Piotr Garbacz
University of Oslo

Morphology and syntax in the Scandinavian vernaculars of Ovansiljan[1]

1 Introduction

In a number of papers beginning with Platzack & Holmberg (1989) and especially in Holmberg & Plaztack (1995), Holmberg & Plaztack proposed that the syntactic differences between Mainland Scandinavian and Insular Scandinavian should be attributed to two parameters that are observable in morphology, namely case marking and verbal agreement.[2] Their proposal has been extentsively discussed ever since and it has resulted in a substantial number of publications on Scandinavian syntax. The last version of this parametric approach is presented in Holmberg (2010a).

Another attempt to explain a number of differences between Icelandic and Faroese on the one hand, and Swedish, Norwegian and Danish on the other, by assuming a link between morphology and syntax was proposed by Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998). As in the case of Holmberg & Platzack, also here the core of the hypothesis is that morphological evidence triggers a positive setting of a parameter that in its turn makes certain syntactic patterns possible. The unidirectional generalization is that the syntactic patterns in question are not expected to appear when the morphological evidence is absent, whereas they may appear when the morphological evidence is present.

The morphological evidence that Holmberg (2010a) and Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) have been talking about is verbal agreement in person and number. In the following, I will test the predictions that Holmberg (2010a) and Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) have made on data form seven Scandianvian vernaculars spoken in the Ovansiljan region in Western Sweden. Five of these vernaculars have retained verbal agreement in number and person and it is therefore particulary interesting to test the typological predictions proposed in the above-mentioned works on these.

[2] "[F]rom a syntactic point of view, the Scandinavian languages can be divided in two main groups: the Mainland Scandinavian (MSc.), consisting of modern Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, and Insular Scandinavian (ISc.), consisting of modern Icelandic and modern Faroese, as well as of all old Scandinavian languages (roughly the medieval variants) and at least one dialect on the Scandinavian mainland, namely the Swedish dialect spoken in Älvdalen in Dalecarlia in central Sweden." (Holmberg & Platzack 1995:8).

The first hypothesis discussed is the one of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) and I will discuss the formulation of it presented there. The second hypothesis is the one first sketched in Platzack & Holmberg (1989) and then developed in Holmberg & Platzack (1995). The last version of it is Holmberg (2010a) and in this paper, I will only consider this last version.

The paper is structured as follows: it starts with a presentation of the Ovansiljan vernaculars in Section 2 and a short methodological discussion in Section 3. The proposal of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) is presented and contrasted with the Ovansiljan data in Section 4, whereas Section 5 deals with the proposal of Holmberg (2010a). In Section 6 a summary of the findings is given and it is discussed what relevance these have for the two parametric approaches.

2 The vernaculars of Ovansiljan

The vernaculars that are discussed in this paper are all spoken in the region of Ovansiljan, located in the northern part of the Dalecarlia province ($_{Swe.}$ *Dalarna*) in western Sweden. According to Levander (1925:1) there are seven vernaculars of Ovansiljan, here in alphabetical order: (1) the vernacular of Älvdalen, termed here as Övdalian[3], (2) the vernacular of Mora, (3) the vernacular of Ore, (4) the vernacular of Orsa, (5) the vernacular of Sollerön, (6) the vernacular of Våmhus, and (7) the vernacular of Venjan, cf. Map 1 below.

Map 1: The location of Ovansiljan vernaculars in the province of Dalecarlia and the location of Dalecaria in Sweden

---

[3] Övdalian is sometimes also labelled Elfdalian (e.g. by Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2010).

In Swedish dialectology the vernaculars are often known as *Ovansiljanmålen,* i.e. 'Upper Siljan vernaculars' (Dahl 2005:1). They are descendants of a variety of Old East Scandinavian, labelled Old Dalecarian (_{Swe.} *forndalska*) by Levander (1925), who argues that this variety must have been quite widespread in the Middle Ages. Today, the most genuine Dalecarlian dialects are limited to the north-western parts of the province (Levander 1925:6 ff., Garbacz 2010:29-31). With the exception of Övdalian, spoken by not more than 2400 people (Larsson et al. 2008), it is unknown how many people speak the vernaculars mentioned above. The number fluctuates between a couple of hundred to one thousand speakers for each vernacular. The speakers are mostly, but not exclusively, elderly people and the vernacular is most often their first language, as many of them learned Swedish first when they started to go to school.

The common view among Swedish dialectologists is that the Ovansiljan vernaculars hold a unique position among the Scandinavian varieties (Hallberg 2005:1697). They exhibit a number of differences compared to the other Scandinavian languages, as well as to the neighbouring dialects, at every level: phonetic, phonologic, morphologic, syntactic ad lexical, see Levander (1925, 1928) for further information. All of the Ovansiljan vernaculars are given a quite detailed description in Levander (1925, 1928) and a more general treatment in Dahl (1998).

Out of the vernaculars, Övdalian is best described, although the amount of works on it is very small compared to the other Nordic languages, see the bibliography of linguistic literature on Övdalian in Garbacz (2010:23-53). Övdalian is spoken in about twenty villages located on both sides of the Österdalälven-valley, see Garbacz (2010:23 ff.) and its form differs between the villages, at least as far as phonology and morphology are concerned (Steensland 2000:361). Övdalian is traditionally considered the most conservative of the Ovansiljan vernaculars. The next best described vernacular is that of Orsa, however, the description consists only of an early, general paper that is not longer up-to-date (Boëthius 1918) and a recent dictionary containing around 5000 words (Ohlsén & Olander 2010). As for the other vernaculars, there exists a small dictionary (containing less than 2000 words) of the vernacular of Våmhus (Ask 2000) as well as smaller dictionaries for the vernaculars of Sollerön (containing around that 4000 words in addition to some grammatical information, Andersson & Danielsson 1999), the vernacular of Venjan (containing about 2000 words, Wennberg 2007) and the vernacular of Ore (an on-line dictionary containing around 2000 words; http://www.oremal.se/index.html). In addition, one will find a brief description of the vernacular of Sollerön (Måsan 2002), a short article that deals with the development of three diphthongs in the same vernacular (Björklund 1994) and two old, short descriptions of the vernacular of Ore (Boëthius 1907 and Tannerhagen 1913).

3 Methodology

Data for this article have been collected from native-speakers of Ovansiljan-vernaculars. The consultants come from the villages of Åsen, Brunnsberg, Loka and Klitten (Övdalian), Våmhus (the vernacular of Våmhus), Färnes (the vernacular of Mora), Orsa (the vernacular of Orsa), Sollerön (the vernacular of Sollerön), the northern part of the village of Venjan (the vernacular of Venjan), and Ore (the vernacular of Ore). The data have been collected by means of elicitation of grammaticality judgements, which means that the consultants were asked whether they would consider the sentences presented to them as grammatical or not. The most important reason for the choice of method is that there is no text corpus of any Ovansiljan-vernacular, with exception of one small corpus of Övdalian (http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nota/scandiasyn/). Another two very important reasons are (1) the possibility of examining sentences that occur very rarely in corpora or in speech and (2) the possibility of obtaining negative information; this is, information on which patterns are not grammatical in a particular language. A revealing example is the low frequency of embedded clauses of the type that excludes V2 and that in addition contains a sentential adverbial or negation. Searching for a combination of a certain complementizer, a certain adverb, a certain verb and, say, a DP-subject yields very few tokens even in a very big corpus. The string: relative complementizer – DP-subject – the adverb *ofte* ('often') and any finite verb gives only five hits in the bokmål part of The Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts which contains about 18.5 million words. On the other hand, it is known that the string is completely grammatical for native speakers of Norwegian. This shows clearly that examining even a very large text is not necessarily enough when studying syntactic phenomena.

The consultants have been chosen with respect to their age, as the aim of this paper is to investigate the oldest variant of the Ovansilijan-vernaculars spoken today. Since the consultants learned Swedish first in the school, it is assumed that the vernacular they speak is their native language. The interviews were carried out by the author during a visit in Ovansiljan in May 2010 and these have been followed up by questionnaires that were sent to the consultants by mail and returned to the author when completed.

4 The Split-IP Parameter

Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998:37) "predict a correlation with other morpho-syntactic phenomena reflecting the presence/absence of AgrPs: 'extra' subject and object positions, transitive expletive constructions, multiple inflectional affixes (…)". Following Höskuldur Thráinsson (1996:262), the authors thus propose that the IP can be either split or unsplit and that this is subject to parametric variation. The so-called Split-IP Parameter (hence SIP) is triggered by morphological evidence, i.e. "the possibility of multiple inflectional morphemes on the verb stem, specifically the co-occurrence of discrete tense and agreement morphemes" (as in the case of Icelandic) or, when morphology is not sufficient, by "other evidence such as verb raising or transitive expletive constructions" (Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson 1998:61-67). Here, one meets what seems to be a serious problem for the

hypothesis: it namely predicts that transitive expletive constructions can be both the trigger of the SIP and an effect of it. I will return to this problem in section 6.

The morphological evidence for a positive value of the SIP is a clearly separable tense and agreement morphology (Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson 1998:58). Such morphology is according to Höskuldur Thráinsson (2007:59) found both in Icelandic, Old Swedish and Övdalian, but not in e.g. the standard Mainland Scandinavian languages. The differences between the Danish, the Icelandic and the Övdalian paradigm are shown in Table 1, adapted from Höskuldur Thráinsson (2007:59). Since the Övdalian verbal forms are incorrect, I give the correct forms in brackets and mark the incorrect forms with an asterisk. The erroneous Övdalian forms do not, however, influence the line of argument.[4]

Table 1: Tense and agreement morphology in Danish, Icelandic and Övdalian.

Infl.	**Danish**		**Icelandic**		**Övdalian**	
	present tense	*past tense*	*present tense*	*past tense*	*present tense*	*past tense*
1 sg.	hør-**er**	hør-**te**	heyr-**i**	heyr-**ð-i**	*hör-**er** (är-**er**)	*hör-**d-e** (är-**d-e**)
2 sg.	hør-**er**	hør-**te**	heyr-**ir**	heyr-**ð-ir**	*hör-**er** (är-**er**)	*hör-**d-e** (är-**d-e**)
3 sg.	hør-**er**	hør-**te**	heyr-**ir**	heyr-**ð-i**	*hör-**er** (är-**er**)	*hör-**d-e** (är-**d-e**)
1 pl.	hør-**er**	hør-**te**	heyr-**um**	heyr-**ð-um**	*hör-**um** (är-**um**)	*hör-**d-um** (är-**d-um**)
2 pl.	hør-**er**	hør-**te**	heyr-**ið**	heyr-**ð-uð**	*hör-**ir** (är-**ið** / är-**ir**)	*hör-**d-ir** (är-**d-ið** / är-**d-ir**)
3 pl.	hør-**er**	hør-**te**	heyr-**a**	heyr-**ð-u**	*hör-**a** (är-**a**)	*hör-**d-e** (är-**d-e**)

Given the morphological data presented in Table 1, we expect Icelandic and Övdalian to exhibit a Split-IP. Accordingly, if the value of the Split IP parameter is positive, the predictions for a language are the following (Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson 1998:67):

- the possibility of Transitive Expletive Constructions (TEC)
- the availability of two subject positions (being a prerequisite to the higher subject position in expletive constructions and to TEC)
- the availability of two object positions (being a prerequisite to Object Shift of full DP-objects)
- the requirement that the verb raises out of the VP in non-V2-environments

---

[4] Thráinsson (2007: 59) has taken the Övdalian forms from Vikner (1995b) who writes that the Övdalian paradigms are "based on Levander (1909:62–63, 80, 84–88)" (Vikner 1995b:7). Having consulted the relevant pages in Levander (1909), one discovers that the inflection pattern of the Övdalian verb *ara* ('to hear') is not mentioned there.

Since the separability of tense and agreement markers is said to be the crucial evidence for determining the value of the SIP, I will in the following show whether the correlation between such marking and the four syntactic constructions is maintained in the dialects of Ovansiljan. I will begin with the presentation of the inflectional paradigm, and then I will go on to test the acceptability of TEC, the higher subject position in expletive constructions, Object Shift of full DP-objects, and V-Adv word order in all types of embedded clauses (V^0-to-I^0 movement).

4.1 Inflectional morphology of the Ovansiljan vernaculars

In the vernaculars spoken in Älvdalen, Mora, Sollerön, and Våmhus, tense and agreements endings are clearly separable in 1st and 2nd person plural, both in present and in past tense (cf. Table 2), whereas in the vernacular of Orsa the endings are only separable in 1st and 2nd person plural when the verb follows the subject (Table 3).[5] The vernaculars of Venjan and Ore represent the Mainland Scandinavian verbal inflection type, as shown in Table 4.

Table 2: Inflectional morphology in the vernaculars of Mora, Sollerön, and Våmhus.[6]

Infl.	**The vernacular of Mora (Färnäs)**[7]		**The vernacular of Sollerön**[8]		**The vernacular of Våmhus**[9]	
	PRESENT TENSE	PAST TENSE	PRESENT TENSE	PAST TENSE	PRESENT TENSE	PAST TENSE
1 sg.	*spil-**är***	*spil-**ä***	*läk-**är***	*läk-**ät***	*bäk-**ä***	*bäk-**äd***
2 sg.	*spil-**är***	*spil-**ä***	*läk-**är***	*läk-**ät***	*bäk-**ä***	*bäk-**äd***
3 sg.	*spil-**är***	*spil-**ä***	*läk-**är***	*läk-**ät***	*bäk-**ä***	*bäk-**äd***
1 pl.	*spil-**um***	*spil-**ä-um***	*läk-**um***	*läk-**ät-um***	*bak-**um***	*bäk-**äd-um***
2 pl.	*spil-**ir***	*spil-**ä-ir***	*läk-**ir***	*läk-**ät-ir***	*bak-**ið***	*bäk-**äd-ið***
3 pl.	*spil-**å***	*spil-**ä***	*läk-**(a)***	*läk-**ät***	*båk-**å***	*bäk-**äd***

Table 3: Inflectional morphology in the vernacular of Orsa (the village of Orsa).[10]

person	PRESENT TENSE		PAST TENSE	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL[11]	SINGULAR	PLURAL[12]
1	*spil-**är***	*spil-**öm** / spil*	*spil-**äd***	*spil-**äd-öm**/spil-**äd***
2	*spil-**är***	*spil-**i**/ spil*	*spil-**äd***	*spil-**äd-i** / spil-**äd***
3	*spil-**är***	*spil-**å***	*spil-**äd***	*spil-**äd***

---

[5] This rule is however absent in the variant of the vernacular spoken in the village of Skattungbyn, where the person endings are always present (Eva Olander p.c.).

[6] As the verbal paradigm of Övdalian is presented in Table 1 above, I refrain from exemplifying it here.

[7] The verb *spilå* 'play'.

[8] The verb *läka* 'play'.

[9] The verb *båka* 'bake'.

[10] The verb *spilå* 'play'.

[11] The 1st pl. ending *–öm* and the 2nd pl. ending *–i* are only present when the verb is placed after the subject.

[12] The 1st pl. ending *–öm* and the 2nd pl. ending *–i* are only present when the verb is placed after the subject.

Table 4: Inflectional morphology in the vernaculars of Ore and Venjan.

Infl.	The vernacular of Ore[13]		The vernacular of Venjan[14]	
	PRESENT TENSE	PAST TENSE	PRESENT TENSE	PAST TENSE
1 sg.	*åtr-**är***	*åtr-**ed***	*kasst-**är***	*kasst-**ed** / kasst-**ät***
2 sg.	*åtr-**är***	*åtr-**ed***	*kasst-**är***	*kasst-**ed** / kasst-**ät***
3 sg.	*åtr-**är***	*åtr-**ed***	*kasst-**är***	*kasst-**ed** / kasst-**ät***
1 pl.	*åtr-**om**[15] / åtr-**är***	*åtr-**ed-om**[16] / åtr-**ed***	*kasst-**är***	*kasst-**ed** / kasst-**ät***
2 pl.	*åtr-**är***	*åtr-**ed***	*kasst-**är***	*kasst-**ed** / kasst-**ät***
3 pl.	*åtr-**är***	*åtr-**ed***	*kasst-**är***	*kasst-**ed** / kasst-**ät***

4.2 The predictions

Given the data presented in Tables 1 to 4, I conclude that Övdalian, as well as the vernaculars of Mora, Sollerön and Våmhus have clearly separable endings for agreement and tense and that this should be enough evidence to trigger Split IP. In the vernacular of Orsa, the endings for tense and agreement are clearly separable only when the verb follows the subject. It is therefore unclear if the verbal morphology in this vernacular can give enough evidence to trigger Split IP. The vernaculars of Ore and Venjan do not display separable endings for tense and agreement and I assume that the morphological evidence is not enough to set a positive value of the SIP.[17] Unlike Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998:61), I leave out the possibility that the positive value of the SIP can be triggered by embedded V-Adv word order or by transitive expletive constructions: since these two constructions are said to be the outcome of the SIP, such argumentation would be circular.

The prediction is thus that Övdalian, the vernaculars of Mora, Sollerön, Våmhus (and possibly that of Orsa) should have *obligatory* V-Adv embedded word order and that these also should have the *possibility* of Transitive Expletive Constructions, a higher subject position in expletive constructions (HiPos) and to Object Shift of full DP-objects. If one assumes that the availability of two subject positions is a prerequisite for TEC and HiPos (and the availability of two object positions a prerequisite for Object Shift of full DP-objects) and that these positions are an outcome of the SIP that in its turn is triggered by the separability of endings for tense and agreement, it is unexpected that a language with inflectional morphology of the Mainland Scandinavian type would exhibit any of these constructions. As the vernaculars of Ore and Venjan display no separable endings for tense and agreement, I expect that these, in line with Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998), should exhibit neither TEC, HiPos nor

---

[13] The verb *åtra* 'change'.

[14] The verb *kassta* 'throw'.

[15] The form *åtredom* is considered archaic (Ann-Christine Elings Blomberg, p.c.).

[16] The form *åtredom* is considered archaic (Ann-Christine Elings Blomberg, p.c.).

[17] The loss of agreement in number and person in Ore must have occurred quite recently, as Levander (1928:170 ff.) notes that the vernacular of Ore exhibits separate endings for 1st and 2nd person plural (of which the first one is still possible to some extent, cf. above).

Object Shift of full DP-objects. The theoretical expectations can be summarized as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Typological expectations given Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998)

	Övdalian	The vernacular of Våmhus	The vernacular of Mora	The vernacular of Sollerön	The vernacular of Orsa	The vernacular of Venjan	The vernacular of Ore
SIP	+	+	+	+	+?	−	−
V^0-TO-I^0	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory?	impossible	impossible
FULL DP OBJECT SHIFT	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible
TEC	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible
HIPOS	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible

Below, I present empirical evidence from each and every vernacular of Ovansiljan.

4.3 V^0-to-I^0 movement

As I have shown in Garbacz (2010:119 ff.), the order V-Adv in all types of embedded clauses (V^0-to-I^0 movement) is still possible, but no longer obligatory in Övdalian. This is shown in the example in (1).

(1) *Eð ir iend buotję   so* ig *(ar)* **aldri** *(ar) lesið.*   (Övdalian)
    IT   IS ONLY BOOK.DEF THAT I   HAVE   NEVER   HAVE   READ

Similar findings have later been presented by Ásgrímur Angantýsson (2011:91). Instead, two patters are preferred in Övdalian embedded clauses: the Mainland Scandinavian embedded word order and the word order with the adverbial preceding the subject (Garbacz 2010:123 ff.), cf. (2).

(2) *Eð ir iend buotję   so (**aldri**)* ig *(**aldri**) ar   lesið.*   (Övdalian)
    IT IS ONLY BOOK.DEF THAT (NEVER) I (NEVER)   HAVE   READ

To the best of my knowledge, V^0-to-I^0 movement is also possible in the vernacular of Mora, at least it is accepted by some speakers, cf. the examples in (3), and in the vernacular of Orsa, where some speakers prefer it to verb-in-situ, see (4). In none of these two vernaculars V^0-to-I^0 movement is obligatory.

(3) a) *Äd   va   sind att   (**int**)* ann *(**int**) besötjä (**int**) våss i går.* (Mora)
       IT   WAS   PITY THAT NOT   HE   NOT   VISITED NOT   US   YESTERDAY

    b) *Äd   e   nå   så   (**åldär**)* i *(**åldär**) a   (**åldär**) djort.*   (Mora)
       IT   IS SOMETHING THAT NEVER   I NEVER   HAVE NEVER   DONE

(4) a) *Ä wa armli att (**int**) ånn (*?**int***) älst (**int**) o wöss igår.* (Orsa)
    IT WAS PITY THAT NOT HE NOT VISITED NOT ON US YESTERDAY

   b) *Belgien i jätt lånd dar (**int**) i (**int**) <u>a</u>(-**nt**) weri aldri.* (Orsa)
    BELGIUM IS A COUNTRY WHERE NOT I NOT HAVE-NOT BEEN NEVER

Like Övdalian, the vernaculars of Mora and Orsa also allow the Mainland Scandinavian embedded word order and the placement of sentential adverbs before the subject. The vernaculars of Våmhus, Ore and Venjan do not exhibit the embedded V^0-to-I^0 movement at all, but they do display the Subject-Adv-Vfin embedded word order. This is also the case of the vernacular of Sollerön spoken by younger speakers (born in the 1950's). Older speakers (born in the 1930's) do accept structures with V^0-to-I^0.

4.4 Transitive Expletive Constructions

Transitive Expletive Constructions are present in the vernaculars of Mora, Orsa, Sollerön, and Venjan, as exemplified in (5) to (9).

(5) a) ***Äd a nån** stuli **män bil**.* (Mora)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN MY CAR

(6) a) ***Ä** a **nön** stuli **bil'n männ**.* (Orsa)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN CAR.DEF MINE

(7) a) ***Ä** a **jänn rev** täj **önor** fö våss.* (Sollerön)
    IT HAS A FOX TAKEN FOWLS FOR US

   b) ***Ä** a **nånn** iti upp **kaku**.* (Sollerön)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY EATEN UP CAKE.DEF

   c) ***Ä** a **mångg studentär** lesi **botji**.* (Sollerön)
    IT HAS MANY STUDENTS READ BOOK.DEF

(8) a) ***Ä** a **nån** stule **biln männ**.* (Venjan)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN CAR.DEF MINE

   b) ***Ä** a **jänn röv** täj **hönnsä worå**.* (Venjan)
    IT HAS A FOX TAKEN FOWLS.DEF OURS

Interestingly, TEC are absent in Övdalian (Garbacz 2010:71) as well as in the vernaculars of Våmhus and Ore, cf. (9) and (10) respectively.

(9) a) **Ä a **någä åjtlänningär** tsiöpa **Matsas aus**.* (Våmhus)
    IT HAS SOME FOREIGNERS BOUGHT MATS' HOUSE

9

b) *Ä a **nån** stuli **männ bil**. (Våmhus)
   IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN MY CAR

(10)a) *Ä a **môngär studenter** läst **botje**. (Ore)
   IT HAS MANY STUDENTS READ BOOK.DEF

b) *Ä a **nôn** jäte upp **kako**. (Ore)
   IT HAS SOMEBODY EATEN UP CAKE.DEF

c) *Ä a **nôn räv** täje **hönsner** fô wôss. (Ore)
   IT HAS ONE FOX TAKEN FOWLS.DEF FOR US

4.5 Higher subject position in expletive constructions (HiPos)

Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998:67) claim that the availability of two subject positions is a prerequisite to the higher subject position in expletive constructions (HiPos). The construction is attested in the vernaculars of Mora, Orsa, Sollerön and Venjan, cf. (11) – (14).

(11)a) *Äd* a **jätt par** *dansa* å *gardim*. (Mora)
   IT HAS A COUPLE DANCED ON GARDEN.DEF

b) *Äd* a **je katta** *väri i(nni) tjötji*. (Mora)
   IT HAS A CAT BEEN IN KITCHEN.DEF

(12)a) *Ä a* **jätt par** *dånsad i gardem*. (Orsa)
   IT HAS A COUPLE DANCED IN GARDEN.DEF

b) *Ä a* **je katta** *weri ini tjetji*. (Orsa)
   IT HAS A CAT BEEN IN KITCHEN.DEF

(13)a) *Ä a* **jätt par** *dannsa i gardim*. (Sollerön)
   IT HAS A COUPLE DANCED IN GARDEN.DEF

b) *Ä a* **je katt'** *ve i tjötji*. (Sollerön)
   IT HAS A CAT BEEN IN KITCHEN.DEF

(14) a) *Ä a* **nå gadfolk** *käme frå Ståkkålm*. (Venjan)
   IT HAS SOME GUESTS COME FROM STOCKHOLM

b) *Ä a* **jänn kattkall** *wäj åjti tjötjä*. (Venjan)
   IT HAS A CAT BEEN OUT-IN KITCHEN.DEF

HiPos is not attested in the vernacular of Våmhus, cf. (15), the vernacular of Ore (16) or Övdalian (17).

(15)a) *Ä   a   **je katta**   we   auti   tsjötsi.   (Våmhus)
      IT   HAS   A CAT   BEEN   OUT-IN   KITCHEN.DEF

  b) *Ä   a   ***främmand***   kämi   frå   Stockola.   (Våmhus)
      IT   HAS   GUESTS   COME   FROM   STOCKHOLM

(16)a) *Ä   a   **nôgär   djästär**   käme   frå   Stôckhôlm.   (Ore)
      IT   HAS   SOME   GUESTS   COME   FROM   STOCKHOLM

  b) *Ä   a   **jäna   katta**   wäre   ti   tjötjä.   (Ore)
      IT   HAS   A   CAT   BEEN   OUT-IN   KITCHEN.DEF

(17) a) *Eð   ar   **iett   par**   dansað   i   garðem.   (Övdalian)
      IT   HAS   A   COUPLE   DANCED   IN   GARDEN.DEF

  b) *Eð   ar   **nog   dşäster**   kumið   frå̊   Stokkol.   (Övdalian)
      IT   HAS   SOME   GUESTS   COME   FROM   STOCKHOLM

  e) *Eð   ar   **ien   katt**   werið   i   tşyötşę.   (Övdalian)
      IT   HAS   A   CAT   BEEN   IN   KITCHEN.DEF

4.6 Full DP Object Shift

Finally, object shift of DP-objects does not exist in any of the seven Ovansiljan vernaculars, and neither does object shift of pronominal objects, cf. (18) – (24).

(18) a) *I läst botje **int.** / I läst'nt botje.   (Ore)
      I READ BOOK.DEF NOT / I READ-NOT BOOK.DEF.

  b) *I läst na **int**. / I läst'nt na.   (Ore)
      I READ HER NOT / I READ-NOT HER

(19) a) *Ig tsiöpäd buotsi **int.** / Ig tsiöpäd **int** buotsi.   (Våmhus)
      I BOUGHT BOOK.DEF NOT / I BOUGHT NOT BOOK.DEF.

  b) *I las na **int**. / I las'nt na.   (Våmhus)
      I READ HER NOT / I READ-NOT HER

(20)a) *I les   nå tidningär   **ent**. **/** I les'ent nå   tidningär. (Venjan)
      I READ NPI NEWSPAPERS.DEF NOT / I READ-NOT NPI NEWSPAPERS.DEF

   b) *Dåm   snodd   änn-**ent** åjt. / Dåm snodd-**ent** åjt   änn. (Venjan)
      THEY   THREW   HIM-NOT OUT / THEY THREW-NOT OUT   HIM

(21)a) *I les tiningär   **innt**. **/** I les **innt** tiningär.   (Sollerön)
      I READ NEWSPAPERS.DEF NOT / I READ NOT NEWSPAPERS.DEF

   b) *Dämm snodd ann **innt** åjjt. / Dämm snodd **innt** åjjt   ann. (Sollerön)
      THEY THREW HIM NOT OUT / THEY THREW   NOT   OUT   HIM

(22)a) *I les tidninggär   **int**. **/** I les **int** tidninggär.   (Orsa)
      I READ NEWSPAPERS.DEF NOT / I READ NOT NEWSPAPERS.DEF

   b) *Däm   windöd ån **int** ajt. / Däm   windöd **int** ajt ån. (Orsa)
      THEY   THREW HIM NOT OUT / THEY THREW   NOT   OUT HIM

(23)a) *I les tidningär   **ent**. **/** I les **ent** tidningär.   (Mora)
      I READ NEWSPAPERS.DEF NOT / I READ NOT NEWSPAPERS.DEF

   b) *Dem   kasted an **int** åjt. / Dem kasted **int** åjt an. (Mora)
      THEY   THREW HIM NOT OUT / THEY THREW NOT   OUT HIM

(24)a) * Ig tjyöpt buotję   **inte/it**. **/** Ig tjyöpt **int/it** buotję.   (Övdalian)
      I   BOUGHT BOOK.DEF NOT / I BOUGHT NOT BOOK.DEF.

   b) *An såg mig **inte/it**. / An såg **int/it** mig.   (Övdalian)
      HE SAW ME   NOT   / HE SAW NOT ME

4.7 Split-IP in Ovansiljan – conclusions

The empirical results concerning both inflectional morphology and syntax in the vernaculars of Ovansiljan and the theoretical predictions of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) can be summarized as shown in Table 6 below. The cases when the empirical data deviate from the theoretical expectations have been shadowed.

Table 6: Syntax of the Ovansiljan vernaculars

	Övdalian	The vernacular of Våmhus	The vernacular of Mora	The vernacular of Sollerön	The vernacular of Orsa	The vernacular of Venjan	The vernacular of Ore
SIP	+	+	+	+	+?	−	−
V^0-TO-I^0	non-obligatory	no	non-obligatory	no / non-obligatory[18]	non-obligatory	no	no
FULL DP OBJECT SHIFT	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
TEC	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
HiPos	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no

The two most problematic facts for the theory of Bobaljik & Thráinsson (1998) are (1) lack of obligatory V^0-to-I^0 movement in the vernaculars of Älvdalen, Mora, Orsa, and Sollerön. [19] Its complete lack (as it seems) in the vernacular of Våmhus as well as (2) the presence of TEC and HiPos in the vernacular of Venjan. The lack of full DP object shift (and the pronominal object shift) in all the vernaculars and the lack of TEC and HiPos in Övdalian and the vernacular of Våmhus do not necessairly contradict the theory. However, these facts needs an explanation: if the prerequisites for the constructions are present in the dialect, what is the reason of the lack of these? Höskuldur Thráinsson (2010:1084) touches upon the question discussing verb movement in the Scandinavian languages:

> "To conclude, it is clear that the verb placement facts in Älvdalsmålet[20] are much more complex and messy than previously believed and it is not at all clear yet what is required to account for them in a satisfactory manner. But if the evidence for separate tense and agreement markers is still clear, then B[obaljik] &T[hráinsson] maintain that Älvdalsmålet should have split IP and more ''subject positions'' than standard MSc and hence allow transitive expletives. If that is true, then instances of Adv-Vfin order in embedded clauses in Älvdalsmålet have to be attributed to ''exceptional'' placement of sentence adverbs, which is then possibly becoming less exceptional than it is in Icelandic because of influence from Standard Swedish [footnote omitted]."

I do claim that the evidence for separate tense and agreement markers is still clear in Övdalian, as it is in the vernaculars of Våmhus, Mora, Sollerön. As far as TEC and HiPos are concerned, the data from the vernaculars of Mora and Sollerön thus corroborate the predictions of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998). Övdalian and the vernacular of Våmhus are more problematic at this point: they do not seem to allow TEC or HiPos. This can either indicate that the vernaculars do not have more subject positions than the standard

---

[18] Applies to speakers born in the 1930's.

[19] Applies to speakers born in the 1930's in the case of Sollerön.

[20] I.e. in Övdalian.

Mainland Scandinavian languages or that these positions are not available due to a certain reason.

Swedish influence, a factor that Höskuldur Thráinsson (2010:1084) mentions, is an important factor, but to my mind it should not be overestimated. There are many syntactic structures in Övdalian, as for instance referential null subjects, multiple subjects and negative concord, that are robust in the language although they are absent in Swedish, see Garbacz (2010:78-82). Any claim that Övdalian would currently be developing "into" Swedish would hence be a simplification. An investigation of the degree to which standard Swedish can be said to influence Övdalian lies outside the scope of the present article. In Garbacz (2010:138 ff.), I have claimed that Swedish have played a catalysing (yet not the most important) role in the ongoing loss of V^0-to-I^0 movement in Övdalian, arguing that the pre-subject placement of negation in Övdalian blurred the evidence for verb movement to I^0. The same argumentation could be used for the other Ovansiljan vernaculars, as they all exhibit such pre-subject placement of negation.

Another way to explain the lack of (obligatory) V^0-to-I^0 movement in Övdalian and in the other vernaculars is to assume an extra adverbial position between AgrSP and TP (cf. e.g. Ásgrímur Angantýsson 2011:106), making verb movement invisible. If so, we expect to observe a contrast between definite/specific subjects (located in AgrSP) and indefinite subjects (located in TP) with respect to co-occurence with the word order Vfin-Adv (as is the case of Icelandic, Ásgrímur Angantýsson 2011:107 ff.).[21] Such a contrast is not present in Övdalian, and I have not found it in the vernaculars of Mora and Orsa either.

Nevertheless, it seems that the correlation that Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) propose between V^0-to-I^0 movement, HiPos and TEC is inadequate. Otherwise, one should account for the fact that the vernacular of Sollerön (spoken by younger informants) exhibits no V^0-to-I^0-movement, but it does display both TEC and HiPos, given that all the constructions are an outcome of the Split-IP, according to Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998). One would like to ask then whether the IP is both split and unsplit and whether V^0-to-I^0 movement is just blocked?

The vernacular of Venjan poses yet another problem. Since it has both TEC and HiPos, this should indicate, given the permises of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998), that the constructions are enabled by a Split-IP. On the other hand, there is no morphological evidence for a positive setting of the SIP-parameter in the vernacular of Venjan (cf. Table 4 above). What do these fact mean for the theory? In this way, the vernacular of Våmhus reminds of spoken Swedish from the 1920's, which is also reported to have exhibited both TEC and HiPos (Ljunggren 1926:350 ff.), in absence of morphological evidence for Split-IP, i.e. separable marking of tense and agreement endings. Swedish examples of TEC and HiPos are given in (25a) and (25b) respectively.[22]

---

[21] Ásgrímur Angantýsson (2011:107) contrasts two embedded clauses with an indefinite subject, out of which the first is grammatical and the other not: (i) *Það var Hrafnkels saga sem* einhver _hafði_ **ekki** _lesið_ (ii) *Það var Hrafnkels saga sem* einhver **ekki** _hafði lesið_. Note, that the same structure as in (ii) is grammatical, when the subject is a personal pronoun, e.g. *hann* 'he' or a DP, e.g. *Haraldur* (ibid.).

[22] Also Nordberg (2005) shows that TEC is attested in Swedish, however, the subject in the construction is according to him never indefinite (Nordberg 2005:149). His material consists of transcribed recordings of people

(25)a) ***Det*** *får* *väl* ***någon*** ***annan*** *överta* ***vakten*** *då (...)*.
    IT MUST THEN SOMEBODY ELSE TAKE-OVER WATCH.DEF THEN
    (from Ljunggren 1926:352)

b) (…) *och* ***det*** *kunde* ***hela*** ***eftermiddagen*** *gå* (…).
    AND IT COULD WHOLE AFTERNOON.DEF GÅ
    (from Ljunggren 1926:351)

The data from the vernaculars of Ovansiljan thus seem to be highly relevant for the hypothesis of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998). They challenge some of its assumptions. The correlation proposed does not seem to be valid for the presented vernaculars. As far as the present data are concerned, this unification seems incorrect.[23] In order to maintain it independent factors must be employed to explain the lack of TEC and HiPos in the vernaculars that otherwise have all prerequisites for a Split-IP. In addition, it also turns out that TEC and HiPos can occur in vernaculars which lack prerequisites for a Split-IP. Finally, the optionality of V^0-to-I^0 movement in all the dialects with separable tense and agreement markers and its complete lack in two of them (in the vernacular of Våmhus and among the younger speakers of the vernacular of Sollerön) is another problem that the proposal of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) cannot account for.

5 φ-features in T

Holmberg (2010a) is the most recent try to explain one morphological and six syntactical differences within the branch of Scandinavian languages by tracing them back to abstract φ-features in T. Whereas Insular Scandinavian (that in Holmberg's 2010a paper is represented solely by Icelandic) exhibits (1) rich subject-verb agreement, (2) oblique subjects, (3) Stylistic Fronting, (4) null expletives, (5) null generic subject pronoun, (6) transitive expletives (TEC), and (7) heavy subject postposing, Mainland Scandinavian (represented in the paper by standard varieties of Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian) does not exhibit any of these phenomena.

> "The seven differences between I[nsular] Sc[andinavian] and M[ainland] Sc[andinavian] I started out with, a reduced version of P&H"s list, have been explained as effects of variation with regard to: ISc has [uPn] and [uNr], MSc has neither. This is morphologically reflected in the agreement on the finite verb. It causes incorporation, in the sense of Roberts (2010a, in press) of a defective, D-less pronoun. A direct result of this is the null generic pronoun and the null expletive. An indirect result is the pure expletive, merged directly with TP, which, in turn, makes the TEC and Heavy Subject Postposing possible. Another indirect result is the possibility of oblique subjects and SF."
> (Holmberg 2010:35 ff.)

---

born before 1965, but the construction is found most frequently among those born before 1935 (Nordberg 2005:146).

[23] The authors state themselves that their proposal "attempts to unify, perhaps incorrectly, all five [phenomena]" (Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson 1998:67).

The prediction seems to be that the above-mentioned properties should cluster in the Scandinavian languages and in their non-standard varieties. More specifically, expletive and generic subjects are unexpected in the varieties that have [uPn] and [uNr] in T.[24][25] It is also unexpected that oblique subjects, Stylistic Fronting, transitive expletives (TEC), and heavy subject postposing will be present in such varieties. As [uPn] and [uNr] in T are "morphologically reflected in the agreement on the finite verb", see above, one does not expect to find null expletive subjects, null generic subjects, oblique subjects, Stylistic Fronting, transitive expletives (TEC), and heavy subject postposing in varieties that lack 'rich' verbal agreement. Finally, since the null generic pronoun and the null expletive is a direct result of this is [uPn] and [uNr], it is expected that varieties that exhibit rich agreement will also obligatorily display null expletive subjects and null generic subjects.

But one may first ask the question of what 'rich' agreement is, as this notion is crucial for the hypothesis. Holmberg (2010a) chooses not to define that, a fact that has been criticized by Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2010). The answers to the critique is as follows:

> "As for pinning down exactly how rich agreement should be to license, in this case, incorporation of a deficient (D-less) pronoun, I remain skeptical. In Holmberg & Platzack (1995) we gave up this ambition after observing a variety of attempts to pin down how rich agreement needed to be to trigger verb movement (Roberts (1994), Rohrbacher (1999) , Vikner (1997), among others), based on generalisations over observed languages and dialects, but which seemed to always be falsified by the next language or dialect investigated. Either the relation between agreement inflection morphology and syntactic properties is less direct than we would like it to be, or we are not operating with the right φ-feature theory (but see Müller (2005) and Roberts (2010a) for a different opinion).
>
> Holmberg (2010b:88)

This is to my mind a very serious problem for the hypothesis of Holmberg (2010a), as its central typological prediction is not defined. Nevertheless, I will test the hypothesis, assuming that the Icelandic and Old Swedish type of agreement can be considered rich. In this way, I will treat the agreement in Övdalian and in the vernaculars of Våmhus, Mora, Sollerön, and possibly the one of Orsa, as examples of rich agreement, whereas I will treat the agreement in the vernaculars of Ore and Venjan as 'poor'. See the relevant paradigms in Section 4.1 above. Given what was said above, the syntactic expectations for the seven vernaculars of Ovansiljan are presented in Table 7 below.

---

[24] Holmberg (2010a:27): "After Agree, the subject will, again, be a copy of T, hence a non-head member of a chain headed by T, will therefore not be attracted by the EPP, and will not be spelled-out."
[25] Holmberg (2010a:26): " The absence of a null generic pronoun in Norwegian and the other MSc languages is a direct consequence of the absence of uφ-features in T which would make possible establishing a chain (T, subject pronoun)."

Table 7: Typological expectations given Holmberg (2010a)

	Övdalian	The vernacular of Våmhus	The vernacular of Mora	The vernacular of Sollerön	The vernacular of Orsa	The vernacular of Venjan	The vernacular of Ore
AGR	rich	rich	rich	rich	rich?	poor	poor
OBLIQUE SUBJECTS	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible
STYLISTIC FRONTING	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible
NULL EXPLETIVES	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory?	impossible	impossible
NULL GENERIC SUBJECT PRONOUN	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory	obligatory?	impossible	impossible
TRANSITIVE EXPLETIVES (TEC)	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible
HEAVY SUBJECT POSTPOSING	possible	possible	possible	possible	possible?	impossible	impossible

5.1 Stylistic Fronting

None of the Ovansiljan vernaculars allows Stylistic Fronting (SF), see (26).[26] Traces of what looks like SF are found in (at least) the vernacular of Orsa, see (27).[27]

(26)a) *An jält iett tal   fer diem so **slutað** add skaulan.   (Övdalian)
       HE   HELD A SPEECH FOR THOSE THAT FINISHED HAD SCHOOL.DEF

   b) *O waist   mig ollt   so **gart** ward ini stugun.   (Våmhus)
       SHE SHOWED ME   EVERYTHING THAT DONE BECAME IN HOUSE.DEF

   c) *Ann jäld jätt tal fö däm   så **sluta** add skauln.   (Mora)
       HE   HELD A SPEECH FOR THOSE THAT FINISHED HAD SCHOOL.DEF

   d) *Ann höll jätt tal   fô dämm summ **sluta**   haddä ti skolan. (Ore)
       HE   HELD A SPEECH FOR THOSE THAT   FINISHED HAD TO SCHOOL.DEF

   e) *Ånn alld jätt tal   fär däm sö **sluta** add skoln.   (Orsa)
       HE   HELD A   SPEECH   FOR THOSE THAT FINISHED HAD   SCHOOL.DEF

   f) *An älld jätt tal   fö dämm så **sluta** add skåjlan.   (Sollerön)
       HE   HELD A SPEECH FOR THOSE THAT FINISHED HAD   SCHOOL.DEF

---

[26] A corresponding sentence without SF is judged as perfectly grammatical in all of the vernaculars.

[27] See also Garbacz (2010:143-164) and Ásgrímur Angantýsson (2011:174-178) on SF in Övdalian.

g) *An hälld jätt tal a dåm så **sluta** add skoln. (Venjan)
   HE   HAD   A   SPEECH FOR THOSE THAT FINISHED HAD SCHOOL.DEF

(27)a) ?Wi skumm fråg onöm so **gamblöst** / **ynggst** i. (Orsa)
       WE SHALL ASK HIM THAT OLDEST / YOUNGST IS

b) ?Wi sö **ajti** **värdn** åmm bott... (Orsa)
   WE THAT OUT-IN WORLD.DEF HAVE LIVED

Despite the sentences presented in (27), it does not seem plausible to assume that the vernacular of Orsa displays SF. What the examples could possibly tell us, is that SF could have disappeared from the vernacular of Orsa later than from the other vernaculars or that the consulted speakers were particularly conservative. In addition, similar examples are possible in standard Swedish and are often considered frozen expressions.

5.2 Oblique subjects
None of the vernaculars allows oblique subjects, cf. (28).

(28)a) I går   drömd **ig/*mig** ien underlin dröm. (Övdalian)
       YESTERDAY   DREAMED I/ME   A   STRANGE DREAM

b) Igår   drömd **ig/*mig** jenn kunstugan dröm. (Våmhus)
   YESTERDAY   DREAMED I/ME   A   STRANGE   DREAM

c) I nåt   drömä **o/*änn** jän grann dröm. (Mora)
   TONIGHT DREAMED SHE/HER A GREAT DREAM

d) I nåt   drömdä **o/*onär** jänn grann dräm. (Orsa)
   TONIGHT DREAMED SHE/HER A   GREAT DREAM

e) I nåt   drömät **o/*ännä** jänn däl dröm. (Sollerön)
   TONIGHT DREAMED SHE/HER A   NICE DREAM

f) Nåtä så wa drömed **å/*änn** så gale fint. (Venjan)
   NIGHT THAT WAS DREAMED SHE/HER SÅ VERY BEAUTIFUL

g) I nåt   drämd **o/*ännär** jänn finan   dräm (Ore)
   TONIGHT DREAMED SHE/HER   A   BEAUTIFUL DREAM

5.3 Heavy subject postposing

Heavy subject postposing is not an option in any of the discussed vernaculars, see the example in (29).[28]

(29) a) **Fôrårä   tjöft   **issa hôjsä**   <u>jänn ungan karr frå Stôckhôlm</u>.* (Ore)
       LAST-YEAR BOUGHT THIS HOUSE.DEF A   YOUNG   MAN FROM STOCKHOLM

   b) **I fiuord   tjyöpt   **å-dar stugụ**   <u>ien   unggan kall frå Falu</u>.* (Övdalian)
       LAST-YEAR BOUGHT THIS HOUSE.DEF A   YOUNG   MAN FROM FALUN

   c) **Förra årä tsiöpäd **itta   ausa**   <u>jenn ung   påik frå Falu</u>.* (Våmhus)
      LAST   YEAR BOUGHT THIS   HOUSE.DEF A YOUNG MAN FROM FALUN

   d) **I fiörd   tjöpt   **itta   öjse**   <u>jän ungg   kall frå Stokkol</u>.* (Mora)
       LAST-YEAR BOUGHT THIS   HOUSE.DEF A YOUNG   MAN FROM STOCKHOLM

   e) **I fjörd   tjept   **deda ajse**   <u>jänn ungg   kall frå Stokkol</u>.* (Orsa)
       LAST-YEAR BOUGHT THIS   HOUSE.DEF A YOUNG   MAN FROM STOCKHOLM

   f) **I fjord   tjöpät   **ita   åjsä**   <u>jänn ungg kall frå Övdalim</u>.* (Sollerön)
       LAST-YEAR BOUGHT THIS   HOUSE.DEF A   YOUNG MAN FROM ÄLVDALEN

   g) **Förår   tjöped   **don   stugu**   <u>jänn ingär   karr frå Mora</u>.* (Venjan)
       LAST-YEAR BOUGHT THIS   HOUSE.DEF A YOUNGER MAN FROM MORA

5.4 Expletive subjects and generic subjects

None of the vernaculars allows omission of expletives and of generic subjects. Such (obligatory) omission is predicted by Holmberg (2010a) for the vernaculars with 'rich' verbal agreement, which in this case are Övdalian, the vernaculars of Våmhus, Mora, Sollerön, and Orsa, see the examples in (30) – (34).

(30) a) *Nụ   raingner   *(eð)   mitjið.*   (Övdalian)
       NOW   RAINS   IT   A-LOT

    b) *Jär   får   *(an)   it   rötja.*
       HERE GETS   ONE   NOT   SMOKE

---

[28] A corresponding sentence, in which the subject directly follows the finite verb and precedes the object, is judged as perfectly grammatical in all of the vernaculars.

(31) a) *Jär raingnä *(äð) mitsi.* (Våmhus)
         HERE RAINS   IT   A-LOT

      b) *Jär får int *(an) rätsa.*
         HERE GETS NOT ONE   SMOKE

(32) a) *Nu raingnä *(äd) mytji.* (Mora)
         NOW RAINS   IT   A-LOT

      b) *Dan fånt   *(an) rötja.*
         THERE GETS-NOT ONE   SMOKE

(33) a) *Um witträ   snajr *(ä) mitji jänå.* (Orsa)
         ON WINTERS SNOWS IT   A-LOT HERE

      b) *Dånä fo'nt   *(ånn) rätja.*
         THERE GETS-NOT ONE   SMOKE

(34) a) *Nu rängnär *(ä) mytji.* (Sollerön)
         NOW RAINS   IT   A-LOT

      b) *Dan få   *(an) innt rätja.*
         THERE GETS ONE   NOT   SMOKE

5.5 Transitive expletives

Finally, transitive expletive constructions (TEC) are possible in the vernaculars of Mora, Orsa, Sollerö, and Venjan, (35)-(38), but not in Övdalian and neither in the vernaculars of Våmhus and Ore, see (39)-(41) and section 4.5 above. [29]

(35)a) ***Äd** a **nån**   stuli **män bil**.* (Mora)
         IT   HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN MY   CAR

(36)a) ***Ä** a **nön**   stuli **bil'n**   **männ**.* (Orsa)
        IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN CAR.DEF MINE

(37)a) ***Ä** a **jänn rev** täj   **önor** fö   våss.* (Sollerön)
        IT HAS A   FOX   TAKEN FOWLS FOR US

---

[29] A corresponding sentence without the TEC is judged as perfectly grammatical in all of the vernaculars.

b) ***Ä*** *a* **nånn** *iti* *upp* **kaku**. (Sollerön)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY EATEN UP CAKE.DEF

c) ***Ä*** *a* **mångg studentär** *lesi* **botji**. (Sollerön)
    IT HAS MANY STUDENTS READ BOOK.DEF

(38)a) ***Ä*** *a* **nån** *stule* **biln** **männ**. (Venjan)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN CAR.DEF MINE

b) ***Ä*** *a* **jänn röv** *täj* **hönnsä** **worå**. (Venjan)
    IT HAS A FOX TAKEN FOWLS.DEF OURS

(39) ****Eð*** *ar* **ien övkall** *tjyöpt* **stugų**. (Övdalian)
    IT HAS AN ÖVDALIAN BOUGHT HOUSE.DEF

(40)a) ****Ä*** *a* **någä åjtlänningär** *tsiöpa* **Matsas aus**. (Våmhus)
    IT HAS SOME FOREIGNERS BOUGHT MATS' HOUSE

b) ****Ä*** *a* **nån** *stuli* **männ bil**. (Våmhus)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY STOLEN MY CAR

(41)a) ****Ä*** *a* **môngär studenter** *läst* **botje**. (Ore)
    IT HAS MANY STUDENTS READ BOOK.DEF

b) ****Ä*** *a* **nôn** *jäte* *upp* **kako**. (Ore)
    IT HAS SOMEBODY EATEN UP CAKE.DEF

c) ****Ä*** *a* **nôn räv** *täje* **hönsner** *fô* *wôss*. (Ore)
    IT HAS ONE FOX TAKEN FOWLS.DEF FOR US

5.6 φ-features in T – conclusion

A summary of the findings presented above is given in Table 8. The cases where the emprirical data deviate from the theoretical expectations have been shadowed.

Table 8: Syntax of the Ovansiljan vernaculars

	Övdalian	The vernacular of Våmhus	The vernacular of Mora	The vernacular of Sollerön	The vernacular of Orsa	The vernacular of Venjan	The vernacular of Ore
AGR	rich	rich	rich	rich	rich?	poor	poor
OBLIQUE SUBJECTS	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
STYLISTIC FRONTING	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
NULL EXPLETIVES	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
NULL GENERIC SUBJECT PRONOUN	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
TRANSITIVE EXPLETIVES (TEC)	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
HEAVY SUBJECT POSTPOSING	no	no	no	no	no	no	no

There is a number of findings that are unexpected, given Holmberg's (2010a) hypothesis. First, the predicted obligatory incorporation of expletives and generic subjects is not attested at all. Second, the vernacular of Venjan exhibits transitive expletives, but behaves in all other respects as the Mainland Scandinavian languages. As it has only 'poor' agreement, it is uncertain what enables TEC in the vernacular of Venjan given the approach of Holmberg (2010a). Out of the seven vernaculars, only the vernacular of Ore behaves as predicted by Holmberg (2010a). In order to retain the approach of Holmberg (2010a) despite the data presented above, one needs to propose an additional factor (or several factors) that could explain the lack of null expletives and null generic subjects in Övdalian as well as in the vernaculars of Våmhus, Mora, Sollerön, and Orsa. Yet another additional factor (or several factors) should be determined in order to explain the presence of TEC in the vernacular of Venjan. Holmberg (2010b:89) notes himself that his proposal faces a problem when confronted with Övdalian data: "The particular mix exhibited by Oevdalian is not completely consistent with P&H, including the version in my paper." Here, I have shown that not only Övdalian, but also the rest of the vernaculars of Ovansiljan, with the exception of the vernacular spoken in Ore, are not consistent with the proposal of Holmberg (2010a).[30]

---

[30] It can be added that Övdalian has lost SF during the 20th century, a loss that was not accompanied (triggered by) any changes in the verbal inflection (pointed out by Garbacz 2010:164 and by Dahl & Koptievskaja-Tamm 2010:50 ff.), and that the vernacular of Orsa has lost the possibility of omitting expletive subjects (reported in Björk 1910:43), whereas this loss has not been accompanied by a change from 'rich' to 'poor' verbal agreement. These facts are yet another challenge to the approach of Holmberg (2010a).

6 Summary and conclusions

In the present paper, I have discussed the hypotheses of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) and of Holmberg (2010a). Although these make correct predictions for the standard forms of the majority of the Nordic languages, they seem to fail when confronted with the empirical evidence from the Swedish vernaculars of Ovansiljan.

The main question to be asked is whether it is possible to account for the new data within the scope of the two approaches discussed above. Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) maintain that the morphological evidence is a trigger for the positive value of the Split-IP parameter, which in turn is responsible for obligatory V^0-to-I^0 movement and which also enables TEC, HiPos, and full-DP Object Shift. When these four phenomena are not present in a language (or a non-standard variety) that has otherwise the appropriate morphological evidence to trigger the positive value of SIP, one could argue that there are external, independent factors that block these syntactic operations. Unless these are not identified, such a solution is not satisfactory. SIP can possibly be triggered by other factors than the morphological ones, like the proposed "other evidence such as verb raising or transitive expletive constructions" (Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson 1998:61). Such a solution could solve the presence of TEC in the vernacular of Venjan. However, if SIP can be triggered by something else than morphology, there is no point in assuming a connection between morphology and syntax in the form proposed by Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998). A proposal that SIP is triggered by the same syntactic patterns that it is supposed to trigger is out of the question. Holmberg (2010b:88) states the following: "Either the relation between agreement inflection morphology and syntactic properties is less direct than we would like it to be, or we are not operating with the right φ-feature theory (but see Müller (2005) and Roberts (2010a) for a different opinion)." If the relation between agreement inflection morphology and syntactic properties is indirect, one would like to know how it can be proved that there is a relation indeed.

The two hypoteses presented by Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) and Holmberg (2010a) are a part of a long tradition of connecting morphology with syntax, in a more or less direct way. Such attempts have been known in linguistics at least since the 14th century (Håkansson 2008:34 and therein cited works) and in the recent years, they have often been formalized in terms of generative grammar. In the present paper, I have shown that neither the approach of Bobaljik & Höskuldur Thráinsson (1998) nor that of Holmberg (2010a) succeed in accounting for the evidence from the Ovansiljan vernaculars. This approach has already been questioned on the basis of both diachronic data, e.g. Sundquist (2002), (2003), Vittersø (2004), Kinn (2010) and synchronic data, e.g. Garbacz (2010), (2011). My results can be seen as yet another objection raised against the parametric approach to Scandinavian syntax. Moreover, as pointed out by Newmeyer (2006), (2008), the parametric approach has not been able to give valid predictions outside (at best) de Germanic language branch.

On the other hand, it should be emphasised that the *search* for parametric correlations has been very succesful, not because it has proved these correlations, but because it has enormously increased our knowledge of the Scandinavian language branch, both diachronically and geographically. This is to my mind the greatest virtue of the parametric approach to Scandinavian syntax. Such an increase of the knowledge of the Scandinavian

languages would not be possible without testing audacious hypotheses.

References:

Andersson M. & S. Danielsson. 1999. *Färdär frå Soldn = Spår från Sollerön : en ordbok på soldmål.* Sollerön.

Ásgrímur Angantýsson. 2011. *The Syntax of Embedded Clauses in Icelandic and Related Languages.* Reykjavík: Hugvísindastofun Háskóla Íslands.

Ask, B. 2000. *Våmhus: ordlista: svenska-våmhusmål jämte kortfattad grammatik samt våmhusmål-svenska: ett urval grundformer.* Våmhus: Bonäs-Våmhus pensionärsförening.

Björk, A. 1910. Orsamål: anteckningar. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv* 113: 43-56.

Björklund, S. 1994. Några diftongvarianter i sollerömål och grannmål i Ovansiljan. *Dalmålsstudier. Festskrift till Stig Björklund på 75-årsdagen den 19 februari 1994.* Uppsala: Dialekt- och folkminnesarkivet: 179-181.

Bobaljik, J. D. & Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1998. Two Heads Aren't Always Better Than One. *Syntax 1 (1)*: 37–71.

Boëthius, J. 1907. Oremålets ställning inom dalmålet. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv 110*: 65-73.

Boëthius, J. 1918. *Orsamålet 1: Ljudlära*. Stockholm: Norstedt.

Dahl. Ö. 1998. *Vad är dalmål?* Institutionen för lingvistik, Stockholm universitet, Stockholm.

Dahl, Ö. 2005. Att sätta älvdalskan på kartan. *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Övdalian, Älvdalen, June 18th-19th, 2004.* Available at http://www.nordiska.uu.se/arkiv/konferenser/alvdalska/konferensrapport.htm

Dahl, Ö & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm. 2010. Rich agreement, everything else being equal and large-scale cross linguistic comparison. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36: 49–56.

Garbacz, P. 2010. *Word Order in Övdalian. A Study in Variation and Change*. Doktorsavh. Lund: Språk- och litteraturcentrum, Lunds universitet.

Garbacz, P. 2011. Sambandet mellan morfologi och syntax i de nordiska dialekterna. In: Edlund, Lars-Erik, Lennart Elmevik & Maj Reinhammar (eds.). *Studier i dialektologi och sociolingvistik.* Uppsala: Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien för svensk folkkultur, 116: 113-121.

Håkansson, D. 2008. *Syntaktisk variation och forandring. En studie av subjektslosa satser i fornsvenska.* Doctoral dissertation, Språk- och litteraturcentrum, Lunds universitet.

Hallberg, G. 2005. Dialects and regional linguistics varieties in the 20th century In: Sweden and Finland. In *The Nordic languages: an international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages,* ed. by O. Bandle, K. Braunmüller, E-H Jahr, A. Karker, H-P Naumann, U. Teleman, L. Elmevik, and G. Widmark, 1691–1706. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Holmberg, A. & Platzack, C. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmberg, A. 2010a. Parameters in minimalist theory: The case of Scandinavian. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36: 1–48.

Holmberg, A. 2010b. Replies to comments. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36: 85–91.

Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1996. On the non-universality of functional categories. In *Minimal Ideas. Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework*, ed. by W. Abraham, S. D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson, and, C. J-W Zwart, 253–281. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Höskuldur Thráinsson. 2007. *The Syntax of Icelandic.* Cambridge University Press, New York.

Höskuldur Thráinsson. 2010. Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian. *Lingua 120*: 1062–1088.

Kinn, K. 2010. *Formelle subjekter i norsk – en diakron undersøkelse.* MA, University of Oslo.

Larsson, G., B. Welin & U. Welin. 2008. *Hur manga talar alvdalska idag?* Paper presented at The Second Conference on Elfdalian, Älvdalen 12–14 June 2008.

Levander, L. 1909. *Älvdalsmålet i Dalarna. Ordböjning ock syntax.* Stockholm: Kungliga boktryckeriet P. A. Norstedt ock söner.

Levander, L. 1925. *Dalmålet. Beskrivning och historia. I.* Uppsala.

Levander, L. 1928. *Dalmålet. Beskrivning och historia. II.* Uppsala.

Lightfoot, D. W. 1979. Principles of diachronic syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ljunggren, R. 1926. *Om den opersonliga konstruktionen.* Uppsala: Berlings.

Måsan, S. 2002. Det finns ju bara ett sollerömål i hela Sverige. I: *Åter till Sollerön: om kulturarv, folk och landsbygd.* Larsson, Cecilia Hammarlund, Bo Larsson, Annette Rosengren (red.). Stockholm: Nordiska museets förlag: 105-116.

Müller, G. 2005. Pro-drop and impoverishment. I: Brandt, P. & E. Fuss (red.) *Form, structure, and grammar. A Festschrift presented to Günter Grewendorf on the occasion of his 60th birthday*: 93-115. Tübingen: Narr.

Newmeyer, F. 2006. A rejoinder to 'On the role of parameters in Universal Grammar: a reply to Newmeyer' by Ian Roberts and Anders Holmberg. *http://people.pwf.cam.ac.uk/mtb23/NSP/Rejoinder%20to%20R&H.pdf*

Newmeyer, F. 2008. *Holmberg and Platzack: The Typological Dimension.* Föredrag vid konferensen Revisiting Parameters: Holmberg and Platzack (1995) Reloaded. Lunds universitet, 16–17 oktober 2008.

Nordberg, B. 2005. Expletivt *det* i samtalsspråk. In: Bäcklund, I. et al. *Text i arbete/Text at work. Festskrift till Britt-Louise Gunnarsson den 12 januari 2005.* Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk: 144–152.

Noreen, A. 1881. Dalmålet I. Inledning till Dalmålet. *Svenska landsmål ock svenskt folklif IV.* 1:2–23.

Ohlsén K. & E. Olander. 2010. *Orsaord: en orsamålsordbok.* Mora: Orsa-Skattunge hembygdsförening.

Roberts, I. 1994. *Verbs and diachronic syntax*: *A comparative history of English and French.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roberts, I. 2010a. A Deletion Analysis of Null Subjects. In: Biberauer, T., Holmberg, A. Roberts, I. & Sheehan, M. *Parametric variation: Null subjects in minimalist theory*: 58-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, I. In press. (In press) *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation and Defective Goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rohrbacher, B. W. 1999. *Morphology-Driven Syntax, A Theory of V to I raising and pro-drop.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Steensland, L. 2000. Älvdalska. In: Vamling, K. & Svantesson, J-O. (ed.) *Världens språk – en typologisk och geografisk översikt,* pp. 361–375. Institutionen för lingvistik, Lunds universitet, Lund.

Sundquist, J. D. 2002. *Morphosyntactic Change in the History of the Mainland Scandinavian Languages.* Doctoral dissertation. Department of Germanic Studies, Indiana University.

Sundquist, J. D. 2003 The Rich Agreement Hypothesis and Early Modern Danish embedded-clause word order. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26.2: 233–258.

Tannerhagen, T. 1913. Oremålet. *Olsmässan: tidning för Ore gammelby med omnejd*: 9.

Wennberg, K. 2007. *Wenjad : en ordbok*. Orsa: Orsa tryckeri.

Vikner, S, 1997: V-to-I movement and inflection for person in all tenses. In: L. Haegeman (ed.). *The New Comparative Syntax*. London: Longman: 187–213.

Vittersø, G. 2004. *Fra sva til sav*. MA-thesis. Institutt for lingvistiske og nordiske studier, University of Oslo.