

Subordinate V2 and Verbal Morphology in Övdalian

Ásgrímur Angantýsson

University of Iceland

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is (i) to locate Övdalian among the Scandinavian languages with regard to verbal morphology and embedded V2, and (ii) to formalize and test hypotheses predicting that languages/dialects that have the relevant morphological differences also show certain syntactic differences. It turns out that the older speakers of Övdalian allow V_{fin}-Adv order in various types of subject-initial clauses more freely than the younger speakers. The results from a verbal paradigm fill-in task reveal substantial variation in the use of verbal affixes and, interestingly, a tendency, especially by the younger speakers, to simplify the verbal morphology. The relevance of these results for different versions of the so-called Rich Agreement Hypothesis is discussed in the paper (see Koenenman and Zeijlstra 2014 and references there). In short, it is maintained that two kinds of V2-order can be found in Övdalian embedded clauses. On the one hand there is V-to-C and hence there is clear evidence that assertion plays a role in the distribution of V2-order in subject-initial complement clauses. But embedded V2-order in Övdalian cannot be attributed to V-to-C alone since they are also accepted, by some speakers at least, in clauses where Embedded Topicalization is completely impossible, such as relative clauses and indirect questions (clauses that have no root properties). This suggests that V-to-I is also a possibility in Övdalian. Some versions of the Rich Agreement Hypothesis would then predict that Transitive Expletives Constructions should also be possible in Övdalian but this prediction is not borne out.

1 Introduction¹

Övdalian (Elfdalian, Älvdalen Swedish) is spoken by about 2,400 people in Älvdalen Municipality in Dalarna in Western-Sweden. Unlike the Mainland Scandinavian languages, this variety preserves a relatively rich inflectional system and certain aspects of its syntax have more in common with the Insular Scandinavian languages (see Holmberg and Platzack 1995:8). In fact, Övdalian is mutually incomprehensible among its closest standard relatives so it is debatable whether it should be regarded as a Swedish dialect or a separate language (see discussions in Bentzen, Rosenkvist and Johannessen 2015: 3–4).

The topic of this paper is the status of Övdalian among the Scandinavian languages, in particular concerning verbal morphology and verb placement in embedded clauses. Icelandic is known for its robust inflectional system and V2 (meaning simply ‘the finite verb in second position’) in all types of subject-initial embedded clauses while the Mainland Scandinavian languages typically lack these properties. Traditionally, Övdalian has been regarded as more similar to Icelandic than Swedish in this respect, based on the view that the finite verb generally precedes pre-VP adverbs in subject-initial embedded clauses (Levander 1909 and much later work), but it has also been claimed that V-to-I movement in Övdalian is optional (Garbacz 2015). The data presented here show that this Scandinavian variety can be viewed

¹ I want to thank Johan Brandtler for his suggestions and corrections. I am also indebted to Höskuldur Thráinsson and two anonymous reviewers of *Íslenskt mál* for their comments on an earlier (Icelandic) version of this paper (Angantýsson 2015). Remaining errors are, of course, mine.

as standing midway between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian with regard to verb placement in embedded clauses.

The examples in (1) present V_{fin}-Adv (V2) and Adv-V_{fin} orders (V3), respectively, in a subject-initial complement clause in Övdalian.

- (1) a. Du wet at páitjin **twä'dd oltiett** biln
 you know that boy-the washed always car-the
 'You know that the son always washed the car'
 b. Du wet at páitjin **oltiett twä'dd** biln
 you know that boy-the always washed car-the
 'You know that the son always washed the car'

V_{fin}-Adv as in (1a) is always the default word order in all types of embedded clauses in Icelandic but it is restricted to certain types of embedded clauses in the Mainland Scandinavian languages (Bentzen et al. 2007b). Adv-V_{fin} as in (1b) is the default word order in embedded clauses in the Mainland Scandinavian languages, but it is heavily restricted in Icelandic (Angantýsson 2007). It has been observed that Övdalian has considerable variation with respect to this construction (see for instance Rosenkvist 2011, Garbacz 2015, and references there).

In languages like Swedish, the embedded V_{fin}-Adv order seems to behave in a similar manner as embedded topicalization (ET), which is restricted to clauses containing the main assertion of the utterance (see Wiklund et al. 2007 and further discussion below). In (2b), we see an example of topicalization in a complement clause of that type in Övdalian:

- (2) a. An wart iwari at an add it lesið q-dar buotje
 he became aware that he had not read she-there book-the
 'He discovered that he had not read that book'
 b. An wart iwari at **q-dar buotje** add an it lesið
 he became aware that she-there book-the had he not read
 'He discovered that he had not read that book'

Topicalization is commonly referred to as a root phenomenon in the literature because its use is mostly restricted to main clauses or "main-clause-like" embedded clauses in languages like English. In order to find out the extent to which the distribution of the V_{fin}-Adv order correlates to that of root phenomena (especially fronting of direct objects) in Övdalian, I include sentences like (2b) in my discussion.

Finally, I shall consider the possibility of transitive expletive constructions (TECs) in Övdalian:

- (3) a. Nog autleningger tjöpt gamtstugu
 some foreigners bought old-house-the
 'Some foreigners bought the old house'
 b. **Eð** tjöpt nog autleningger gamtstugu
 EXPL bought some foreigners old-house-the
 'Some foreigners bought the old house'

Sentences like (3b), have commonly been assumed to be a characteristic of languages with “extra” subject positions, most famously Icelandic (see the discussion of Multiple Subject Constructions in Chomsky 1995: 341–394 and later work). This construction will be discussed in connection with the idea of a split inflectional phrase (IP) in languages like Icelandic and Övdalian.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I sketch the theoretical background and spell out the predictions about the constructions in question. Section 3 reports on the results from my data collection in Älvdalen, with a comparison to recent studies on syntactic variation in Icelandic, Faroese and Danish. It turns out that the older speakers of Övdalian allow V2 more freely than the younger speakers, and the conditions for V2 depend to a certain extent on the type of embedded clause as well as the type of finite verb and adverb. The results from a verbal paradigm fill-in task reveal substantial variation in the use of verbal affixes and, interestingly, a tendency, especially by the younger speakers, to simplify the verbal morphology. In short, we see evidence for V2-order as a root phenomenon, which is reminiscent of the Mainland Scandinavian languages (but not Icelandic), i.e. dependent on the properties of the CP, but we also see evidence for V-to-I movement as in Icelandic (but not the Mainland Scandinavian languages) because the V2-order is not completely impossible in embedded clauses where topicalization is excluded. My data does not provide support for the ‘strong version’ of the Rich Agreement Hypothesis (RAH) (Holmberg & Platzack 1995; Vikner 1995, 1997; Rohrbacher 1999; Koenenman & Zeijlstra 2014) but it is argued that the facts regarding verb/adverb placement can be accounted for under a ‘weak’ RAH analysis (Bobaljik 1995; Jonas 1996b; Thráinsson 1996; Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998; Bobaljik 2002; Thráinsson 2010; Heycock et al. 2010; Angantýsson 2011; Heycock et al. 2012). Section 4 concludes the paper.

2 Background

2.1 Inflection and verb movement

In the literature on Scandinavian syntax, various differences between the languages and aspects of their historical changes (word order, subject-verb agreement, case marking etc.) have frequently been associated with the properties of IP (Thráinsson 1986, Platzack 1987, Sigurðsson 1989, Rögvaldsson & Thráinsson 1990, Holmberg & Platzack 1995, Thráinsson 2010; see also Heycock et al. 2012, 2013, and Koenenman & Zeijlstra 2014). Vikner (1995:160–163), who otherwise analyzes generalized V2 in embedded clauses in languages like Modern Icelandic as V-to-C movement, also assumes that the change from subject-initial V2 to V3 in embedded clauses in the Mainland Scandinavian languages is related to verbal morphology. However, various diachronic and synchronic studies have shown that the connection between (verbal) morphology and syntactic rules cannot be direct (Sundquist 2002; Thráinsson 2003, 2010; Bentzen et al. 2007a; Garbacz, Håkansson, & Rosenkvist 2007; Wiklund et al. 2009; Angantýsson 2011).

According to the ‘strong’ version of the Rich Agreement Hypothesis (RAH), a language will have V-to-I movement if and only if it has ‘rich verbal morphology’ (see discussions on

‘strong’ and ‘weak’ RAH in Thráinsson 2010). Vikner (1997:103–104) claims, for instance, that V-to-I is only found in languages where person inflection can occur in the same verbal form as temporal inflection. The problem with this approach is that some Scandinavian dialects, in particular the Tromsø-dialect in Norway (Bentzen 2007; Wiklund et al. 2007) and the (Swedish) Kronoby-dialect in Finland (Bentzen forthcoming), allow subject-initial V2 in various types of embedded clauses despite ‘poor’ verbal morphology (see also Bobaljik 2002, Thráinsson 2003, 2007:60 and 2010:1078–1079). Evidence from Old Swedish and Old Danish also shows that the relevant inflectional distinctions merged long before the change from V2 to V3 in subject-initial embedded clauses took place (Falk 1993). The ‘weak’ version of RAH (RAHw) entails that if a language has rich verbal morphology it will have V-to-I movement (Holmberg & Platzack 1995; Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998; Bobaljik 2002; Thráinsson 2003, 2010). This approach leaves open the possibility that languages/dialects with poor verbal morphology can have V-to-I movement.

Icelandic has all the morphological and syntactic properties that Bobaljik and Thráinsson (1998) mention as potential evidence for a split IP, i.e. tense/agreement distinction in the past tense of weak verbs, V_{fin}-Adv order in subject-initial embedded clauses and the possibility of TECs. In the Mainland Scandinavian standard languages we have the reverse situation: No separated tense and agreement markers, Adv-V_{fin} order is the default word order in subject-initial embedded clauses and TECs are not possible. This is shown in (4) with examples from Icelandic and Danish (see further section 2.3):

- (4) a. ég **talaði**, þú **talaðir** : jeg **snakkede**, du **snakkede**.
 I talked you talked: I talked you talked
 b. ef maður **hefði ekki** séð myndina: om man **ikke havde** set filmen.
 if one had not seen movie-the: if one not had seen movie-the
 c. **Það hefur einhver** borðað epli í bílnum. : ***Der har nogen** spist et æble í bilen.
 there has somebody eaten apple in car-the

In Övdalian, the verbal inflection is richer than in the Mainland Scandinavian languages but not as rich as in Icelandic, and V_{fin}-Adv order in subject-initial embedded clauses is not as common or general as in Icelandic. Obviously, this situation makes Övdalian (along with Faroese) very interesting as a testing ground for theories predicting a connection between verbal morphology and verb movement.

2.2 Different types of complement clauses

It has been claimed that the distribution of root phenomena like topicalization can be accounted for in terms of the semantic notion of ASSERTION (see Hooper & Thompson 1973, Levin 1993, Heycock 2006, Julien 2007 and Simons 2007). According to Hooper & Thompson’s definition of the term, the assertion of a sentence is “its core meaning or main proposition” and it “may be identified as that part which can be negated or questioned by the usual application of these processes of negation and interrogation” (1973: 473). Some examples are shown in (5):

- (5) a. It's just started to rain.
 b. He said it's just started to rain.
 c. It's just started to rain, he said.

Example (5a) is a typical speaker assertion. (5b) contains two assertions: *He said X* and *It's just started to rain*, which gives this sentence at least two readings. On the first reading, the former assertion is “taken to be the important assertion, the assertion whose truth is in question or being discussed in the discourse context” (Hooper & Thompson 1973: 475), while on the second reading, this value judgement applies to the latter assertion. If the latter assertion is the main assertion of (5b), then the former assertion is used in its “parenthetical” sense, where the reading of (5b) is synonymous with (5c) (Hooper & Thompson 1973: 475).

In table 1 we see a classification of predicates that take clauses as their complements (cf. Hooper & Thompson 1973; see also Levin 1993 and Simons 2007).

Table 1: Classification of predicates that take clauses as their complements.

Class	Predicates
A	<i>say, report, exclaim, assert, claim, vow, be true, be certain, be sure, be obvious</i>
B	<i>suppose, believe, think, expect, guess, imagine, it seems, it happens, it appears</i>
C	<i>be (un)likely, be (im)possible, be (im)probable, doubt, deny</i>
D	<i>resent, regret, be sorry, be surprised, bother, be odd, be strange, be interesting</i>
E	<i>realize, learn, find out, discover, know, see, recognize</i>

Classes A, B and C represent nonfactive predicates and classes D and E represent factive predicates. In classes D and E the content of the complement clause is presupposed.

2.3 Predictions of RAH: The research questions

The standard paradigm of weak verbs like *spilå* ‘play’ in Övdalian is shown in table 2 (Åkerberg 2012), with a comparison to Icelandic and Danish (see also Garbacz 2010: 45 and references there).

Table 2: Verbal inflection in Icelandic, Övdalian and Danish

	Icelandic		Övdalian		Danish	
	Present	Past	Present	Past	Present	Past
1sg.	<i>spil-a</i>	<i>spil-að-i</i>	<i>spil-är</i>	<i>spil-äð</i>	<i>spill-er</i>	<i>spill-ede</i>
2sg.	<i>spila-ar</i>	<i>spil-að-ir</i>	<i>spil-är</i>	<i>spil-äð</i>	<i>spill-er</i>	<i>spill-ede</i>
3sg.	<i>spila-ar</i>	<i>spil-að-ir</i>	<i>spil-är</i>	<i>spil-äð</i>	<i>spill-er</i>	<i>spill-ede</i>
1pl.	<i>spil-um</i>	<i>spil-uð-um</i>	<i>spil-um</i>	<i>spil-äð-um</i>	<i>spill-er</i>	<i>spill-ede</i>
2pl.	<i>spil-ið</i>	<i>spil-uð-uð</i>	<i>spil-ið</i>	<i>spil-äð-ið</i>	<i>spill-er</i>	<i>spill-ede</i>
3pl.	<i>spil-a</i>	<i>spil-uð-u</i>	<i>spil-å</i>	<i>spil-äð</i>	<i>spill-er</i>	<i>spill-ede</i>

Icelandic shows person distinction in both tenses and numbers. Övdalian makes no person distinction in the singular but it does in the plural. Danish has no person distinction at all. In Icelandic, tense and agreement suffixes can be separated very clearly in both numbers. In Övdalian, the same holds true for the plural.

Whether or not the person distinction in the past tense plural of weak verbs is sufficient evidence for “independent tense and agreement morphology” in terms of the Rich Agreement Hypothesis is an open question. If it is, one expects the following to hold true²:

- (6) Informants who have independent tense and agreement morphology are more likely than others to(i) to allow verb movement in non-V2 contexts, and (ii) to allow TECs.

The idea in (6) is that some speakers might have a split IP grammar, while others have a simple IP grammar. On the assumption that V-to-I movement is obligatory in a complex IP structure one would expect the split IP group to prefer the V_{fin}-Adv over the Adv-V_{fin} order. Another property of a split IP structure as opposed to a simple IP structure is that it has the extra subject positions required for TECs. Therefore one would expect that the group who has more structure is more likely to accept TECs.

If Övdalian is not like Swedish but rather somewhere between Icelandic and the Mainland Scandinavian languages with respect to embedded V2 (cf. Thráinsson 2001, 2003, 2010, and Heycock et al. 2012, 2013 for Faroese), it can be hypothesized that there are two kinds of verb movement in Övdalian embedded clauses: V-to-I movement (as is typically assumed for Icelandic) and V-to-C which is dependent on the properties of the CP (as is usually assumed for the Mainland Scandinavian languages). This idea is illustrated further in (7):

- (7) a. If there are some remains of “Icelandic” verb movement in Övdalian it means that the IP is split (cf. Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998). According to this some speakers of Övdalian should accept TECs.
 b. If the varying acceptance rate of V2 in complement clauses is related to the semantic properties of the predicate in the root clause, which in turn is reflected in the structure of the CP, then one expects the typical root phenomenon of topicalization to show the same distribution.
 c. If all instances of V2 are root phenomena, it is to be expected that topicalization has the same distribution.

The hypotheses in (7) assume a connection between embedded verb movement and TECs on the one hand and verb movement in complement clauses and topicalization on the other hand. A structure with a split IP has “extra positions” for subjects. Therefore, one would expect that informants who have such a structure as a part of their grammars are more likely to accept transitive expletive constructions. We will come back to this in section 3.

² Koenenman & Zeijlstra (2014) argue for a new version of the strong Rich Agreement Hypothesis, namely that there is a connection between argumenthood, which postulates a particular functional projection in the extended vP, and obligatory verb movement. According to their analysis, Övdalian has unambiguous rich agreement while Faroese does not. However, it can be argued that Övdalian and Faroese behave very similarly with respect to verb/adverb placement in subject-initial embedded clauses (see Angantýsson 2011).

3 Results from fieldwork in Älvdalen

3.1 About the data collection

The results presented here are from two written questionnaires administered to 52 speakers of Övdalian during fieldwork in Älvdalen. The first questionnaire (45 participants) included 16 minimal pairs contrasting V_{fin}/Adv order (V2) and Adv/V_{fin} order (V3) in various types of subject-initial embedded clauses with sentence adverbs like *int/it* ‘not’, *older/aldri* ‘never’ and *oltiett* ‘always’. The second questionnaire (7 participants) consisted of 35 minimal pairs/triplets of (i) embedded topicalization, (ii) Stylistic fronting, (iii) transitive expletive constructions (TECs), as well as some additional examples of V2/V3 in subject-initial embedded clauses. A subset of the speakers (34 in total) also performed verbal paradigm fill-in tasks. The number of informants tested simultaneously ranged from one to four. The method can be described as ‘supervised questionnaire completion’ (see discussions on the written questionnaire method and ‘oral elicitation’ in Cornips & Poletto 2005).

In the first questionnaire, 27 speakers out of 45 solved the verbal paradigm fill-in task illustrated in (8). The expected forms according to Åkerberg (2012) are given in brackets.

(8)	<i>baita</i> ‘bite’				
	ig bait	‘I bite’	wjð ‘we’	_____	(<i>baitum</i>)
	du bait	‘you bite’	ið ‘you pl.’	_____	(<i>baitið</i>)
	an ‘he’	_____ (<i>bait</i>)	dier ‘they’	_____	(<i>baita</i>)

It turned out that this verb is not the best choice for a fill-in task of this kind, since it also has a reciprocal form *baitas* ‘bite each other, fight’, which probably makes the task more complicated and makes the results more difficult to interpret. The second questionnaire was administered to seven informants. All of them also solved a verbal-paradigm fill-in task comparable to the one in (9), but this time including the verbs *dröma* ‘dream’ and *spilå* ‘play’ instead of *baita* ‘bite’.

As for the test sentences, there were three possible responses in both questionnaires:

- (9) Yes = A natural sentence that I could easily say
 ? = An odd sentence that I could hardly ever say
 No = An unacceptable sentence that I could not say

The instructions were given in standard Swedish. The test sentences in the first questionnaire were modeled after the examples in Garbacz (2006). In the second questionnaire, my choice of sentences was aimed at obtaining systematically comparable material to Icelandic and Faroese. When designing the questionnaires I obtained translations from experts on Övdalian who consulted with native speakers about the examples.

3.2 Verbal inflection

The results from the first fill-in task revealed substantial variation in the use of verbal affixes in both age groups, and a tendency by the younger speakers to simplify the verbal

morphology (the standard endings/forms are boldfaced, cf. Åkerberg 2012). Table 3 presents the results for 3sg. and 1pl.

Table 3: Variation in the use of verbal affixes (the present tense of *baita* ‘bite’, 3sg. and 1pl.)

		Adolescents (10)	Adults (17)	Total (27)
3sg.	<i>bait-Ø</i>	10	14	24
	<i>bait-s</i>	0	3	3
	Null affix	100%	82%	89%
	Non-null affix	0	8%	11%
1pl.	<i>bait-Ø</i>	3	0	3
	<i>bait-um</i>	6	15	21
	<i>bait-ums</i>	0	2	2
	<i>bait-a</i>	1	0	1
	Null affix	30%	0	11%
	Non-null affix	70%	100%	89%

The forms of 3sg. and 1pl. are for the most part in accordance with Åkerberg’s (2012) handbook of Övdalian grammar. The main exceptions are (i) the lack of an ending in 1pl. (among the adolescents) and (ii) an additional *s*-sound in both categories (among the adults). In 3pl., an *-a* plus an extra *s*-sound is the most common form, followed by the expected *a*-ending. Interestingly, this category has no ending for most adolescents. Table 4 shows the results for 2pl. and 3pl.

Table 4: Variation in the use of verbal affixes (the present tense of *baita* ‘bite’, 2pl. and 3pl.)

		Adolescents (10)	Adults (17)	Total (27)
2pl.	<i>bait-Ø</i>	7	2	9
	<i>bait-ið</i>	1	5	6
	<i>bait-ir</i>	1	5	6
	<i>bait-is</i>	0	2	2
	<i>bait-ier</i>	0	1	1
	<i>bait-as</i>	0	1	1
	<i>bait-um</i>	0	1	1
	<i>bait-t</i>	1	0	1
	Null affix	70%	14%	33%
	Non-null affix	30%	86%	77%
3pl.	<i>bait-Ø</i>	7	1	8
	<i>bait-as</i>	1	9	10
	<i>bait-a</i>	1	6	7
	<i>bait-n</i>	1	1	2
	Null affix	70%	7%	30%
	Non-null Affix	30%	93%	70%

In 2pl. there are various forms. For most adolescents this category has no ending. Among the adults, *-ið* and *-ir* are equally common.³ Two speakers use *-is* but the other variants are only

³ The variation between *-ð* and *-r* is dialectal (Henrik Rosenkvist, p.c.).

isolated examples. If all endings of the type *-i* plus a (dental/alveolar) consonant are added together there are 15 speakers (13 adults) who use this type of ending.

Among the adolescents, three speakers use the same verbal form throughout the paradigm (no suffix). Among the adults the *-um* suffix is used consistently and productively⁴ and so is the *-a(s)* ending in 3pl. On the other hand, the ending for 2pl. seems to be rather unstable (although this can be affected by the choice of verb, or even orthography). Only five informants solved the paradigm fill-in task in full accordance with the handbook. In order to see if there is a direct correlation between having the “correct” verbal morphology and allowing subject-initial V2 in non-V2 contexts, I compared the syntactic results from the individuals who show the full paradigm and the individuals who show no person distinction. It turned out that the acceptance rate of sentences of this type was very low in both groups (close to the average).

Tables 5–6 below present the results for the present tense of two other verbs (from the second questionnaire).

Table 5: Variation in the use of verbal affixes (pres. tense of *dröma* ‘dream’ and *spilå* ‘play’)

		Children (2)	Grown-ups (5)	Total (7)
3sg.	<i>dröm-er</i>	2	4	6
	<i>dröm-ð</i>	0	1	1
1pl.	<i>dröm-um</i>	2	5	7
2pl.	<i>dröm-ir</i>	1	2	3
	<i>dröm-id</i>	1	1	2
	<i>dröm-er, dröm-de</i>	0	2	2
3pl.	<i>dröm-a</i>	1	4	5
	<i>dröm-er, dröm-d</i>	1	1	2
1pl.	<i>spil-um</i>	2	5	7
2pl.	<i>spil-ir</i>	2	5	7
3pl.	<i>spil-å</i>	2	4	6
	<i>spil-o</i>	0	1	1

In table 5 we see that unlike the results for *baita* ‘bite’, there is no tendency to use null affixes in the plural. The forms of 3sg., 1pl. and 3pl. are in accordance with handbooks of Övdalian grammar (cf. Åkerberg 2012) with one exception in 3sg. and two exceptions in 3pl. As before (cf. table 4), most speakers either choose *-ir* or *-id* in 2pl. but there also the variants *-er* and *de* (the last one presumably mistaken as past tense). The data does not indicate any important difference between the younger speakers and the older ones.

Table 6 shows the results for the past tense which was not tested in the first questionnaire.

⁴ Note that the subject is usually omitted in 1pl. so this particular form has a special syntactic status.

Table 6: Variation in the use of verbal affixes (past tense of *dröma* ‘dream’ and *spilå* ‘play’)

		Children (2)	Grown-ups (5)	Total (7)
3sg.	<i>dröm-de</i>	2	4	6
	<i>dröm-d</i>	0	1	1
1pl.	<i>dröm-dum</i>	1	5	6
	<i>dröm-de</i>	1	0	1
2pl.	<i>dröm-dir</i>	2	2	4
	<i>dröm-did, dröm-der</i>	0	3	3
3pl.	<i>dröm-de, dröm-d(e)</i>	2	3	5
	<i>dröm-dä, dröm-dir</i>	0	2	2
1pl.	<i>spil-edum, spil-eđum, spil-äđum</i>	2	3	5
	<i>spil-äđ, spil-um</i>	0	2	2
2pl.	<i>spil-äđir, spil-eđir, spil-edir</i>	0	3	3
	<i>spil-äđ, spil-ed, spil-et, spil-id</i>	2	2	5
3pl.	<i>spil-äđ, spil-äd, spil-eđ, spil-ed, spil-et</i>	2	5	7

Here we see more variation than in the present tense. The 3sg. forms of both verbs and the 1pl. form(s) for *dröma* ‘dream’ are in accordance with Åkerberg’s (2012) handbook with one exception in each category (the exceptions are not from the same speaker though). Abstracting away from the spelling, all speakers use the same form in 3pl. of *spilå* ‘play’, i.e. *-äđ* (*-äđa* would be the expected form in environments where there is no deletion of final vowels), and 5 out of 7 speakers use (some form of) the expected *-äđum* ending in 1pl. of this same verb. 2pl. of *spilå* ‘play’ has seven different forms if spelling differences are taken into account but abstracting away from orthography presumably leaves only two different pronunciations, i.e. *-äđir* and *-äđ*. Again, there is no tendency to use zero-endings and there is no important difference between the younger speakers and the older ones.

The crucial data with respect to the RAHW concern the past tense forms of weak verbs like *dröma* ‘dream’ and *spilå* ‘play’ (table 6), as these forms are expected to distinguish between the tense marker and the agreement marker. Although most speakers make this distinction in most cases (cf. the plural endings in table 6), there is considerable variation, with only 3 out of 7 speakers showing no sign of a merger between different forms in the past tense. Actually, one of the older informants told me after she had taken the test that the verbal paradigm fill-in task was the most difficult part and that she would need help with things of this sort in her formal writing. A situation like this is unexpected in a stable system of verbal inflection. These results regarding verbal inflection suggest that morphological evidence for a positive setting for a split IP is not unambiguous in Övdalian anymore.

The expectation that speakers that consistently inflect verbs according to the traditional pattern, as presented by Åkerberg (2012), would score differently with respect to the syntactic variables that were investigated, was not fulfilled. The three consistent speakers did not form a uniform group when grading the example sentences.

3.3 Verb/adverb placement in subject-initial embedded clauses

In the previous literature on verb movement in the Scandinavian languages it has often been pointed out that the conditions for Vfin-Adv order (V2) and Adv-Vfin order (V3) in subject-initial clauses depend to some extent on the type of embedded clause. In the Mainland Scandinavian languages, where Adv-Vfin is the default word order, embedded V2 is mostly restricted to complements of predicates of type A, B and E. In Icelandic, where Vfin-Adv is always the unmarked word order, subject-initial V3 is for the most part restricted to relative clauses, some types of adverbial clauses (including conditional clauses) and indirect questions introduced by a *wh*-pronoun (Angantýsson 2007). In this section I shall present the total results by different types of embedded clauses and consider the results on an individual basis, in light of the results from the verbal paradigm fill-in task.

Tables 7–8 show the results for assertive *att*-clauses, i.e. complements of bridge verbs (11–16) versus non-bridge verbs (17–18).⁵

Table 7: V2/V3 in subject-initial *att*-clauses (complements of bridge-verbs)

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(10) <i>Du wet att þáitjin twá'dd oltiett biln</i> (V2) you know that son-the washed always car-the 'You know that the son always washed the car'	33%	37%	30%		
(11) <i>Du wet att þáitjin oltiett twá'dd biln</i> (V3) you know that son-the always washed car-the 'You know that the son always washed the car'	80%	10%	10%	14%	2%
(12) <i>Du wet att Anna wild int kriuop ijuop sos</i> (V2) you know that Anna wanted not nestle up like <i>iet fuoster</i> a fetus 'You know that Anna did not want to nestle up like a fetus'	67%	18%	13%		
(13) <i>Du wet att Anna int wild kriuop ijuop sos</i> (V3) you know that Anna not wanted nestle up like <i>iet fuoster</i> a fetus 'You know that Anna did not want to nestle up like a fetus'	69%	13%	18%	47%	11%
(14) <i>Du wet att Anna wild it kriuop ijuop sos</i> (V2) you know that Anna wanted not nestle up like <i>iet fuoster</i> a fetus 'You know that Anna did not want to nestle up like a fetus'	60%	24%	16%		
(15) <i>Du wet att Anna it wild kriuop ijuop sos</i> (V3) you know that Anna not wanted nestle up like <i>iet fuoster</i> a fetus 'You know that Anna did not want to nestle up like a fetus'	56%	23%	21%	27%	14%

⁵ Examples (10–11) were used in both questionnaires (52 speakers) whereas examples (12–17) were only used in the first questionnaire (45 informants).

Table 8: V2/V3 in subject-initial *att*-clauses (complements of non-bridge verbs)

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(16) <i>Ed war undelit att Anna wild oltiett kriuop ijuop (V2)</i> it was strange that Anna wanted always nestle up <i>sos iet fuoster</i> like a fetus 'It was strange that Anna always wanted to nestle up like a fetus'	30%	23%	46%		
(17) <i>Ed war undelit att Anna oltiett wild kriuop ijuop (V3)</i> it was strange that Anna always wanted nestle up <i>sos iet fuoster</i> like a fetus 'It was strange that Anna always wanted to nestle up like a fetus'	82%	11%	7%	16%	7%

The Adv-Vfin order was widely accepted, although the acceptance rate never surpasses 82%, while the Vfin-Adv order is much more restricted. There is a slight difference between the acceptability of V2 in complements of bridge verbs on the hand (10) and non-bridge verbs on the other hand (16), in such a way that more speakers fully reject it in the latter type of clauses. The main contrast, however, is between Vfin-Adv as in (10) and (16) and Vfin-Neg as in (12) and (14). In other words, the finite verb can more easily precede the negation than a sentence adverb like *oltiett* 'always' (cf. also Garbacz 2006 and 2010). This is exactly the opposite of the situation in Northern Norwegian (Bentzen 2007).⁶ In addition to the information in tables 7–8, it should be mentioned that no speaker who accepted or rejected both orders did so consistently. We do not know if there was a preferred order for those who accepted both orders since the informants were not asked to rank two acceptable choices.

According to Garbacz (2006:179), verb movement "seems to be obligatory" in indirect questions introduced by *wiso* 'why'. Table 9 presents my overall results for this type of embedded clauses.

Table 9: V2/V3 in indirect questions

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(18) <i>Ig will witå wiso Anna kumb it noð (V2)</i> I want know why Anna comes not NPI 'I want to know why Anna does not come'	80%	13%	7%		
(19) <i>Ig will witå wiso Anna it kumb noð (V3)</i> I want know why Anna not comes NPI 'I want to know why Anna does not come'	75%	20%	5%	63%	4%
(20) <i>Ig will witå wiso Anna add it kumið noð (V2)</i> I want know why Anna had not come NPI 'I want to know why Anna had not come'	57%	25%	18%		
(21) <i>Ig will witå wiso Anna it add kumið noð (V3)</i> I want know why Anna not had come NPI 'I want to know why Anna had not come NPI'	48%	32%	20%	34%	32%

⁶ The default position of the negation seems to be between the complementizer and the subject in embedded clauses in Övdalian (see Rosenkvist 1994, 2011 and Garbacz 2010 and references there). Actually, the sentence adverb *older/aldri* 'never' also occurs in that position (see also Garbacz 2010). As examples (14) and (16) show, the strong form of the negation (*int*) is preferred over the weak form (*it*) in pre-verbal position. This is expected under Garbacz's analysis of negation in Övdalian (Garbacz 2010).

Both orders receive similar scores and for many speakers V2/V3 is optional. This is totally different both from Icelandic, where the V3 order is difficult to use in indirect questions of this type, and from Danish where the V2 order is very hard to get. In (19) and (21), the negation preceding the finite verb has a weak form which probably results in more negative judgments because usually the negation only appears in the weak form when following the finite verb (Garbacz 2006). The Vfin-Neg order is easier if the finite verb is a main verb than an auxiliary ((18) versus (20)). Interestingly, relative clauses behave differently in this respect as we will see.

The results for adverbial clauses are shown in tables 10–12. Let us first look at causal clauses introduced by *ettersos* ‘because’ (table 10).⁷

Table 10: V2/V3 in causal clauses

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(22) <i>Pappa var faingen ettersos þáitjin twá'dd oltiett</i> (V2) father-the was glad because boy-the washed always <i>bíln</i> car-the ‘The father was glad because the son always washed the car’	34%	16%	50%		
(23) <i>Pappa var faingen ettersos þáitjin oltiett twá'dd</i> (V3) father-the was glad because boy-the always washed <i>bíln</i> car-the ‘The father was glad because the son always washed the car’	88%	8%	4%	24%	5%
(24) <i>Warum tungner tjöþ wineð ettersos Anna</i> (V2) (we) were forced buy wine-the because Anna <i>drock older öleð</i> drank never beer-the ‘We were forced to buy the wine because Anna never drank the beer’	29%	25%	46%		
(25) <i>Warum tungner tjöþ wineð ettersos Anna</i> (V3) (we) were forced buy wine-the because Anna <i>older drock öleð</i> never drank beer-the ‘We were forced to buy the wine because Anna never drank the beer’	98%	0%	2%	27%	0
(26) <i>Bruorn wart jálák ettersos Ierk</i> (V2) brother-the was angry because Ierk <i>þyövd oltiett lán peningg min kamratum sainum</i> needed always borrow money from friends his-REFL ‘The brother was angry because Ierk always needed to borrow money from his friends’	40%	28%	33%		
(27) <i>Bruorn wart jálák ettersos Ierk</i> (V3) brother-the was angry because Ierk <i>oltiett þyövd lán peningg min kamratum sainum</i> always needed borrow money from friends his-REFL ‘The brother was angry because Ierk always needed to borrow money from his friends’	78%	11%	11%	22%	7%

As before the V3 order is clearly the unmarked choice. The V2 order gets similar judgments as in complement clauses with a non-negation adverb (there were no examples of Neg-Vfin or

⁷ Examples (32–35) were used in both questionnaires (52 speakers) whereas examples (36–37) were only used in the first questionnaire (45 informants).

Vfin-Neg order in my questionnaires). This is similar to the situation in the Mainland Scandinavian languages (Julien 2007) but different from Icelandic which has V2 as the default word order in causal clauses.

Tables 11–12 present the results for verb/adverb placement in conditional clauses introduced by *um* ‘if’.⁸

Table 11: V2/V3 in conditional clauses (with the adverb *older* ‘never’)

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(28) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið kumb older</i> ⁹ (V2) they become disappointed if Alfrið comes never ‘They become disappointed if Alfrið never comes’	18%	20%	62%		
(29) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið older kumb</i> (V3) they become disappointed if Alfrið never comes ‘They become disappointed if Alfrið never comes’	98%	2%	0%	16%	0

Table 12: V2/V3 in conditional clauses (with negation)

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(30) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið kumb it noð</i> (V2) they become disappointed if Alfrið comes not NPI ‘They will be disappointed if Alfrið doesn’t come’	45%	16%	39%		
(31) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið it kumb noð</i> (V3) they become disappointed if Alfrið not comes NPI ‘They will be disappointed if Alfrið doesn’t come’	58%	20%	22%	13%	12%
(32) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið kumb int</i> (V2) they become disappointed if Alfrið comes not ‘They will be disappointed if Alfrið doesn’t come’	21%	17%	62%		
(33) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið int kumb</i> (V3) they become disappointed if Alfrið not comes ‘They will be disappointed if Alfrið doesn’t come’	80%	4%	16%	11%	9%
(34) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið kumb it</i> (V2) they become disappointed if Alfrið comes not ‘They will be disappointed if Alfrið doesn’t come’	44%	16%	40%		
(35) <i>Dier werd fel lie'ssner um Alfrið it kumb</i> (V3) they become disappointed if Alfrið not comes ‘They will be disappointed if Alfrið doesn’t come’	49%	17%	34%	14%	21%

V3 is strongly preferred over V2. The number of speakers who accept V2 in conditional clauses ranges from 18% to 45%. Again, the Vfin-Neg order scores much higher than other Vfin-Adv orders (*older* ‘never’), i.e. in case the negation has the weak form. According to Garbacz (2006, 5) the negative polarity item *noð* is optional in sentences like (31).

Finally, table 13 shows the results for relative clauses.¹⁰

⁸ Examples (28–29) were used in both questionnaires (52 speakers) whereas examples (30–35) were only used in the first questionnaire (45 informants).

⁹ Some speakers said that they would use the (Swedish) lexical item *aldri* ‘never’ rather than *older* ‘never’. When this came up I asked them to judge the sentence as if it had the former.

¹⁰ The results in (36–39) are from 45 informants (both questionnaires) whereas the results for (40–41) are from 7 informants (only the second questionnaire). In the latter case I use actual numbers instead of percentages.

Table 13: V2/V3 in relative clauses¹¹

	OK	?	*	Both OK	Neither OK
(36) <i>Ittað-jär ir ien buok so Alfrið ar older lesið</i> (V2) this is a book that Alfrið has never read 'This is a book that Alfrið has never read'	33%	17%	50%		
(37) <i>Ittað-jär ir ien buok so Alfrið older ar lesið</i> (V3) this is a book that Alfrið never has read 'This is a book that Alfrið has never read'	91%	7%	2%	21%	2%
(38) <i>Ittað-jär ir ien buok so Alfrið ar sakt lesið</i> (V2) this is a book that Alfrið has probably read 'This is a book that Alfrið has probably read'	36%	23%	41%		
(39) <i>Ittað-jär ir ien buok so Alfrið sakt ar lesið</i> (V3) this is a book that Alfrið probably has read 'This is a book that Alfrið has probably read'	78%	20%	2%	20%	7%
(40) <i>Ittað-jär ir buotjē so Alfrið las older</i> (V2) this is a book that Alfrið read never 'This is the book that Alfrið never read'	0	0	7		
(41) <i>Ittað-jär ir buotjē so Alfrið older las</i> (V3) this is a book that Alfrið never read 'This is the book that Alfrið never read'	7	0	0	0	0

Again, V3 is highly preferred over V2, which is very much the same situation as in the Mainland Scandinavian languages. The judgments of (40–41) indicate that V2 is more acceptable if the finite verb is an auxiliary, which is consistent with Garbacz's (2006) findings, but contrary to what we just saw for indirect questions. Abstracting away from (40), around one third of the speakers accepted V2 in relative clauses, which is similar to the acceptance rate in adverbial clauses and complement clauses. Notice that examples (38) and (39) contain the adverb *sakta* 'probably' whose distribution might be different from the distribution of central sentence adverbs like 'never' and 'always'. I did not have examples with negation in my questionnaires but Garbacz's (2010) data show that Neg-Vfin order is preferred over Vfin-Neg in relative clauses.

Table 14 shows a comparison of the different sentence types tested (regardless of the type of adverb and whether or not there was an auxiliary).

¹¹Johan Brandtler (p.c.) points out that these relative clauses are all restrictive, and according to Hooper and Thompson (1973) we would not expect root transformations (nor subject-initial V2) in them. V2/V3 in non-restrictive relative clauses are certainly a relevant topic for further research.

Table 14: V2/V3 in different sentence types

			OK	?	*
Complements of bridge verbs (table 6)	V2		52%	26%	22%
	V3		69%	17%	14%
Complements of non-bridge verbs (table 6)	V2		30%	23%	47%
	V3		82%	11%	7%
Causal clauses (table 8)	V2		53%	20%	27%
	V3		89%	6%	5%
Conditional clauses (table 9)	V2		35%	22%	43%
	V3		72%	13%	15%
Indirect questions (table 7)	V2		69%	19%	12%
	V3		61%	26%	13%
Relative clauses (table 10)	V2		32%	18%	50%
	V3		85%	13%	2%

These data show very clearly that the V_{fin}-Adv order is always more marked than the Adv-V_{fin} order. The overall picture is very similar to the situation in the Mainland Scandinavian languages, with the exception of indirect questions.

Another interesting finding is that the older speakers allow V2 more freely than the younger speakers (table 15).

Table 15: V2/V3 in different age-groups

		The youngest informants (14-16 years old, 14 people)			The oldest informants (74-89 years old, 14 people)		
		OK	?	*	OK	?	*
<i>that</i> -clauses of type A, B and E	V2	6	5	3	8	4	1
	V3	11	2	1	10	4	0
<i>that</i> -clauses of type C and D	V2	3	4	7	6	5	3
	V3	10	2	1	12	2	0
Causal clauses	V2	3	4	6	7	4	3
	V3	13	1	0	13	1	0
Conditional clauses	V2	2	3	9	7	3	4
	V3	12	1	1	11	1	2
Indirect questions	V2	7	4	3	12	2	0
	V3	8	3	2	9	4	1
Relative clauses	V2	5	2	7	7	2	5
	V3	12	2	0	11	2	1

The V3 order scores similarly in both age groups, while the V2 order is always scored higher by the older speakers. Of course, these results are not statistically reliable since the number of informants is too low, but they suggest that there is age-related variation with respect to verb placement in embedded clauses in Övdalian. The overall results for verb/adverb placement are consistent with recent syntactic studies (Rosenkvist 1994; Garbacz 2006) which indicate that V2 is not obligatory in embedded clauses in Övdalian as has been traditionally assumed (on the basis of Levander 1909). Moreover, my data show very clearly that V2 is always marked as opposed to the V3 order, with the exception of indirect questions with a negation,

and, most interestingly, that there is a correlation between declension of V2 and simpler morphology (the younger speakers).

3.4 Embedded topicalization

There have been conflicting claims in the literature as to the extent to which ET is applicable in complement clauses in the Scandinavian languages. Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson (1990), Vikner (1995: 72) and Holmberg & Platzack (1995: 78–79) all assume that Icelandic allows it more freely than the Mainland Scandinavian languages, whereas Ottósson (1989), Jónsson (1996, 36–37), and Wiklund et al. (2009) claim that Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian ET display similar restrictions (see also discussions and an analysis in de Cuba 2007). The data in tables 16–17 suggest that Övdalian does not show any significant peculiarities in this respect.

Table 16: Embedded topicalization in *att*-clauses (matrix predicates of classes A and E)

	OK	?	*
(42) <i>Gunnar miener at Ilma ar stuolið iss-jär peningger</i> Gunnar claims that Ilma has stolen this-there money 'Gunnar claims that Ilma has stolen this money'	7	0	0
(43) <i>Gunnar miener at iss-jär peningger ar Ilma stuolið</i> Gunnar claims that this-there money has Ilma stolen 'Gunnar claims that Ilma has stolen this money'	5	2	0
(44) <i>An wart iwari at an add it lesið ø-dar buotje</i> he became aware that he had not read she-there book-the 'He discovered he had not read that book'	7	0	0
(45) <i>An wart iwari at ø-dar buotje add an it lesið</i> he became aware that she-there book-the had he not read 'He discovered he had not read that that book'	4	2	1

Table 17: Embedded topicalization in *att*-clauses (matrix predicates of classes C and D)

	OK	?	*
(46) <i>Ig twivler ø at ø ar råkað an-dar kall'n</i> I doubt on that she has met he-there man-the 'I doubt that she has met that man'	7	0	0
(47) <i>Ig twivler ø at an-dar kall'n ar ø råkað</i> I doubt on that he-there man-the has she met 'I doubt that she has met that man'	0	4	3
(48) <i>Ministern aunggrer at dier åvå it diskutirað ø-dar satje</i> Minister-the regrets that they have not discussed she-there matter 'The minister regrets that they have not discussed this matter'	6	1	0
(49) <i>Ministern aunggrer at ø-dar satje åvå dier it diskutirað</i> Minister-the regrets that she-there matter have they not discusse 'The minister regrets that they have not discussed this matter'	4	3	0

The acceptability of topicalization in *att*-clauses varies with respect to the type of predicate in the matrix clause. Five speakers out of seven accept ET in a clause which is a complement of the non-factive and assertive predicate *miena* 'claim' (class A) and four out of seven fully accept it in a complement of the semi-factive *wårå iwari* 'discover' (predicate of class E). This is to be expected under Hooper & Thompson's (1973) theory. Nobody fully accepts ET in a complement of the non-assertive predicate *twivel* 'doubt' (class C) which is also predicted by Hooper & Thompson. ET in a complement of the factive, non-assertive predicate *aungger*

‘regret’ (class D) gets rather positive judgments. This is a bit surprising in the light of Hooper & Thompson’s (1973) theory.

Not surprisingly, the acceptability rate of ET in other types of embedded clauses is very low (tables 18–19).

Table 18: Embedded topicalization in indirect questions and adverbial clauses

	OK	?	*
(50) <i>Ig spuord wiso Pietter ar it lesið ϕ-dar buotjē</i> I asked why Peter has not read she-there book-the ‘I asked why Peter had not read that book’	7	0	0
(51) <i>Ig spuord wiso ϕ-dar buotjē ar Pietter int lesið</i> I asked why she-there book-the has Peter not read ‘I asked why Peter had not read that book’	0	2	5
(52) <i>Um an ar aldri si’tt filmin ur beller an dō ávå nogu mieninggu um an?</i> if he has never seen movie-the how can he then have some opinion about he ‘If he has never seen the movie how can he have any opinion of it?’	7	0	0
(53) <i>Um filmin ar an aldri si’tt ur beller an dō ávå nogu mieninggu um an?</i> if movie-the has he never seen how can he then have some opinion about he ‘If he has never seen the movie how can he have any opinion of it?’	0	1	6
(54) <i>Áva ly’dd ϕ raðio mes ϕ kuokeð suppa</i> Áva listened to radio while she cooked food-the ‘Áva listened to the radio while she cooked the food’	7	0	0
(55) <i>Áva ly’dd/árd ϕ raðio mes suppa kuokeð ϕ</i> Áva listened to radio while food-the cooked she ‘Áva listened to the radio while she cooked the food’	0	1	6

Table 19: Embedded topicalization in relative clauses

	OK	?	*
(56) <i>Ittað-jär ir pátjin so ig rákeð i Stokkol sienest gaundjin</i> this-here is boy-the that I met in Stockholm last time ‘This is the boy that I met in Stockholm last time’	7	0	0
(57) <i>Ittað-jär ir pátjin so i Stokkol rákeð ig sienest gaundjin</i> this-here is boy-the that in Stockholm met I last time ‘This is the boy that I met in Stockholm last time’	0	0	7

Most speakers judge all the ET-examples as fully ungrammatical. Similar trends hold true for Icelandic, Faroese and Danish (see Angantýsson 2011). Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the possibilities of ET depend on semantic/syntactic properties of CPs rather than IPs: If it were related to morphology one would expect variation.

Finally, let us look at the transitive expletive construction. This phenomenon has been assumed to be a characteristic of languages with “extra” subject positions and the RAHW predicts that it should exist in languages with separate tense and agreement markers. Table 20 shows the results for the test sentence:

Table 20: Transitive expletive construction

	OK	?	*
(58) <i>Nog autleningger tjiöpt gamstugu</i> some foreigners bought old-house-the ‘Some foreigners bought the old house’	7	0	0
(59) <i>Eð tjiöpt nog autleningger gamstugu</i> EXPL bought some foreigners old-house-the ‘Some foreigners bought the old house’	0	0	7

As we can see, the TEC-example gets no “votes” (for a detailed discussion on expletive constructions in Icelandic and related languages, see Thráinsson 2007, 309-340).

In section 2, I proposed the following hypothesis:

- (60) The speakers who are most willing to accept verb movement in non-V2 contexts are also most willing to allow TECs.

This hypothesis is obviously not supported by my data, so here we have a “disassociation” of V-to-I movement and a phenomenon commonly associated with V-to-I movement.

The result is that Övdalian can be viewed as standing midway between Icelandic and the Mainland Scandinavian languages with respect to V2-order in embedded clauses. We have seen evidence for V2-order as a root phenomenon, which is reminiscent of the Mainland Scandinavian languages (but not Icelandic), i.e. dependent on the properties of the CP, but we have also seen evidence for V-to-I movement as in Icelandic (but not the Mainland Scandinavian languages) because the V2-order is not completely impossible in embedded clauses where topicalization is excluded.

None of the working hypotheses introduced in section 2.3 are supported by the Övdalian data. For instance, there is no connection between accepting V_{fin}-Adv order in non-V2 contexts and allowing ET and there is no direct connection between showing the full inflectional paradigm for verbs and allowing TECs or V_{fin}-Adv order in non-V2 contexts. However, the general picture is that the younger speakers are most likely to simplify the verbal morphology and least likely to accept the V_{fin}-Adv order. In that sense there is a correlation between the two linguistic variables.

4 Conclusions

In modern Övdalian, verb movement in various types of embedded clauses appears to be on its way out. This is similar to the situation in Faroese, but unlike in Faroese (and Icelandic), TECs are heavily degraded in Övdalian. ET seems to obey restrictions that are similar to those of the other Scandinavian languages. It turns out that the older speakers of Övdalian allow the V_{fin}-Adv order more freely than the younger speakers, and the conditions for subject-initial V2 depend to a certain extent on the type of embedded clause as well as the type of finite verb and adverb. The results from a verbal paradigm fill-in task reveal substantial variation in the use of verbal affixes and, interestingly, a tendency, especially by the younger speakers, to simplify the verbal morphology.

The relevance of these results for different versions of the Rich Agreement Hypothesis is discussed in the paper (Holmberg & Platzack 1995, Vikner 1995, 1997, Jonas 1996, Rohrbacher 1999, Bobaljik 2002, Thráinsson 1996, Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, Thráinsson 2010, Koenen and Zeijlstra 2014, Gärtner 2016). In short, it is maintained that two kinds of V2-order can be found in Övdalian embedded clauses (see a similar analysis of Faroese in Heycock et al. 2012). On the one hand there is V-to-C and hence there is very clear evidence that assertion plays a role in the distribution of V2-order in subject-initial complement clauses in Övdalian: If the complement proposition can be interpreted as the

main assertion of the utterance then V2 is usually fine, but if the matrix predicate expresses the main assertion then V2 is heavily degraded in most cases. But embedded V2-orders in Övdalian embedded clauses cannot all be attributed to V-to-C since they are also accepted, by some speakers at least, in clauses where ET is completely impossible, such as relative clauses and indirect questions (clauses that have no root properties). This suggests that V-to-I is also a possibility in Övdalian. Some versions of the so-called Rich Agreement Hypothesis (e.g. Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998) would then predict that transitive expletives should also be possible in Övdalian but this prediction is not borne out.

References

- Angantýsson, Á. 2007. Verb-third in embedded clauses in Icelandic. *Studia Linguistica* 61(3): 237–260.
- Angantýsson, Á. 2011. *The syntax of embedded clauses in Icelandic and related languages*. Ph.D.-thesis, University of Iceland.
- Angantýsson, Á. 2015. Um sagnbeygingu og sagnfærslu í elfdælsku [‘On verbal inflection and verb movement in Övdalian’]. *Íslenskt mál* 37: 81–112.
- Bentzen, K. 2007. *Order and Structure in Embedded Clauses in Northern Norwegian*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Bentzen, K. forthcoming. Kronoby revisited: Verb movement in embedded non-V2 contexts in Northern Ostrobothnian. *Nordlyd. Tromsø Working Papers in language and Linguistics*.
- Bentzen, K., Hrafnbjargarson, G. H., Hróarsdóttir, T., & Wiklund, A.-L. 2007. The Tromsø guide to the Force behind V2. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 79: 93–118.
- Bentzen, Kristine, Henrik Rosenkvist and Janne Bondi Johannessen (eds.). 2015. *Studies in Övdalian Morphology and Syntax. New Research on a Lesser Known Scandinavian Language*, pp. 87–105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bobaljik, J. D. 2002. Realizing Germanic Inflection: Why Morphology Does Not Drive Syntax. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 6: 129–167.
- Bobaljik, J. D., & Thráinsson, H. 1998. Two Heads Aren’t Always Better than One. *Syntax* 1: 37–71
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Massachusetts: The MIT-Press.
- Cornips, L., & Poletto, C. 2005. On standardising syntactic elicitation techniques (part 1). *Lingua* 115(7): 939–957.
- de Cuba, C. 2007. *On (Non)Factivity, Clausal Complementation and the CP-Field*. Ph.D. thesis, Stony Brook, New York.
- de Haan, G. 2001. More is going on upstairs than downstairs: embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Syntax* 4(1): 3–38.
- Emonds, J. 2004. Unspecified Categories as the Key to Root Constructions. In D. Adger, C. de Cat & G. Tsoulas (Eds.), *Peripheries. Syntactic Edges and their Effects* (pp. 75–120). Dordrecht / Boston / London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Falk, C. 1993. *Non-Referential Subjects in the History of Swedish*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Lund.
- Garbacz, P. 2006. Verb movement and negation in Övdalian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 78: 173–190.
- Garbacz, P. 2010. *Word Order in Övdalian*. Ph.D. thesis, Lund University.
- Garbacz, Piotr. 2015. Optional V-to-I Movement in Övdalian. In Bentzen, Kristine, Henrik Rosenkvist and Janne Bondi Johannessen (eds.). 2015. *Studies in Övdalian Morphology and Syntax. New Research on a Lesser Known Scandinavian. Language*, pp. 87–105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Garbacz, P., Håkansson, D., & Rosenkvist, H. 2007. [Review of] John D. Sundquist. *Morphosyntactic Change in the History of Mainland Scandinavian Languages*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest, 2002, 389 pp. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 30(1): 137–146.

- Gärtner, H.-M. 2016. A Note on the Rich Agreement Hypothesis and Varieties of "Embedded V2". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 96: 1–13.
- Haegeman, L. 2003. Conditional Clauses: External and Internal Syntax. *Mind and Language* 18(4): 317–339.
- Haegeman, L. 2006a. Argument Fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the Left Periphery. In R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger & P. Portner (Eds.), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistic Investigations* (pp. 27–52). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Haegeman, L. 2006b. Conditionals, factives and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116(10): 1651–1669.
- Haegeman, L. 2010. *The movement derivation of conditionals*. The Movement Derivation of Conditional Clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41 (4): 595–621.
- Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace and Zakaris S. 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(3):61–97.
- Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace, Zakaris Svabo Hansen, Frances Wilson and StenVikner. 2012. Detecting the Late Stages of Syntactic Change: The Loss of V-to-T in Faroese. *Language* 88 (3):558–600.
- Holmberg, A., & Platzack, C. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hooper, J., & Thompson, S. 1973. On the applicability of Root Transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465–497.
- Iatridou, S., & Kroch, A. S. 1992. The Licensing of CP-recursion and its Relevance to the Germanic Verb-Second Phenomenon. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 50: 1–24.
- Jonas, D. 1996a. *Clause structure and verb syntax in Scandinavian and English*. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.
- Jonas, D. 1996b. Clause Structure, Expletives, and Verb Movement. In W. Abraham, S. D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson & C. J.-W. Zwart (Eds.), *Minimal Ideas: Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework* (pp. 176–188). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jónsson, J. G. 1996. *Clausal Architecture and Case in Icelandic*. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Julien, M. 2007. Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80: 103–161.
- Koenenman, Olaf and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2014. The Rich Agreement Hypothesis Rehabilitated, *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:571–615.
- Levander, L. 1909. *Älvdalsmålet i Dalarna. Ordböjning ock syntax [Övdalian. Inflection and syntax]*. Stockholm: Kungl. boktryckeriet P. A. Norstedt & söner.
- Ottósson, K. 1989. VP-Specifier Subjects and the CP/IP Distinction in Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 44: 89–100.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1989. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar. Handbook in Generative Syntax* (pp. 281–337). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rohrbacher, B. W. 1999. *Morphology-Driven Syntax. A Theory of V-to-I Raising and Pro-Drop*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rosenkvist, H. 1994. *Tecken på syntaktisk utveckling i älvdalsmålet under senare tid*. BA thesis, Lund University
- Rosenkvist, Henrik. 2011. Verb Raising and Referential Null Subjects in Övdalian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 88:1–20.
- Rögnvaldsson, E., & Thráinsson, H. 1990. On Icelandic Word Order Once More. In J. Maling & A. Zaenen (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 24. Modern Icelandic Syntax* (pp. 3–40). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Sigurðsson, H. Á. 1989. *Verbal Syntax and Case in Icelandic*. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University.
- Sundquist, J. D. 2002. *Morphosyntactic Change in the History of the Mainland Scandinavian Languages*. Ph.D. thesis, Indiana University.

- Thráinsson, H. 1986. V1, V2, V3 in Icelandic. In H. Haider & M. Prinzhorn (Eds.), *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages* (pp. 169–174). Dordrecht Foris.
- Thráinsson, H. 1996. On the Non-Universality of Functional Categories. In W. Abraham, S. D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson & C. J.-W. Zwart (Eds.), *Minimalist Ideas: Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework* (pp. 253–281). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thráinsson, H. 2001. Object Shift and Scrambling. In M. Baltin & C. Collins (Eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory* (pp. 148–202). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thráinsson, H. 2003. Syntactic Variation, Historical Development and Minimalism. In R. Hendrick (Ed.), *Minimalist Syntax* (pp. 152–191). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thráinsson, H. 2007. *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thráinsson, H. 2010. Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian. *Lingua* 120: 1062–1088.
- Vangsnes, Ø. A. 2002. Icelandic Expletive Constructions and the Distribution of Subject Types. In P. Svenonius (Ed.), *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP* (pp. 43–70). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vikner, S. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiklund, A.-L., Bentzen, K., Hrafnbjargarson, G. H., & Hróarsdóttir, T. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119: 1914–1938.
- Wiklund, A.-L., Hrafnbjargarson, G. H., Bentzen, K., & Hróarsdóttir, T. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10(3): 203–233
- Åkerberg, Bengt. 2012. *Älvdalsk grammatik*. Älvdalen: Ulum Dalska.

Ásgrímur Angantýsson,
University of Iceland
E-mail: asgriman@hi.is