
- b. *Hwilket skall Mahomet 2:[secun]dus hafwa giort*
 which shall M second have done
 ‘which Mahomet the second is supposed to have done’ (Rålamb *1622, p. 125)

Moving on now to the order between subjects and sentence adverbials. Here, the order in Earlier Late Modern Swedish varied, much as in the present-day language: non-initial subjects could either precede or follow a sentence adverbial; the order subject–adverbial is often referred to as involving *subject shift* (see e.g. Holmberg 1993, Svenonius 2002, Andréasson 2007). Weak pronominal subjects almost always shifted across the adverbial:

- (13) *Herr Baron, känner I intet Lars Lustig?*
 Sir Baron know you not Lars Lustig
 ‘Baron, don’t you know Lars Lustig?’ (Gyllenborg *1679)

However, on occasion, weak pronouns could follow negation; (14a) has a non-referential *det* after negation, and (14b) has a non-shifted generic pronominal subject. Examples like these are admittedly rare in the historical texts, and they hardly occur in present-day Swedish (modulo some dialectal variation; see Bentzen 2014).

- (14) a. *så börjar Frökne-namnet låta så flatt så flatt, at I gifwa Er*
 so starts maiden-name.DEF sound so flat so flat that you give REFL
ingen ro, för än I fått byta bårt det samma, är icke det så
 no peace before than you get.SUP change PRT it same is not it so
 ‘so the maiden-name starts to sound so flat, so flat, that you give yourself no peace until you have exchanged it, isn’t it so’ (Gyllenborg, *1679)
- b. *Fredric: En sjö utan fiskar å en skog utan foglar,*
 Fredric a lake without fish and a forest without birds
maschär mär ja vill inte gå på Opran.
 ma.chère mère I want not go to Opera.DEF
Clas: jo, ja vill si dä där regne som inte man blir våt åf.
 Clas: yes I want see that there rain that not one is wet by

‘Fredric: A lake without fish and a forest without birds, ma chère mère, I don’t want to go to the Opera. Clas: But I want to see the rain that you don’t get wet from.’ (Ristell *1744)

Non-pronominal subjects, on the other hand, could either precede or follow the adverbial:

- (15) a. *Men min Gu-Far, har intet Fru Lotta orsak at wara swartsiuk*
 but my god-father has not Madam Lotta reason to be jealous
 ‘But my God-father, doesn’t Madam Lotta have reason to be jealous’ (Gyllenborg *1679)
- b. *så är Juncker Torbjörn intet mas*
 so is nobleman Torbjörn not miser
 ‘Noble Torbjörn is not a miser’ (Gyllenborg *1679)

The frequency of subject shift with non-pronominal subjects varies somewhat between texts, and it fluctuates over time (Andréasson & Larsson in prep.). Still in the present-day language, there is variation between speakers and texts (see e.g. the data in the Nordic Word Order Database, Lundquist et al. 2019 and cf. Andréasson 2007).¹⁵

3.2.2. Object placement

As shown by Delsing (1999), the change from OV- to VO-language started already during EOS. However, we still find quite a lot of OV examples well into the 18th century (Petzell 2011, Sangfelt 2019). In fact, even the very symbol of modernity, *Argus*, sometimes displays OV-order. The text in (3) above continues like this:

- (16) *Men fast än hwarken de gamla sådane Läro-sätt skulle älskat*
 but although than neither the ancient such lessons would love.PTC
eller nyare frägdade Folckeslag dem älska
 or newer esteemed people.PL them love
 ‘But although neither the ancient or newer esteemed peoples would have loved such lessons’ (*Argus*)

These rather late examples of OV order do not indicate an underlying OV-structure in the VP (as has been suggested for EOS, see Delsing 1999: 189, 211–214). Instead, the position of the object to the left of the entire verbal complex in a subordinate clause suggests that it has moved out of the V-domain into the I-domain (Petzell 2011).

Whereas the possibility to create OV by moving O over a finite verb in situ (in V) disappears during the 18th century, weak pronominal objects and reflexives can still today shift across a

¹⁵ The Nordic Word Order Database is available here: <https://tekstlab.uio.no/nwd>

sentence adverbial when the main verb is in C, commonly referred to as *object shift*.¹⁶ The EMS word orders in (17) below are, in other words, fine also in present-day Swedish (see e.g. Holmberg 1986, Andréasson 2008, Bentzen 2014, Erteschik-Shir & Josefsson 2018).

- (17) a. *Ammiral, Jag kiände **Er** **intet**.*
 Admiral I knew you not
 ‘Admiral, I didn’t recognize you.’ (Gyllenborg *1679)
 b. *jag tror **dig** **intet**, för än jag får smakat*
 I believe you not before than I get taste.it
 ‘I don’t believe you until I get to taste it’ (Modée *1698)

Contrasted pronominal objects and objects with a non-nominal (or type) antecedent, do not shift (cf. Andréasson 2008):

- (18) a. *Utan vidare ceremonier, herr öfverste, gif mig åter min fostersyster.*
 without further ceremonies sir colonel give me back my foster.sister
*Hon tillhör **inte** er.*
 she belongs.to not you
 ‘Without further ceremonies, Colonel, give me back my foster sister. She does not belong to you.’ (Jolin *1818)
 b. *Nej, maschär mär, ja vill **inte** dä*
 no ma.chère mère I want not it
 ‘No, ma chère mère, I don’t want that’ (Ristell *1744)

As in present-day Swedish, object shift in LMS is not completely obligatory even with weak pronouns (cf. Erteschik-Shir & Josefsson 2018):

- (19) *MAGISTERN: dä sant att Baron Fredric ha slaje gåssen.*
 teacher.DEF it true that Baron Fredric has beaten boy.DEF
*FREDRIC: Ja, men hvar före lydde han **inte** mäj,*
 Fredric yes but where fore obeyed he not me
när ja befalte.
 when I commanded
 ‘The teacher: is it true that Baron Fredric has beaten the boy? Fredric: Yes, but why didn’t he obey me when I commanded?’ (Ristell *1744)

In this volume, object shift is discussed in the paper by Larsson & Lundquist. They show that although there is perhaps some variation both within and across texts, there is no change in the distribution of object shift across negation, with the exception of object shift in particle

¹⁶ Non-pronominal object shift is not possible in present-day Swedish, and it does not seem to have occurred in older Swedish either, with a small number of exceptions in Old Swedish (Falk p.c.). One example is given in (i).

(i) *For thy at the **thz första** **bodhordh** **ekke** **hioldo***
 for that that they the first commandment not kept
 ‘because they didn’t keep the first commandment’ (15th c.; from Falk p.c.)

constructions: objects could shift across verb particles in older Swedish (as they do in the other North Germanic languages), but this is no longer a possibility.

Unlike the other North Germanic languages, present-day Swedish has the possibility of shifting a weak object pronoun or reflexive across a non-pronominal subject to a position immediately after the finite verb; this is often referred to as *long object shift* (see e.g. Holmberg 1986, Heinat 2010). Long object shift mostly occurs with reflexives (20a), but at least some speakers allow long object shift with pronouns, if they have a distinct object form. For instance, the first person singular pronoun *mig* ‘me’ can shift across the subject (20b), but the third person *dom* ‘they, them’ cannot, since it does not have a distinct object form; consequently, in (20c), *dom* can only be interpreted as the subject. Long object shift is impossible across a pronominal subject; cf. (20d).

- (20) a. *I morse rakade sig Kalle.* (PDS)
 in morning shaved REFL Kalle
 ‘This morning, Kalle shaved.’
 b. *Idag erbjöd mig Lisa en glass.*
 today offered me Lisa an ice.cream
 ‘Today, Lisa offered me an ice cream.’
 c. *Idag erbjöd dom Lisa en glass.*
 today offered they/them Lisa an ice.cream
 ‘Today, they offered Lisa an ice cream.’
 NOT: ‘Today Lisa offered them an ice cream.’
 d. **I morse rakade mig jag.*
 in morning shaved me I

Long object shift can be attested with both reflexives and pronouns throughout the Modern Swedish period (and they occur also in Old Swedish; Falk p.c.). Examples from *Argus* are given in (21).

- (21) a. *på rätt grundar sig ett folks Sällhet.*
 on right founds REFL a people.POSS bliss
 ‘A people’s bliss is founded on righteousness’ (*Argus*)
 b. *Anledningen gaf mig Herr Ehrenmenvet*
 possibility.DEF gave me Mr Ehrenmenvet
 ‘Mr Ehrenmenvet gave me the possibility’ (*Argus*)

3.3. Double objects and passives

In this section, we first look briefly at double object and benefactive constructions (in section 3.3.1), and then, in 3.3.2, we turn to passives.

3.3.1. Double objects

Swedish has the well-known alternation between a construction with two objects on the one hand, and a double complement construction (with object + PP-adverbial) on the other. In the present-day language, few verbs require double objects, and many alternate, depending e.g. on whether the recipient/benefactive-argument is pronominal or not. The same type of alternation can be observed throughout the history of Swedish; examples of the verb *giva* ‘give’ from the 18th and 19th century (taken from Valdeson 2016) are given in (25) below.

- (22) a. *Hon har gifvit mig den aftalta vinken*
she has given me the agreed.upon waive.DEF
‘She has waived at me as we agreed.’ (19th century; from Valdeson 2016:280)
- b. *Och hwilken Fader som gifwer sin Dotter til en Man*
and what father who gives POSS.REFL daughter to a man
som hon icke kan tåla...
that she not can stand
‘And what a father, who gives is daughter to a man that she can’t stand’ (18th century; from Valdeson 2016:284)
- c. *...om vi skulle ge rum åt vår vän*
if we would give room for our friend
‘if we would give room to our friend’ (18th century; from Valdeson 2016:280)

In (22a), *giva* takes a pronominal indirect object and a non-pronominal direct object. In (22b), there is a non-pronominal object and a PP introduced by the preposition *til* ‘to’. In (22c), there is also a non-pronominal object and a PP, but here the preposition is (the less common) *åt* ‘to, toward’.

Since EOS, the alternative with a PP has gradually gained ground. In EMS and LMS, the choice between the different constructions depends on lexical and information structural factors, as in the present-day language. However, as is clear from the paper by Valdeson in this volume, the use of the construction with two objects changes in the Late Modern Swedish period with the double object construction becoming both less frequent and lexically more restricted. In present-day Swedish, the construction with a direct object + PP is often preferred.

Swedish still has the possibility of so-called free benefactives, as in (23). In the present-day language, free benefactives are rather restricted, and they are not always possible even with verbs of production, bringing or ballistic motion (see Lundquist 2014 and references there).

- (23) *Jag stickade henne en tröja.*
I knitted her a sweater
‘I knitted her a sweater.’

The group of verbs that could take two nominal objects have gradually grown smaller in the Late Modern Swedish period (cf. Valdeson 2017). For instance, fewer verbs of communication (e.g. *berätta* ‘tell’ – see Silén 2005) can now occur with double objects, and verbs of hindrance (e.g. *hindra* ‘hinder’) no longer do; cf. the LMS examples in (24) with the present-day Swedish ones in (25).

- (24) a. *berätta henne det samma*
 tell her the same
 ‘tell her the same’ (Gyllenborg *1679)
 b. *Republiquen ville hindra honom det*
 republic.DEF wanted hinder him that
 ‘The republic wanted to hinder him from that.’ (18th century; from SAOB)
- (25) a. **berätta henne något* – *berätta något för henne* (PDS)
 tell her something tell something for her
 b. **hindra honom det* – *hindra honom från det*
 hinder him that hinder him from that

Moreover, there are changes in the word order possibilities in double object constructions. In present-day Swedish, the order between the indirect and the direct object is invariable, with few exceptions: the indirect object always precedes the direct object in the verb phrase. In OS and EMS, the opposite order is also possible, as in the example in (26). This possibility largely disappears around the end of EMS; Valdeson (2016) finds no examples in texts from the 18th century and onwards. However, with a small number of verbs, there is still some variability, as with *tillägna* ‘dedicate’ in (27).

- (26) *ok gaf gul ok self fatøco folke.*
 and gave gold.N.SG.ACC and silver.N.SG.ACC poor.DAT people.N.SG.DAT
 ‘and gave gold and silver to poor people’ (EOS; from Valdeson 2016:280)
- (27) a. *Stevie Wonder tillägnade konserten sin hustru.* (PDS)
 Stevie Wonder dedicated concert.DEF POSS.REFL wife
 b. *Stevie Wonder tillägnade sin hustru konserten.*
 Stevie Wonder dedicated POSS.REFL wife concert.DEF
 ‘Stevie Wonder dedicated the concert to his wife.’ (Lundquist 2014:137)

In present-day Swedish, either of the objects can be promoted to subject in passives, but the indirect object is most often chosen (see Lundquist 2004). Examples are given in (28). In (28a)

the indirect object is promoted to subject in the passive, whereas in (28b) the indirect object is promoted to subject.

- (28) a. *Hon erbjöds ett jobb.* (PDS)
 she offer.PST.PASS a job
 ‘She was offered a job.’
 b. *Jobbet erbjöds henne.*
 job.DEF offer.PST.PASS her
 ‘The job was offered to her.’

In older Swedish, only the direct object could be promoted to subject. The possibility to passivize the indirect object (as in 28a) arose in the Late Modern Swedish period. This development is the topic of the paper by Falk, in this volume.

3.3.2. *Passives*

Swedish has two ways of forming passives, and both existed already in Old Swedish. Firstly, there is a periphrastic passive with *vara* ‘be’ (this gives a stative passive) or *varda/bli* ‘become’ + a passive participle (yielding an eventive passive). The eventive passive auxiliary was *varda* roughly until the Early Modern Swedish period, when *bli* (a loan from Low German) gradually took over. From the second half of the 18th century, *bli* is the rule in the standard language but some dialects still use *varda* in the past tense (i.e. *vart*). In addition, Swedish has a morphological passive built with the verbal suffix *-s*. The example in (29) includes both a periphrastic passive and a morphological passive.

- (29) *Men ehwad flit och möda här wid fordras,*
 but what diligence and hardship here by require.PRS.PASS
 och ehwad öde Wårt Arbete nu blir underkastat
 and what destiny our work now is subjugate.PTC
 ‘but what diligence and hardship is hereby required, and what destiny Our Work is now subject to’ (*Argus*)

Norwegian and Danish have both periphrastic and morphological passives, too, but the distribution varies between the languages (see e.g. Engdahl 2006, Laanemets 2012). In short, the *s*-passive has a wider range of uses in present-day Swedish than in the other languages. To some extent, this holds also for older stages. In Norwegian and Danish, the *s*-passive is for instance generally not possible in the past tense. In Swedish preterite forms with passive morphology can be found early on, as shown in (30).

- (30) *j samu stund förpes döb vt af stapenom*
 in same moment bring.PST.PASS dead out of town.DEF.M.SG.DAT
 ‘in the same moment [a woman] was brought dead out of the town’ (EOS, F-leg:150)

In present-day Swedish, the morphological passive can be used in all tenses, including in the perfect. This possibility first emerged in Early Modern Swedish (see e.g. Holm 1952, Platzack 1989, Larsson 2009:412); one example is given in (31). In the 18th and 19th century, grammarians still disapproved of this use of the *s*-passive (cf. Platzack 1989).

- (31) *när waran har förddts in, så ha namne kom[m]it in mä.*
 when product.DEF has bring.PTC.PASS in so has name.DEF come.PTC in too
 ‘when the product has been brought in, the name has come too’ (17th century; from Larsson 2009:412)

With respect to the periphrastic passive, it appears to have been less restricted in older Swedish than in the present-day language. The examples in (32) below (from Falk p.c.) show that the 17th century edition of *Nils Mattsson Kiöpings resa*, ‘The journey of N. M. K.’ has periphrastic passives (see (32a)), where the 18th century edition of the text, revised by the influential publisher Lars Salvius (see 2.1 above), instead has the *s*-passive (cf. (32b)). In the present-day language, an *s*-passive would indeed be used in this context; the *s*-passive tends to be the unmarked choice, whereas the periphrastic passive is often used with animate subjects (see e.g. Engdahl 2006).

- (32) a. *Then yterste Barcken är grå, blifwer aff-skurin och bort-kastat:*
 the outermost bark.DEF is grey becomes off-cut.PTC and away-throw.PTC
Then innerste är askefärgader, blifwer uthi fyrkantige stycken
 the innermost is ash.coloured becomesin square pieces
skuren, och sådan sammanrullader
 cut.PTC and then together.roll.PTC
 ‘The outermost bark is grey, is cut off and thrown away: the innermost is ash-coloured, is cut in square pieces and then rolled together’ (Kiöping *1621)
- b. *[barken] rensas först bort och kastas sin kos.*
 bark.DEF clear.PRS.PASS first away and throw.PRS.PASS POSS.REFL way
Den inre ... skäres i fyrkantige stycken, hvilka sedan rullas
 the inner cut.PRES.PASS in square pieces which then roll.PRS.PASS
tilhopa
 together
 ‘The bark is first cleared and thrown away. The inner ... is cut in square pieces, which are then rolled together’ (Salvius *1706).

The distribution of the different passives in older Swedish has not been thoroughly investigated (but see Kirri 1975). For an extensive study of the *s*-passive in Old Swedish and the Swedish dialects, see Holm (1952).

3.3. Nominal morphology and the noun phrase

Present-day Swedish has both definite and indefinite articles, and generally requires so-called double definiteness marking in modified noun phrases (see Julien 2005). This system is fully in place in Late Modern Swedish; see the examples from *Argus* given in (33). Determiners are prenominal, and this includes also possessives, except on occasion with nouns referring to family members; cf. (34a) and (34b)

- (33) a. *den högmodiga efter-tankan*
 the haughty after-thought.DEF
 ‘the haughty after-thought’ (*Argus*)
 b. *en så oskyldig afsikt*
 a such innocent intention
 ‘such an innocent intention’ (*Argus*)
- (34) a. *min Läsare*
 my reader
 ‘my reader’ (*Argus*)
 b. *Har Swåger min ingen Pinne-Skog til sitt Bruk*
 has brother-in-law my no stick-forest to POSS.REFL cultivation
 ‘Has my brother-in-law no stick-forest [poor forest] for his cultivation’ (*Argus*)

In Late Modern Swedish, adjectives are no longer inflected for case, but attributive adjectives agree with the noun in gender, number and definiteness; see (35) below.¹⁷ Predicative adjectives also show agreement in number and gender, as shown in (36).¹⁸ No gender distinctions are made

¹⁷ In PDS, the adjectival ending in definite or plural noun phrases is generally *-a*; *-e* is sometimes used with reference to male human beings (see Bylin 2016). In older Swedish, *-e* had a wider use (depending on author and text); see Larsson (2004) and references there.

¹⁸ PDS has apparently non-agreeing predicatives in so-called pancake-sentences (e.g. Josefsson 2009), as in (i).

- (i) *Pannkakor är gott.*
 Pancake.PL is good.N.SG
 ‘Pancakes are good.’

Simplifying somewhat, the subject here looks semantically like a small clause, and it refers to the eating of pancakes (rather than to a plurality of pancakes). According to Faarlund (1977) and Josefsson (2014), the possibility of pancake-sentences arose around 1900, but Haugen & Enger (2019) find Swedish examples from the 1850’s; an early example is given in (ii).

- (ii) *mjölgröt är södt*
 flour.porridge.C.SG is sweet.N.SG
 ‘Flour porridge is sweet’ (Sw. 1850s, from Haugen & Enger 2019:252)

in the plural, or in definite attributive adjectives (setting aside the marginal use of *–e* described in footnote 13).

- (35) a. *en stor Bok*
 a.C.SG great.C.SG book[C] ‘a great book’
 b. *ett godt ord*
 a.N.SG good.N.SG word[N] ‘a good word’
 c. *många kloka ord*
 many.PL wise.PL word[N.PL] ‘many wise words’
 d. *utländske Böcker*
 foreign.PL book.PL ‘foreign books’
 e. *den stora hopen*
 the.C.SG large.DEF group.DEF.C.SG ‘the large group’
 f. *det magra hufwudet*
 the.N.SG meagre.DEF head.DEF.N.SG ‘the meagre head’
 (examples from *Argus*)

- (36) a. *Menniskian är högmodig.*
 man.DEF.C.SG is conceited.C.SG
 ‘Man is conceited.’
 b. *om en Satz är falsk eller sann*
 if a.C.SG sentence[C] is false.C.SG or true.C.SG
 ‘if a sentence is false or true’
 c. *detta omdömet är ädelt*
 this.N.SG opinion.DEF.N.SG is noble.N.SG
 ‘this opinion is noble’
 d. *fast de sielwa icke äro ostraffbare*
 although they self.PL not be.PRS.PL unpunishable.PL
 ‘although they are not unpunishable themselves’ (examples from *Argus*)

The three-gender system of Old Swedish is gradually lost in the period from 1500–1900 (see e.g. Davidson 1990:48–50). In the 18th century, a system with two genders (neuter and common gender) dominates in all genres, and this is also what we find in Dalin’s *Argus*. However, remnants of the old system are preserved in many dialects, and most often this can be seen in the pronominal system (rather than in the inflection of determiners and adjectives); see 3.4 below for examples. Whereas *Argus* has a pronoun *den* ‘it’ referring back to inanimate entities with common gender, see (37), other LMS texts uses *han* to refer to masculine inanimates and *hon* to refer to nouns with grammatical feminine gender. Examples are given in (38).

- (37) a. *annan lärdom, än den som kunde wärkställas*
 other.C.SG learning[C] than C.3SG which could execute.INF.PASS
 ‘other learnings than that which could be executed’ (*Argus*)

Pancake-sentences have not been attested before the 19th century, and it seems clear that the possibility arises in the LMS period.

- b. *En ting wände hon bort med annat tal, när den*
 one.C.SG thing[C] turned she away with other speech when C.3SG
bracktes på bahren
 bring.PST.PASS on course.DEF
 ‘One thing she always diverted by talking of else, when it was brought up’ (*Argus*)

- (38) a. *Tag repet och drag kälken, så tror far, att*
 take rope.DEF.N.SG and pull sledge.DEF.C/M.SG so believes father that
han är din.
 M.3SG is yours.C/M.SG
 ‘Take the rope and pull the sledge, so will father believe, that it is yours.’ (19th century; from SAOB)
- b. *tenckia alt wel om sin öfwerhet, tala wel om henne*
 think all well about POSS.REFL.C/F.SG authority[C/F] speak well of F.3SG
 ‘think only well of their authority, speak well of it’ (18th century; from SAOB)

There is considerable dialect variation in nominal morphosyntax in North Germanic, see e.g. Delsing 2003 and Dahl 2015.

3.4. A concluding remark on dialect variation

As of today, most of the LMS morphosyntax described in section 3 has spread to the entire Swedish speaking area, which (setting aside the heritage varieties in the Americas) includes parts of Finland as well as Sweden. However, there is still variation, and this was the main objective of ScanDiaSyn (Scandinavian Dialect Syntax), a collaborative project that was initiated in the early 2000s, involving participants from all the Nordic countries, and which later resulted in a number of digital corpus resources (Johannessen et al. 2009, Lindstad et al. 2009).

Going back a century or so, the dialectal variation within Sweden was substantial (cf. section 2.2 above). Dialects in the periphery – from a Stockholm perspective – were often highly deviant from standard Swedish, both since they had held on to archaic traits long gone in Central Sweden, and since they had undergone separate developments, either unique or shared with neighbouring dialects or languages.

Let us for instance consider the traditional dialect of Orust in the southwestern province of Bohuslän. In a collection of Orust narratives, phonetically transcribed by dialectologists around 1900 (cf. 2.3 above), much of the morphosyntax is reminiscent of what we find in texts from the early 18th century. As can be seen in (39) below,¹⁹ this goes for the tense and gender systems, the realisation of non-referential subjects and the syntax of verbal particles. In (39a), the

¹⁹ The phonetic font is simplified here (see Petzell 2019, 2020 for details).

auxiliary is *vara*, ‘be’ rather than *ha*, ‘have’, as in PDS (cf. 3.1.2 above). The indefinite article *e* (in *e gran*, ‘a pine tree’) indicates feminine gender (distinct from masc. *en*, and neuter *ett*; cf. 3.3). As shown in (39b), anaphoric pronouns also agree in gender with their antecedents: the feminine clitic *ner* refers to *kuärna*, ‘mill.DEF.FEM’. As for the syntax of verbal particles, both the position of arguments and the lack of particle incorporation place the Orust dialect closer to EMS than to PDS (see the paper by Larsson & Lundquist in this volume for EMS data). Thus, in (39c) the pronominal object comes before the particle (*henne ud*) rather than after, which it always does in PDS, and in (39d), the particle (*fram*) follows the participle (*sätt*) rather than being attached to its left as in PDS (*fram-satt*).

- (39)
- a. *å sō lå där e grân, sum vâ blâst ikôll*
and so lay there a.F pine.tree[F] that was blow.PTC down
‘also, there was a pine tree lying on the ground, which the
wind had blown down’ (Orust 22:2)
 - b. *kuärna, um i vell sälje=ner*
mill.DEF.F.SG if you.PL want.PRS sell.INF=her.CL
‘the mill, if you want to sell it’ (Orust 27:9)
 - c. *velle nara henne ud*
want.PST lure.INF her out
‘wanted to lure her out’ (Orust, 27:3)
 - d. *se bLe där sätt fram ett feskefåd*
so become.PST there put forth a.N.SG fish.plate[N]
‘then, a fish plate was put on the table’ (Orust 27:2)

Many of the morphosyntactic peculiarities of the Orust dialect could also be taken to reflect the fact that Orust is situated in the peripheral west, closer to both Denmark and Norway than to Stockholm. Up until 1658, Bohuslän was a Norwegian province, dominated by Denmark from the late Middle ages (as the rest of Norway). As noted, the Orust particle syntax, the tense system and the three-gender system is reminiscent of EMS, but much of it is also very similar to what we find in present day Norwegian (the old gender system, however, being intact only in some Norwegian dialects). Furthermore, the expletive subject is *där* in (39a) and (39d), just like Danish *der*, and the periphrastic formation of passive with *bli* in (39d) would be infelicitous in PDS, where the *s*-passive is preferred, but fine in both Danish and Norwegian. In fact, the preference for the *bli* passive in the Orust sample lacks any correlate in the history of standard Swedish (see 3.3.2). By contrast, expletive *där* varied with *det* for quite some time in EMS (Falk 1993).

Naturally, many of the traditional dialects also exhibit developments of their own, novations that are not attested in any other variety (standard or non-standard). One example of this comes

from the Swedish dialect of the Estonian island of Nuckö described by Vesterdahl (2018). In this variety, the case system of Old Swedish is all gone, much like in standard Swedish and in most dialects. Nevertheless, the old nominative-accusative distinction on adjectives lives on but with a new function. According to Vesterdahl, the Nuckö speakers have reanalysed the distinction as a predicative-attributive distinction, operating within a still intact three gender system (as in Orust). Consequently, we get pairs like *storan båt*, ‘big boat’, and *båten är storor*, ‘the boat is big’; the adjective has the old masculine accusative ending (*storan*) when it modifies the noun inside the DP, but the old masculine nominative (*storor*; cf. OS *storer*) when the adjective is used predicatively.

Late Modern Swedish is obviously not the end of history, either. New cases of variation of course arise continually, in the standard language as well as in the dialects. Some of this new variation can be observed as a difference between older and younger speakers in the ScanDiaSyn investigations. For instance, with respect to measureless quantificational exclamatives, Vangsnes (2014) observes that younger speakers in Sweden more often accept a split structure with the *wh*-word in initial position but the rest of the phrase in the base position (*vad det var bilar här!*, lit. ‘what it was cars here!’), whereas older people often only accept fronting of the whole phrase (*vad bilar det var här!*, lit. ‘what cars it was here’). Some recent changes are a consequence of language planning and policy (such as the introduction of a new gender-neutral pronoun with human reference, *hen*, see Ledin & Lyngfelt 2013). Other examples involve familiar types of grammatical change, like the grammaticalization of discourse markers (like *bara/ba* lit. ‘only’ discussed by e.g. Eriksson 1995). In fact, several of the changes discussed in the following chapters are possibly still on-going. For instance, the changes in the use of double object constructions discussed by Valdeson will most likely continue in the future, and the relatively new use of adverbial infinitives with a concessive meaning observed by Kalm will possibly gain ground in the coming decades. As pointed out by Falk, the preferences for choice of subject in ditransitives have also shifted recently, and it might be that this change has not yet reached its conclusion. Furthermore, Larsson & Lundquist suggest that there are recent shifts in the preferences in particle constructions (e.g. with modified particles), which need to be investigated further in the present-day language.

4. The papers in this volume

This volume includes six full-length articles and one short squib. The contributions cover different grammatical domains, including case and verbal syntax, word order and agreement, and grammaticalization in the nominal domain.

Firstly, the paper by Cecilia Falk discusses the possibility to promote an indirect object to subject in a passive; this is referred to as passivization of indirect objects. She shows that only direct objects could be passivized in Swedish before the 17th century, and that a major change in the grammar took place in the second part of the 19th century. Falk proposes that the indirect object is merged in an inherent case position both in older and present-day Swedish, but that the featural make-up, and, crucially, the case assigning properties of ditransitive verbs, have changed. She assumes that before the change, there was no phi-agreement between the indirect object and the verb, whereas, after the change, a ditransitive verb carried two sets of phi-features. This difference accounts for the different possibilities in passives. Falk furthermore suggests that the change in passivization possibilities is related to the emergence of a dedicated and obligatory subject position in the I-domain (cf. section 3.2.1 above).

Fredrik Valdeson's paper, too, is concerned with double object constructions, albeit from a different theoretical point of view. Valdeson investigates the use of verbs with double objects from a constructional perspective, and argues that changes in the double object construction provide evidence for a constructional network where higher and lower levels (more or less abstract constructions) can change in similar ways, but also partly independently. He observes that the double object construction becomes less frequent in the period from the beginning of the 19th century to the present. It also occurs with fewer verbs; in Valdeson's terms there is less *lexical variation*. He looks closer at the most frequent verbs and shows that some of them also show less lexical variation – they occur with fewer different types of objects. However, some verbs become less frequent in the double object constructions, but still show high lexical variability. Valdeson therefore concludes that productivity is not necessarily dependent on text frequency.

Ida Larsson and Björn Lundquist study the development of a strict order between verbal particle and object. Up until the middle 17th century, Swedish had the same word order possibilities in particle constructions as for instance modern English and Norwegian: pronominal objects typically preceded verbal particles, whereas non-pronominal objects could either precede or follow the particle. Present-day Swedish, on the other hand, differ from all the other Germanic languages, by requiring that all objects follow a particle. Larsson & Lundquist

show that the change starts in the 17th century and that the modern word order is largely established around the end of the 18th century. However, not all particle constructions are affected at the same time, and there is continual development into the present-day. The authors suggest that the variability in older Swedish has to do with the status of the particle as a phrasal modifier, in combination with the principles of linearization of phrases. The change, they argue, is due to a reanalysis of the particle from phrase to head; this is not an unexpected development given economy principles such as the Head Preference Principle (van Gelderen 2004).

Mikael Kalm discusses the emergence of different kinds of adverbial infinitival clauses. In Old Swedish, the only type of adverbial infinitival clause that is attested expresses purpose, and other types do not seem to become possible until the 17th century; temporal and instrumental adverbial infinitivals are rare in Kalm's sources, and they are not attested before the 19th century. Kalm ties the development partly to the grammaticalization of the infinitival marker *att*. As in many other Germanic languages, this marker starts out as a preposition, but it is not until the 18th century, Kalm argues, that it loses all prepositional content, in effect preparing the ground for the wide assortment of adverbial infinitives that we have today. The development, Kalm suggests, is a consequence of contact induced grammaticalization, as well as so-called *Verschriftlichung* and language *Ausbau* (Höder 2009, 2010). In other words, the use of adverbial infinitival clauses depends on the development and elaboration of the written code, and the Swedish written code is influenced by other languages. To test this hypothesis, Kalm compares present-day Standard Swedish with translations to Övdalian, which, unlike Standard Swedish, has not been codified until recently. The use of adverbial infinitival clauses is therefore expected to be restricted or even non-existent. Kalm shows that although some of the adverbial infinitivals in the Swedish original text are translated with infinitival clauses, Övdalian prefers other constructions (coordination, embedded finite clauses etc.). Temporal and instrumental infinitival clauses seem to be avoided in the Övdalian translations.

Adrian Sangfelt studies word order in complex VPs, more specifically the possibility to have adverbials (and other constituents) between the separate verbal heads. In general, OV-languages (e.g. German) do not allow intervening material in such contexts, whereas VO-languages (e.g. English) do (see Haider 2010, 2013). Sangfelt investigates verbal clusters in Swedish during the period 1725–1850. At this time, the final remains of the old OV-system disappear, and given the cross-linguistic patterns, it is therefore expected that it will be increasingly possible with material intervening between the verbal heads. Interestingly, Sangfelt's results suggest that Swedish appears to contradict the generalization: intervening elements become increasingly uncommon. In fact, the only verbal sequence that turns out to be universally clustered is main

verb + auxiliary (VAux). Although VAux is restricted to OV languages, OV word order does not need to involve VAux.

Erik Petzell tests the Rich Agreement Hypothesis (RAH), recently revitalised by Koenenman & Zeijlstra (2014; see also Tvica 2017) on data from Viskadalian Swedish. In this dialect, there is no V-to-I movement although finite verbs are inflected for all persons in the plural (i.e. rich agreement by any standard). However, the RAH still stands, Petzell maintains, as long as the person endings are analyzed as part of [tense], an account that is independently supported by the emergence of the 2SG clitic *(s)tä*. Petzell argues further that both the reanalysis of agreement as part of tense (i.e. [tense]-[agr] → [tense_{agr}]), and the clitic development, where the former 2SG suffix *-(s)t* becomes part of the pronominal clitic *ä*, represent instances of syntactic grammaticalization in the sense of Roberts & Rousseau (1999, 2003). In both cases, the agreement morpheme climbs upwards in the syntactic tree, as it were, as it becomes associated with T (the locus of tense as well as subjects) rather than a lower functional head of its own.

Grammaticalization is discussed in the final contribution, as well, where Lars-Olof Delsing studies how the gradable adjectives *mycket* ‘much’ and *lite* ‘little’ develop into quantifiers, and the concomitant loss of agreement morphology. Delsing shows that non-agreeing forms of *lite* spread from the 17th century and onwards, and that the development of the quantifier *mycket* takes place mainly during the 18th and 19th century. He further argues that weak forms of *lite* and *mycket* have been reanalysed further, and that they are polarity items in present-day Swedish. There are to date few detailed studies of grammaticalization within the nominal domain in Swedish, and one important contribution of Delsing’s squib is to point to questions for future work.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Cecilia Falk, Elisabet Engdahl, and Kari Kinn for their helpful comments and constructive criticism on an earlier version of this introduction, and to all the reviewers that kindly accepted to scrutinize the contributions to the volume. We are also grateful to Dick Claésson and Paulina Helgeson for their translation of the introduction to Dalin’s *Argus*. Any remaining flaws and inconsistencies are, of course, our responsibility. Ida Larsson’s work was carried out within the project *Variation and Change in the Scandinavian Verb Phrase* funded by the Norwegian Research Council (grant nr. 250755).

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis & Gisbert Fanselow. 2002. On the correlation between morphology and syntax. The case of V-to-I. In Jan Wouter Zwart & Werner Abraham (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax. Proceedings from the 15th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 219–242.
- Alving, Hjalmar. 1916. *Det grammatiska subjektets plats i den narrativa satsen i svenskan* [The place of the grammatical subject in the narrative clause in Swedish]. Uppsala: Edv. Berlings boktryckeri.
- Andersson, Peter. 2007. *Modalitet och förändring. En studie av må och kunna i fornsvenska* [Modality and change. A study of *må* and *kunna* in Old Swedish]. Diss. University of Gothenburg.
- Andréasson, Maia, Susanna Karlsson, Erik Magnusson & Sofia Tingsell. 2004. *Har/hade-bortfall i svenskan* [Omission of *har/hade* in Swedish]. In Björn Melander, Ulla Melander Marttala, Catharina Nyström, Mats Thelander, Carin Östman (eds.), *Svenskans beskrivning 26*. Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren. S. 67–74.
- Andréasson, Maia. 2007. *Satsadverbial, ledföljd och informationsdynamik i svenskan* [Sentence adverbials, word order, and information dynamics in Swedish]. Diss. University of Gothenburg.
- Andréasson, Maia. 2008. Not All Objects Are Born Alike: Accessibility as a Key to Pronominal Object Shift in Swedish and Danish. In Miriam Butt, Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI. Pp. 26–45.
- Andréasson, Maia & Ida Larsson. In prep. Subject placement in Swedish and Danish.
- Bentzen, Kristine. 2014. Object shift. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal*. 1:332–343.
- Berg, L.-O. 1994. När vi läsa i vår bok. Något om läskunnigheten vid början av 1700-talet [When we read in our book. On literacy in the beginning of the 18th century]. In Birgitta Ernby (ed.), *Spår av odling. Festskrift till Hugo Karlsson*. Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning. Pp. 35–43.
- Berg, Johanna., Rickard Domeij, Jens Edlund, Gunnar Eriksson, Per Fallgren, David House, Eva Lindström, Erik M. Petzell, Zofia Malisz, Susanne Nylund Skog & Jenny Öqvist. 2019. Making archival speech recordings accessible for research. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv*. 141:2018:171–178.

- Bergman, Gösta. 1968. *Kortfattad svensk språkhistoria* [A concise history of Swedish]. Stockholm: Prisma.
- Biblia, thet är, all then Helgha Scrifft, på swensko* [Biblia, that is, the entire holy scripture, in Swedish]. 1541. Uppsala.
- Biblia thet är: all then helgha scrifft, på swensko* [Biblia that is: the entire holy scripture, in Swedish]. 1618. Stockholm.
- Biblia, thet är all then heliga skrift på swensko* [Biblia, that is the entire holy scripture in Swedish]. 1703. Stockholm
- Borin, Lars, Markus Forsberg & Johan Roxendal. 2012. Korp – the corpus infrastructure of Språkbanken In *Proceedings of LREC 2012*. Istanbul: ELRA. Pp. 474–478.
- Brandtler, Johan & Lars-Olof Delsing. 2010. Framväxten av obestämd artikel i svenska [The emergence of the indefinite article in Swedish]. In Gunilla Byrman, Anna Gustafsson & Henrik Rahm (eds.), *Svensson och Svenskan - Med sinnen känsliga för språk*. Lund: Lund University. Pp. 24–36.
- Breitbarth, Anne. 2005. *Live fast, die young – the short life of Early Modern German auxiliary ellipsis*. Diss. Tilburg University.
- Bylin, Maria. 2013. *Aspektuella hjälpverb i svenskan* [Aspectual auxiliaries in Swedish]. Diss. Stockholm University.
- Bylin, Maria. 2016. Adjektivbøjningens -a och -e Ett seglivat variationstillstånd [The adjectival morphemes -a and -e. A state of enduring variation]. *Språk och stil*. 26:69–100.
- Bäckström, Linnéa. 2019. *Etableringen av ha-bortfall i svenskan. Från kontaktfenomen till inhemsk konstruktion* [The rise of ha-omission in Swedish. From a contact phenomenon to a language specific construction]. Diss. University of Gothenburg.
- Cederschiöld, Gustaf. 1897. *Om svenskan som skriftspråk* [On Swedish as a written language]. Gothenburg: Wettergren & Kerber.
- Dahl, Östen. 2015. *Grammaticalization in the North. Noun Phrase Morphosyntax in Scandinavian Vernaculars*. Language Science Press.
- Davidson, Herbert. 1990. *Han hon den: genusutvecklingen i svenskan under nysvensk tid* [*Hon han den*. The development of gender during Modern Swedish]. Diss. Lund University.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1991. Om genitivens utveckling i fornsvenskan [On the development of the genitive in Old Swedish]. In Sven-Göran Malmgren & Bo Ralph (eds.), *Studier i svensk sprdkhistoria 2*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Pp. 12–30.

- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1999. Från OV-ordföljd till VO-ordföljd. En språkförändring med förhinder [From OV to VO word order. A linguistic change with obstacles]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*. 114:151–232.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 2003. Syntaktisk variation i nordiska nominalfraser [Syntactic variation in Nordic noun phrases]. In Øystein Alexander Vangsnes, Anders Holmberg & Lars-Olof Delsing (red.), *Dialektsyntaktiska studier av den nordiska nominalfrasen*. Novus: Oslo. Pp. 11–64.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 2014. Stora katastrofen – med för- och efterskalv [The big disaster – with fore- and aftershocks]. In Maria Bylin, Cecilia Falk, Tomas Riad (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 12. Variation och förändring*. Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Pp. 27–46.
- Engdahl, Elisabet. 2006. Semantic and syntactic patterns in Swedish passives. In Benjamin Lyngfelt & Torgrim Solstad (eds.), *Demoting the Agent*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 21–45.
- Erteschik-Shir, Noomi & Gunlög Josefsson. 2018. Scandinavian object shift is phonology. In Laura R. Bailey & Michelle Sheenan (eds.), *Order and structure in syntax I. Word order and syntactic structure*. Berlin: Language Science Press. Pp. 99–115
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 1977. Embedded clause reduction and Scandinavian gender agreement. *Journal of Linguistics*. 13:239–257.
- Faarlund, Jan-Terje. 2019. *The Syntax of Mainland Scandinavian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Falk, Cecilia. 1993. *Non-Referential Subjects in the History of Swedish*. Diss. Lund University.
- Falk, Cecilia. 1997. *Fornsvenska upplevarverb* [Old Swedish experiencer verbs]. Lund: Lund University.
- Falk, Cecilia. 2010a Ledföljden i fornsvenska infinitivfraser [Word order in Old Swedish infinitival phrases]. In Erik Magnusson & Lena Rogström (eds.), *Svenska språkets historia 10 – hur och för vem?* Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning. Pp. 99–107
- Falk, Cecilia. 2010b Att analysera fornsvenska infinitivfraser – vad är grammatiskt, vad är ogrammatiskt? [Analyzing Old Swedish infinitival phrases – what is grammatical, what is ungrammatical?]. In Maj Reinhammar (ed.), *Studier i svenska språkets historia 11: Förhandlingar vid Elfte sammankomsten för svenska språkets historia i Uppsala 23-24 april 2010*. Uppsala: Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien för svensk folkkultur. Pp. 31–48

- Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2019. On the Rich Agreement Hypothesis and varieties of embedded V2. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. 42:2:209–225.
- Haapamäki, Saara. 2010. Språkhistoria och nordistikens historia – nordistiska doktorsavhandlingar på 1900-talet [Language history and the history of Scandinavian studies – doctoral theses in Scandinavian studies in the 18th century]. In Erik Magnusson & Lena Rogström (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 10. *Språkhistoria – Hur och för vem?* Gothenburg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning. Pp. 1–19.
- Haugen, Tor Arne and Hans-Olav Enger. 2019. The semantics of Scandinavian pancake constructions. *Linguistics*. 57:3:531–575.
- Haider, Hubert. 2010. *The syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haider, Hubert. 2013. *Symmetry Breaking in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinat, Fredrik. 2010. Long object shift and reflexives. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. 33:1:67–80.
- Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace & Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2010. V-to-I and V2 in subordinate clauses: An investigation of Faroese in relation to Icelandic and Danish. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*. 13:61–97.
- Holm, Gösta. 1952. *Om s-passivum i svenskan. Företädesvis folkmålen och den äldre fornsvenskan* [On the s-passive in Swedish. In particular the dialects and Early Old Swedish]. Lund: Gleerups.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Diss. Stockholm University.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1993. Two subject positions in Mainland Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 52:29–41.
- Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Håkansson, David. 2008. *Syntaktisk variation och förändring – en studie av subjektlösa satser i fornsvenska* [Syntactic variation and change – a study of subjectless clauses in Old Swedish]. Diss Lund University.
- Håkansson, David. 2011. Bisatsledföljden i äldre svenska – variation eller förändring? [Subordinate clause word order in older Swedish – variation or change?]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 126:93–140.
- Höder, Steffen. 2009. Converging languages, diverging varieties. Innovative relativisation patterns in Old Swedish. In Kurt Braunmüller & Juliane House (eds.), *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 73–100.

- Höder, Steffen. 2010. *Sprachausbau im Sprachkontakt. Syntaktischer Wandel im Altschwedischen* [Sprachausbau in language contact. Syntactic change in Old Swedish]. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi, Joel Priestley, Kristin Hagen, Tor Anders Åfarli & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes. 2009. The Nordic Dialect Corpus – an Advanced Research Tool. In Kristiina Jokinen & Eckhard Bick (eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics NODALIDA 2009*. NEALT Proceedings Series Volume 4. Pp. 73–80.
- Johannisson, Ture. 1945. *Hava och vara som tempusbildande hjälpverb i de nordiska språken* [*Hava and vara as temporal auxiliaries in the Nordic languages*]. Lund: Gleerups
- Johansson, Egil. 1981. Den kyrkliga lästraditionen i Sverige – en konturteckning [The ecclesiastical reading tradition in Sweden – a sketch]. In Mauno Jokipii & Ilkka Nummela (eds.), *Ur nordisk kulturhistoria: Läskunnighet och folkbildning före folkskoleväsendet*. Jyväskylä: Studia Historica Jyväskyläensia. Pp. 193–224
- Johansson, Lars-Erik. 2007. Periodindelningen i svensk språkhistoria: terminologi och avgränsningar [The periodization in Swedish language history: terminology and definitions]. In Lars Wollin, Anna Saarukka & Ulla Stroh-Wollin (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 9. Det moderna genombrottet – också en språkfråga?* Åbo: Åbo Akademi. Pp. 125–132.
- Johansson, Lars-Erik. 2010. Den första nordiska språkhistorien. En studie i en genres uppkomst och prototypiska textutformning [The first Nordic language history. A study of the rise of a genre and its prototypical textual disposition]. In Erik Magnusson & Lena Rogström (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 10. Språkhistoria – Hur och för vem?* Gothenburg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning. Pp. 152–161.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 2009. Peas and pancakes: On apparent disagreement and (null) light verbs in Swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. 32:1:35–72.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 2014. Pancake sentences and the semanticization of formal gender in Mainland Scandinavian. *Language Sciences*. 43:62–76.
- Julien, Marit. 2002. Optional *ha* in Swedish and Norwegian. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*. 5:67–95.
- Julien, Marit. 2005. *Nominal phrases from a Scandinavian perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Julien, Marit. 2015. The force of V2 revisited. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*. 18:139–181.

- Kalm, Mikael. 2016. *Satsekvivalenta infinitivfraser i svenskan: en synkron och diakron undersökning* [Control infinitives and ECM-Infinitives in Swedish: a synchronic and diachronic investigation]. Diss. Uppsala University.
- Kirri, Arto. 1975. *Studier över passivkonstruktioner i nysvenskt skriftspråk* [Studies of the passive construction in Modern written Swedish]. Diss. University of Helsinki.
- Kosmeijer, Wim. 1986. The status of the finite inflection in Icelandic and Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*. 26:1–41.
- Koenaman, Olaf & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2014. The Rich Agreement Hypothesis Rehabilitated. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 45:4:571–615.
- Laanemets, Anu. 2012. *Passiv i moderne dansk, norsk og svensk: Et korpusbaseret studie af tale- og skriftsprog* [The passive in present-day Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish: A corpus based study of spoken and written language]. Diss. Tartu University.
- Lagervall, Marika. 2014. *Modala hjälpverb i språkhistorisk belysning* [Modal auxiliaries from a diachronic perspective]. Diss. University of Gothenburg.
- Larsson, Ida. 2009. *Participles in Time. The Development of the Perfect Tense in Swedish*. Diss. University of Gothenburg.
- Larsson, Ida. 2014. HAVE and BE + participle of an unaccusative verb. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 1:381–395.
- Larsson, Ida. 2015. The HAVE/BE alternation in Scandinavian. Perfects, Resultatives and Unaccusative Structure. In Rolf Kailuweit & Malte Rosemeyer (eds.), *Auxiliary selection: Gradience and Gradualness*. De Gruyter. S. 145–182.
- Larsson, Ida. To appear. The development of the BE-perfect in Germanic. To appear in Kristin Eide & Marc Fryd (eds.), *The Perfect Volume*. John Benjamins.
- Larsson, Kent. 1988. *Den plurala verbböjningen i äldre svenska* [Verbal inflection for plural in older Swedish]. Uppsala University.
- Ledin, Per & Benjamin Lyngfelt. 2013. Olika *hen*-syn
Om bruket av *hen* i bloggar, tidningstexter och studentuppsatser. [Gender-neutral pronouns. On the use of *hen* in blogs, newspapers, and student essays.] *Språk & Stil* 23:141–174.
- Leopold, Carl Gustaf af. 1801. *Afhandling om Svenska Stafsättet* [Treatment of the Swedish orthography]. Svenska Akademiens handlingar från år 1796. Första delen. Stockholm.
- Lindstad, Arne Martinus, Anders Nøklestad, Janne Bondi Johannessen & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes. 2009. The Nordic Dialect Database: Mapping Microsyntactic Variation in the Scandinavian Languages. In Kristiina Jokinen & Eckhard Bick (eds.), *NEALT Proceedings Series* 4. Pp. 283–286.

- Lundquist, Björn. 2004. *Subjektsval vid passivering av ditransitiva verb*. Master's thesis, Lund University.
- Lundquist, Björn. 2014. Double object constructions: active verbs. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 1:136–145.
- Lundquist, Björn, Ida Larsson, Maud Westendorp, Eirik Tengesdal & Anders Nøklestad. Nordic Word Order Database: motivations, methods, material and infrastructure. *The Nordic Atlas of Language Structures Online (NALS) Journal* 4:1–33.
- Lyttkens, Ivar A. & Fredrik Wulff. 1889. *Svensk uttals-ordbok* [Swedish pronunciation dictionary]. Lund.
- Malmgren, Sven-Göran 2007. Modernt språkligt genombrott, modern nysvenska och nusvenska [Modern linguistic breakthrough, Modern New Swedish and present-day Swedish]. In Lars Wollin, Anna Saarukka & Ulla Stroh-Wollin (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 9. *Det moderna genombrottet – också en språkfråga?* Åbo: Åbo Akademi. Pp. 166–173.
- Magnusson, Erik. 2007. *Gränsöverskridande koordination: syntaktisk förändring i äldre svenska* [Coordination unlimited. Syntactic change in older Swedish]. Diss. University of Gothenburg.
- McFadden, Thomas & Artemis Alexiadou, 2005. Counterfactuals and BE in the History of English. In John Alderete, Chung-hye Han, & Alexei Kochetov (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project. Pp. 272–280.
- Melander Marttala, Ulla & Siv Strömquist. 2001. *Korpusen Svensk Dramadialog. Användarhandbok* [The Corpus Drama Dialogue in Sweden – a Manual]. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Neuman, Erik 1925. Kritiska strövtåg i svensk historisk formlära [Critically browsing Swedish historical morphology]. *Nysvenska studier*. 5:65–213.
- Nilsson, Jenny & Erik Magnusson Petzell. 2015. Svenskt talspråk efter 1800 – huvudlinjer i utvecklingen [Spoken Swedish after 1800 – main developments]. In Helge Sandøy (ed.), *Talemål etter 1800 – Norsk i jamføring med andre nordiske språk*. Oslo: Novus. Pp. 355–379.
- Norde, Muriel. 1997. *The history of the genitive in Swedish: a case study in degrammaticalization*. Diss. University of Amsterdam.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1903. *Vårt språk* I [Our language]. Lund: Gleerups.
- Thet Nyia Testamentit på Swensko* [The New Testament in Swedish] 1526. Stockholm

- Pettersson, Gertrud. 1988. Bisatsordföljden i svenskan eller Varifrån kommer BIFF-regeln? [Subordinate clause word order in Swedish or Where does the BIFF rule come from?]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*. 103:157–180.
- Petzell, Erik M. 2011. OV-ordföljd i svenskans historia [OV word order in the history of Swedish]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*. 126:41–192.
- Petzell, Erik M. 2013. Relative inversion and non-verb-initial imperatives in Early Modern Swedish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. 36:1:27–55.
- Petzell, Erik M. 2017. Enclitic subjects and agreement inflection in Viskadalian Swedish. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal*. 2:1–39.
- Petzell, Erik M. 2018. Verbböjning och ordföljd i Viskadalen [Verbal inflection and word order in Viskadalen]. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv*. 140:89–125.
- Petzell, Erik M. 2019. Automatisk transkribering av landsmålstext [Automatic transcription of dialect text]. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv*. 141:2018:184–199.
- Petzell, Erik M. 2020. Handwritten text recognition and linguistic research. In Sanita Reinsone, Inguna Skadiņa, Anda Baklāne, and Jānis Daugavietis (eds.), *Proceedings of the Digital Humanities in the Nordic Countries 5th Conference (DHN 2020), Riga, Latvia, October 21–23, 2020*. CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org) Vol. 2612. Riga: University of Riga. Pp. 302–309.
- Platzack, Christer 1981. Ändelsevokalismen i supinum och perfekt particip av starka verb: en studie av växlingen it:et och in:en i äldre och yngre nysvenska [The ending vowels in the supine and the past participle of strong verbs: a study of the variation it:et and in:en in Early and Late Modern Swedish]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*. 96:107–136.
- Platzack, Christer 1985. Syntaktiska förändringar i svenskan under 1600-talet [Syntactic changes in Swedish during the 17th century]. In Sture Allén (ed.), *Svenskans beskrivning* 15. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Platzack, Christer. 1988. Den centralskandinaviska bisatsordföljdens framväxt [The emergence of the Central Scandinavian subordinate clause word order]. In Gertrud Pettersson (ed.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria*. Lund: Lund University Press. Pp. 241–255.
- Platzack, Christer, 1989. The Swedish Supine: An Active Verb Form or the Non-agreeing Form of the Past Participle? In Dany Jaspers, Yvan Putseys, Wim Klooster & Pieter Seuren (eds.), *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon. Studies in Honour of Wim de Geest*. Dordrecht: Foris. Pp. 305–319.
- Platzack, Christer. 2005. Karl XII:s bibel 1703 och svenska språket [Karl the XII's Bible of 1703 and the Swedish language]. In Tord Larsson & Birger Olsson (eds.), *Den gamla*

- översättningen: *Karl XII:s bibel och dess receptionshistoria: föredrag vid en konferens i Lund den 21–25 februari 2003 anordnad av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. Pp. 285–307.
- Platzack, Christer. 2011. *Den fantastiska grammatiken – en minimalistisk beskrivning av svenskan* [The fantastic grammar – a minimalistic description of Swedish]. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Platzack, Christer & Anders Holmberg. 1989. The Role of AGR and Finiteness. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Languages*. 43:51–76.
- Ralph, Bo. 2000. Vanans makt i svensk språkhistoriebeskrivning [The power of habit in descriptions of Swedish language history]. In Lars-Erik Edlund (ed.) *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 5. Förhandlingar vid Femte sammankomsten för svenska språkets historia, Umeå 20–22 november 1997*. Umeå: Umeå University. Pp. 360–379.
- Roberts, Ian G. & Anna Roussou. 1999. A formal approach to 'grammaticalization'. *Linguistics*. 37:6:1011–1041.
- Roberts, Ian G. & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: a minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rohrbacher, Bernhard. 1999. *Morphology-driven syntax: A theory of V to I raising and pro-drop*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Rosenkvist, Henrik. 2004. *The Emergence of Conditional Subordinators in Swedish – a Study in Grammaticalization*. Diss. Lund University.
- Rosenkvist, Henrik. 2018. Estlandssvenskarna – en historisk och språklig bakgrund [The Estonian Swedes – a historic and linguistic background]. In Henrik Rosenkvist (ed.), *Estlandssvenskans språkstruktur*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg. Pp. 7–31.
- Sahlstedt, Abraham. 1773. *Swensk Ordbok* [Swedish dictionary]. Stockholm.
- Sangfelt, Adrian. 2017. OV-ledföljd och huvudsats-bisatsasymmetri i svenskans historia [OV order and main clause-subordinate clause asymmetry in the history of Swedish]. *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift*. 35:1:109–128.
- Sangfelt, Adrian. 2019. *Syntaktiska strukturer i tiden. OV- och bisatsledföljd i svenskans historia* [Syntactic structures in time. OV and subordinate clause word order in the history of Swedish]. Diss. Uppsala University.
- Santesson, Lillemor 1986. *Tryckt hos Salvius* [Printed by Salvius]. Diss. Lund University.
- Sellberg, Lars. 1993. *Av kärlek till Fosterland och Folk. Gabriel Djurklou och dialektforskningen* [Out of love for native land and people. Gabriel Djurklou and dialectology]. Diss. Uppsala University.

- Silén, Beatrice. 2005. Från *jag wil idher berætta* till *här måste jag berätta för er* - strukturförändringar vid verbet berätta [From *jag wil idher berætta* to *här måste jag berätta för er* – structural changes in the verb *berätta*]. In *Från översättning till etik* (Acta Universitatis Ouluensis . Series B; Vol. 64). Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.
- Skrzypek, Dominika. 2005. *The Decline of Nominal Inflection in Old Swedish: The Loss of Dative Case*. Diss. Lund University.
- Skrzypek, Dominika. 2009. The Formation of the Definite Article in the Nordic Languages. *Lingua Posnaniensis*. 51:1.
- SOU 1924:27 = Betänkande med förslag till ett systematiskt utforskande av den svenska allmogekulturen [Report with suggestion for a systematic study of Swedish folk culture]. *Statens offentliga utredningar*, nr 27, 1924.
- Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2016. The emergence of definiteness marking in Scandinavian – new answers to old questions. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 131:129–169.
- Ståhle, Carl Ivar. 1970. *Svenskt bibelspråk från 1500-tal till 1900-tal* [Swedish biblical language from the 16th to the 20th century]. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2002. Subject Positions and the Placement of Adverbials. In Peter Svenonius (ed.), *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sweriges Rikes lag, gillad och antagen på Riksdagen Åhr 1734* [The law of the kingdom of Sweden, approved and passed in parliament in the year of 1734]. 1736. Stockholm.
- Teleman, Ulf. 2002. *Ära rikedom och reda. Svensk språkvård och språkpolitik under äldre nyare tid* [Glory, richness, and order. Swedish language planning and language politics during the Early Modern period]. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Teleman, Ulf. 2003. Tradis och funkis. *Svensk språkvård och språkpolitik efter 1800*. [Traditional and functional. Swedish language planning and language politics after 1800.] Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik 1–4* [The grammar of the Swedish Academy]. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
- Thelander, Mats. 1988. Nu eller alltid? Perspektiv på 110 års nusvenska [Now or forever? Perspectives on 110 years of present-day Swedish]. *Nysvenska studier*. 67:5–14.
- Thelander, Mats. 2007. "De där befängda modärna idéerna ...": Svenskt dramaspråk och det moderna genombrottet [”Those absurd modern ideas...” Swedish drama language and the modern breakthrough]. In Lars Wollin, Anna Saarukka & Ulla Stroh-Wollin (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 9. Det moderna genombrottet – också en språkfråga?* Åbo: Åbo Akademi. Pp. 35–63.

- Tingsell, Sofia. 2010. *Sin och hans – i förändring?* [*Sin and hans – changing?*]. In Erik Magnusson & Lena Rogström (eds.), *Svenska språkets historia 10 – hur och för vem?* Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning. Pp. 261–271.
- Tvica, Seid. 2017. *Agreement and verb movement. The Rich Agreement Hypothesis from a typological perspective*. Diss. University of Amsterdam.
- Valdeson, Fredrik. 2016. Variation mellan olika konstruktionsval vid verbet *ge* från fornsvenska till nusvenska [Variation between different choices of construction with the verb *ge* from Old to present-day Swedish]. In Daniel Andersson, Lars-Erik Edlund, Susanne Haugen & Asbjørg Westum (eds.), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 13. Historia och språkhistoria*. Umeå: Umeå University Pp. 279–292
- Valdeson, Fredrik. 2017. Dativalternering i modern svenska [Dative alternation in present-day Swedish]. In Emma Sköldberg, Maia Andréasson, Henrietta Adamsson Eryd, Filippa Lindahl, Sven Lindström, Julia Prentice & Malin Sandberg (eds.), *Svenskans beskrivning 35: Förhandlingar vid trettiofemte sammankomsten. Göteborg 11–13 maj 2016*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, Pp. 355–367.
- Van Gelderen, Elly. 2004. *Grammaticalization as Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vangsnes, Øystein A. 2014. Measureless quantificational exclamatives. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal*. Vol. 1:475–485.
- Wessén, Elias. 1958. *Svensk språkhistoria*. Vol. 1. *Ljudlära och formlära* [Swedish language history. Phonology and morphology]. 5th ed. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Wessén, Elias. 1965. *Svenskt lagspråk* [The language of Swedish laws]. Lund: Gleerups
- Vesterdahl, Ida. 2018. *Ingan kast sto tomor*. Attributiv och predikativ kongruens i nuckömålet [Ingan kast sto tomor. Attributive and predicative agreement in the dialect of Nuckö]. In Henrik Rosenkvist (ed.), *Estlandssvenskans språkstruktur*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg. Pp. 97–115.
- Widmark, G. 1970. Stildifferentiering i Gyllenborgs komedi *Svenska sprätthöken* [Stylistic differentiation in Gyllenborg's comedy *Svenska sprätthöken*]. *Nysvenska studier*. 49: 5–77.
- Widmark, Gun. 2000. Boksvenska och talsvenska. Om språkarter i nysvenskt talspråk [Book Swedish and colloquial Swedish. On language kinds in Modern spoken Swedish]. In *Boksvenska och talsvenska. Ett urval uppsatser samlade till författarens 80-årsdag 31 juli 2000*. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Wollin, Lars. 1988. Nordiska språk – ett modernt 1800-talsämne? Några glimtar ur en disciplins historia [Scandinavian studies – a modern subject of the 19th century? Some glimpses from

the history of a discipline]. In Jan Svensson (ed.) *Nordistiken som vetenskap. Artiklar om ämnets historia, teorier och metoder*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. Pp. 31–46.

Sources

Argus = Dalin, Olof von. 1732–1734. *Then Swänska Argus* [The Swedish Argus]. Stockholm.

Available through FTB/Korp (text) and LB (facsimile).

EWL = Collin, Hans Samuel & Carl Johan Schlyter (eds.). 1827. *Samling af Sweriges gamla lagar. Första bandet. Westgöotalagen* [Collection of the old laws of Sweden. Volume one. The Westrogothic law]. *Stockholm: Z. Haeggström*. Available through FTB/Korp.

F-leg = Stephens, George (ed.). 1847. *Svenska medeltidens kloster- och helgonabok [...]* *Ett forn-svenskt legendarium [...]* [The Swedish medieval book of monasteries and saints ... An Old Swedish collection of legends]. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Gyllenborg *1679 = Gyllenborg, Carl (*1679). *Swenska sprätthöken* [The Swedish dandy]. Ed. by Lennart Breitholtz & Einar Törnqvist. Stockholm: Gebers, 1959. Available through LB.

Horn *1629 = Horn, Agneta (*1629). *Beskrivning över min vandringstid* [Description of my life]. Edited by Gösta Holm. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1959. Available through FTB/Korp.

Jolin *1818 = Jolin, Johan (*1818). *Barnhusbarnen eller Verldens dom* [The children of the orphanage or the judgement of the world]. 1849. See Melander Marttala, Ulla & Siv Strömquist 2001. Available through LB (facsimile).

K-styr = Moberg, Lennart (ed.). 1964. *En nyttigh bok om konnunga styrilse och höfdinga* [A useful book on the royal rule]. Facsimile of edition from 1634 by Johannes Bureus. Uppsala. Available through FTB/Korp.

Kiöping *1621 = Kiöping, Nils Mattson (*1621). *Nils Matssons Reesas korta Beskriffning* [The short description of the journey of Nils Mattsson Kiöping]. In *Een kort Beskriffning Uppå Trenne Reesor och Peregrinationer, sampt Konungarijket Japan*. Printed by Johan Kankel in Wisingsborgh, 1674. Available here:

<http://spraakbanken.gu.se/ktex/kioping/Kioping1674.xml>

Modée *1698 = Modée, Reinhold Gustaf (*1698). *Håkan Smulgråt* [Håkan Cheapskate]. 1738. See Melander Marttala, Ulla & Siv Strömquist 2001. Available through LB (facsimile).

Ristell *1744 = Ristell, A.F. (*1744). Några mil från Stockholm [A few miles from Stockholm]. 1787. Edited by Gösta Langenfeldt & Bo Thörnqvist. Stockholm: Institutionen för nordiska språk, 1974.

Rålamb *1622 = Callmer, Christian (utg.) 1963. Diarium under resa till Konstantinopel 1657–1658 [‘Diary during a journey to Constantinople 1657–1658’, undertaken by Claes Rålamb (*1622)]. Historiska handlingar 37:3. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Salvius *1706 = Salvius, Lars (*1706). *Beskrifning om en resa genom Asia, Africa och många andra hedna länder, som är Giord af Nils Matson Kiöping för detta Kongl. Maj:ts skeps lieutenant* [A description of a journey through Asia, Africa, and many other pagan countries, which is made by Nils Matson Kiöping, former lieutenant of the Royal navy]. Printed in Stockholm, 1743. Available here:

<http://spraakbanken.gu.se/ktext/kioping/Kioping1743.xml>

Spf = Swedish prose fiction 1800–1900. Available through Korp.

Orust = Dialect texts (IOD, old accession numbers 22:1–3, 27:1–9) from 1897–1901 from the island of Orust, kept at the Institute for Language and Folklore in Gothenburg.

Öxn= Recordings (accession numbers ULMA6804–6806) from 1956 from the parish of Öxnevalla, kept at the Institute for Language and Folklore in Uppsala.

SAOB = Ordbok över svenska språket, utg. av Svenska Akademien [Dictionary of the Swedish language, published by The Swedish Academy]. 1893–. Available here: www.saob.se

Electronic corpora

Korp: <https://spraakbanken.gu.se/korp>

Fornsvenska textbanken (FTB, ‘The text bank of Old Swedish’):

<https://project2.sol.lu.se/fornsvenska>

Litteraturbanken (LB, ‘The bank of literature’): www.litteraturbanken.se