

Jørgensen, Henrik. 2012. Incongruent pronominal case in the Swedish dialect of Västra Nyland (Finland). *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 35(3), 251–268.

# Incongruent pronominal case in the Swedish dialect of Västra Nyland (Finland)

Henrik Jørgensen

This paper reports on field work conducted during 1994 in Västra Nyland (Finland) in order to obtain independent and current documentation of the incongruent case forms in the dialect, as reported by Lundström (1939). The data collected substantiated the existence of incongruent case forms in the dialect, but the actual use of such forms could not be traced any longer. Due to this, several details in the actual use of certain incongruency types could not be clarified. The loss of case incongruency in this dialect area raises the question of how a vernacular can change such a grammatical feature. According to Emonds (1986), such losses cannot be remedied, but this is exactly the case here. The changing status of a modern Scandinavian dialect seems to be the only way to explain this change.

**Keywords** case incongruency, dialect status, language acquisition, language change

*Henrik Jørgensen, Department of Aesthetics and Communication, University of Aarhus, Jens Chr. Skous Vej 2, DK-8000 Aarhus, Denmark. norhj@hum.au.dk*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Swedish dialect of Västra Nyland (Finland) is notorious for the fact that a number of subject positions or subject-like positions could be filled with personal pronominal forms of the Oblique (Obl) type. The relevant constructions may be analyzed in two different ways: either as case incongruence, where the Accusative (Acc) form takes over subject functions, or as a system corresponding to modern French, where only unstressed pronouns ('bound pronouns') have inflected forms, and stressed pronouns ('unbound pronouns') have no inflection (the 'unbound' form often appears to be a stressed variant of the Acc, incidentally). Since the confrontation of these two interpretations of the situation is not at stake, the term 'incongruence' shall be used here.

Case incongruence is an important part of modern colloquial Danish, and it is creeping into modern colloquial Norwegian as well (Faarlund, Lie & Vanneboe 1997:318–323). In the Swedish-speaking part of Mainland Scandinavia, on the other hand, the only area with extensive case incongruence seems to have been Västra Nyland.<sup>1</sup> Thus, this special phenomenon occurs in an area which seems to be isolated from those parts of Mainland Scandinavia where case incongruence is otherwise attested. However, as I shall report, the case incongruence phenomena

seem to have been lost in recent generations. This raises the question of why the phenomenon came into existence, and why it has been lost again. It seems unlikely that structural reasons were at work. If it were so, why is Västra Nyland the only part of the Swedish domain where such case alternations came into existence? Even in southern Sweden, under Danish rule up to 1658, examples with case incongruence are not found. When such examples are tested with southern Swedish informants, they are not recognized at all, indicating that the incongruence pattern is foreign to the idiom.

In a paper on the parallel English situation, Emonds (1986) claims that once these phenomena of incongruence have been introduced, it becomes impossible for the children to reach a sufficient input to re-establish the traditional norm of congruence. The situation of Västra Nyland demonstrates that Emonds cannot be fully right in this; but I shall suggest that Emonds's theses are a clue to the understanding of the actual recordable facts about the Mainland Scandinavian case incongruence.

It is interesting that early discussions of the dialect neglect the use of non-subject forms in subject or subject-like positions. Descriptions of the dialect, beginning with Hipping (1846) and Freudenthal (1870), do not deal with syntax to any large extent; still it is surprising that case incongruence is not noted here. However, in Danish dialect descriptions from this period we observe that case incongruence also may pass unnoticed, although there is no reason to assume that the phenomenon did not exist when the descriptions were prepared. In Danish dialects, case incongruence must have been well-established much earlier, since traces of incongruence may be found in the written standard language already in the 17th century (Jørgensen 2000:173).

On the other hand, Lundström's (1939) dissertation on Swedish dialect syntax in southern Finland gives a wealth of documentation of the use of incongruence in Västra Nyland. Since then, Nyholm (1986) has confirmed some of the phenomena. Lundström says that her investigations began in 1928; she gives the age of the informants as between 60 and 102 years, which means that some of them may have met Freudenthal when they were young.

In order to test Lundström's claims, I conducted some fieldwork in Västra Nyland during 1994. In the field work I elicited data with different informants with the aid of a questionnaire set up mainly with examples collected from Lundström's book; where such examples were not present, sentences modeled on Danish patterns were used. At that time, nobody used the constructions observed by Lundström anymore, but I encountered several locals who remembered older people using such forms. I investigated how likely they found several constructions. This is of course nothing like real evidence, but for want of better, it is the only clue to some problems of analysis. Most people I contacted were local speakers with an academic education, some younger, some middle-aged. Two others were more like genuine dialect informants, having lived locally most of their lives and having no education beyond what the

Singular	1st person	2nd person	3rd person masc.	3rd person fem.	3rd person neut.
Nom	ja, jag	du, tu, et, 't	an	un, hu	he, e, det
Obl	me, mej	dej	an, han, honon, 'n	un, henna, na	he, e, den <sup>a</sup>
Plural					
Nom	vi	ni	dom		
Obl	oss	er	dom		

<sup>a</sup> This form is not found in Freudenthal's inventories; Lundström (1939:56) supposes that it relies on influence from the standard language(s), Standard Swedish or Standard Finland-Swedish.

**Table 1. Case forms of Västra Nyland after Freudenthal (1870) and Lundström (1939).**

local communities offered. Their estimations were of course most important for the evaluation of the problems in hand.

The present investigation into the Västra Nyland dialect confronts Lundström's 1939 data with the 1994 data. Before we can analyze the material, two theoretical points have to be clarified: the morphological material and the syntactic constructions in which incongruence occurs.

## 2. ESTABLISHING WHAT A CASE FORM IS

Before we enter into discussion of the syntactic constructions, it is important to note that not all personal pronouns in Mainland Scandinavian have two case forms. The pattern of Västra Nyland is illustrated in Table 1. The actual forms in the table are collected from Lundström; the forms given in Freudenthal (1870) follow the same distributional pattern, but are recorded in a somewhat different phonetic form.

This paradigm displays separate forms for Nominative (Nom) and Obl in the 1st and 2nd person singular and plural, but in the 3rd person the Nom forms may also be used in Obl positions. Some 3rd person forms, like *honon* or *henna*, are reserved for Obl use. This corresponds rather well to the situation in northern Mainland Scandinavia, where case inflection in the 3rd person pronouns is at best unclear, and in many cases absent (see Jørgensen 2000:Chapter 6). When the pronominal case system of Mainland Scandinavian was reduced from a three-case system (Nominative – Accusative – Dative) to a two-case system (Nominative – Oblique), reorganization of paradigms sometimes kept the old 3rd person masculine Acc *han*, and in some cases the Dative form *honom*. When *han* was the preferred form, the distinction 'Nom|Obl' was blurred within the system, and the consequence was that case distinctions in the 3rd person were often lost. In the following examples, 1st and 2nd person Obl forms in subject-related positions count as evidence for case incongruence. Some examples with *honon* or *henna* are also quoted, although with the reservation that all 3rd person

forms may instead be case-neutral forms. In this respect Danish seems to have the best-functioning case inflection of pronouns (maybe because the widespread and systematic functional incongruences gave the case-inflected forms a new lease on life).

### 3. INCONGRUENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND DANISH

Incongruent forms in English and Danish are found in constructions where the personal pronouns are deictic rather than anaphoric, i.e. they indicate that the referent of the pronoun is new to the context, whereas anaphors refer to the immediate context (Togebly 2003:144–147). In Danish, deictic pronouns are regularly stressed (Brink & Lund 1975:663), a conventional sign of the deictic status. The focus is on the semantic function, not the stress, since several constructions in modern Danish have obligatory or facultative stress on personal pronouns, yet retain Nom (Hansen & Lund 1983:27–32). A systematic distinction between anaphoric and deictic pronoun forms is found in modern French (Riegel, Pellat & Rioul 1994:199–202), where it has been an accepted part of the normative grammar for a long time, despite the fact that such a distinction has no correspondence in Latin.

Whether this distinction between stressed and unstressed forms was also present in Västra Nyland is difficult to prove in the absence of recordings or longer text passages, but judging from the examples it seems plausible. In a wider context, the distinction between purely anaphoric and deictic uses of the pronouns in English, Danish and Västra Nyland Swedish is a part of the fact that these languages demand clitics to fill both subject and object positions (Chomsky 1981:275–278). The clitics, i.e. unstressed anaphoric pronouns, correspond to the ‘dropped pros’ of e.g. Italian or Latin, and the stressed deictic variants to those pronouns that are actually present. This distribution had already been observed by Kuen (1957) in his analysis of the ‘obligatorium’ of Germanic and Romance pronominal systems. Languages with such an obligatorium (‘non pro-drop’) may develop different forms for deictic and anaphoric pronominal use. French has done so; case inflection is retained with the anaphoric forms, but the bound forms have only one case-neutral form. Spoken English and Danish may be analyzed in the same way. Swedish (with the exception of Västra Nyland) has not done so, and within Norway some areas distinguish stressed and unstressed forms, while others do not.

Emonds (1986:96) gives the following list of incongruent constructions in English, reproduced here with some of his examples of normal spoken (but not written) standard:

#### *Conjoined subjects*

- (1) Mary and him are late.
- (2) Sometimes her and us are late.

*Subjects of understood predicates*

- (3) Everybody but them gets on John's nerves.
- (4) Students smarter than her get no scholarship.

*Predicate nominals*

- (5) Mary has a nice life, but you could never be her now.
- (6) It is just us who John says are late.

*First person demonstratives*

- (7) Us commuters are often blamed for smog.
- (8) How much would us with insurance have to pay?

*Appositives to subjects*

- (9) Judy thinks that the best math student, namely her, ought to get a scholarship.
- (10) My twins say that the three New Yorkers, Mary and them, know the most about art.

In modern Colloquial Danish many of the same constructions are found (see Parrott 2009). The actual system of the Danish constructions has to be described in a somewhat different way in order to account for specific positions (Jørgensen 2000:106–107). This system distinguishes three kinds of positions (incongruent case forms are in bold).<sup>2</sup>

**3.1 Direct subject positions obligatorily filled with Obl forms**

**3.1.1 Pronominal subjects in long extractions<sup>3</sup>**

- (11) **Dem** kunne jeg ikke huske hvor \_\_\_ var.  
*them.OBL could I not remember where were*  
'I could not remember where they were.'
- (12) **Ham** mener jeg ikke \_\_\_ var i stand til dette.  
*him.OBL think I not was capable of this*  
'I did not think that he was capable of this.'

**3.1.2 Subjects in elliptic sentences (subgroup of Emonds's 'subjects of understood predicates')<sup>4</sup>**

- (13) **Mig?** Jeg ved ikke noget!  
*me.OBL I know not anything*

- (14) A: Er du blevet tosset? B: Hvem, **mig**? A: Ja, **dig**!  
*have you.SG.NOM gone mad who me.OBL yes you.SG.OBL*

### 3.2 Positions with congruence to the subject

#### 3.2.1 Predicate nominals (cp. (5)–(6) above)

- (15) Hun ved, at den masokistiske del i hende også er **hende**.  
*she.NOM knows that the masochistic part in her also is her.OBL*
- (16) Ophavsmændene til bogen er **os**.  
*authors.DEF of book.DEF are us.OBL*  
 ‘We are the authors of the book.’

#### 3.2.2 Pronouns as existential subjects

- (17) Der var kun **os** to.  
*there were only us.OBL two*
- (18) Og så er der **mig** selv.  
*and then is there me.OBL self*

#### 3.2.3 Subjects in stressed right dislocation (right copying)

This construction is not found within the Danish-speaking area, but is frequent in northern Scandinavia (see Askedal 1987). Here is a (congruent) Norwegian example:

- (19) Jeg skal nok passe på deg, **jeg**.  
*I.NOM shall definitely take care of you.SG.OBL I*

### 3.3 Positions where the incongruence is determined by syntactic factors other than subjecthood

#### 3.3.1 Comparisons with conjunctions (subgroup of Emonds’s ‘subject of understood predicates’, cp. (3)–(4) above)

- (20) At jeg skulle være bedre end **hende**, er nonsense.  
*that I.NOM should be better than her.OBL is nonsense*
- (21) Sådanne folk som **Dem**<sup>5</sup> kommer jo ikke til  
*such people like them.OBL come certainly not to*  
*menigheds møderne.*  
*community.meetings.DEF*  
 ‘People like you do not appear at the community meetings.’

#### 3.3.2 Conjoined subjects (cp. (1)–(2) above)

- (22) Peter og **mig** kom for sent.  
*Peter and me.OBL came too late*  
 ‘Peter and me were late.’

- (23) **Ham** og **mig** sad tilbage.  
*him.OBL and me.OBL sat back*  
 ‘Him and me were still there.’

### 3.3.3 *Pronouns as nucleus of a heavy NP construction (this group includes Emonds’s group ‘1st person demonstratives’)*

Heavy NP constructions are of three types in Danish: the heavy element may be a relative clause, an adjunct adverb phrase or prepositional phrase, or an apposition.

- (24) Det er **dig** der er instruktøren.  
*it is you.SG.OBL who is director.DEF*  
 ‘YOU are the director.’
- (25) Han kommer, **ham** fra ministeriet.  
*he.NOM comes him.OBL from department.DEF*  
 ‘He is coming, him from the department.’
- (26) **Ham** Johnny sidder og sover.  
*him.OBL Johnny sits and sleeps*  
 ‘Johnny is sleeping.’

### 3.3.4 *(Unstressed) pronouns as determiners in NP groups*

This group displays strong similarities to certain subtypes like (26), but is different from those due to the stress pattern, the pronoun being unstressed. In the former type, the pronoun takes a full NP as its appositive, whereas in the latter the pronoun acts as the determiner of NP.<sup>6</sup> In contrast to the constructions above, this type has a preference for Nom.

- (27) Vi danskere er ikke et hak bedre selv.  
*we.NOM Danes are not a bit better ourselves*

Jørgensen’s typology is used in the investigation of the Västra Nyland dialect in order to acquire the most detailed picture of actual use.

## 4. SYNTACTIC CONSTRUCTIONS WITH CASE INCONGRUENCE IN VÄSTRA NYLAND

In this section, the constructions found in Lundström (1939) are confronted with the results of interviews with the informants of Västra Nyland. Lundström mentions the following constructions as having case incongruence in this dialect.

### 4.1 *Predicate nominals (cp. Section 3.2.1 above)*

Pronouns in the function of predicate to the subject are in Obl.<sup>7</sup>

- (28) Ä de **dej**, vo:r I:da, E:vals mω:ra? (Lundström 1939:55)  
*is that you.SG.OBL our Ida Evald's mother*
- (29) An (katten) trω:dd väl, att det var **henna** (matmodern),  
*he.NOM cat.DEF thought probably that it was her.OBL mother.of.the.house*  
 o so ga: an se i šakk med ωn. (ibid.:57)  
*and then gave he.NOM himself in company with she.NOM*  
 'He [the cat] thought that it was her [the mother of the house] and then he started mingling with her.'

In (29), the 3rd person form is normally understood as Obl, but it contrasts in an interesting way with the fact that the (etymologically nominative) form *ωn* (*un*) is used in a position normally associated with Obl functions later in the same sentence (see also example (72) below). All relevant examples in Lundström's book have the Obl form, with one exception:

- (30) ...men den, som int föld me:, de var **ja** (Lundström 1939:126)  
*but the.one that not came with that was I.NOM*  
 'but the one who didn't come with, that was me'

Whether this relies on influence from Swedish standard, or whether it is genuine in the dialect, is difficult to determine.

In my interviews, most people recognized these constructions, but not all of them. One of the most authentic speakers of the dialect reacted negatively to the following constructed example:

- (31) Är det dej, Oskar?  
*is that you.SG.OBL Oscar*

Such evidence would normally weigh strongly against the authenticity of the construction. However, quite a number of other informants remembered such constructions, so there is no reason to doubt the description in Lundström's work.

#### 4.2 Stressed right copying of the subject

This construction is typical of northern Mainland Scandinavian, but is hardly found in Danish. Instead Danish uses more heavy designations for the right copying of the subject. Lundström (1939:56) claims that the use of the Obl form is mandatory in this context in Västra Nyland, as seen in (32)–(34).

- (32) Tω ä tω:koger, **dej**.  
*you.SG.NOM are crazy you.SG.OBL*
- (33) Nu lä:r ωn a vari so vilder, **henna**.  
*now shall she.NOM have been so wild her.OBL*  
 'Now, she is said to have been quite wild.'
- (34) Dω most ωgg o: an li:te ot me, **dej**.  
*you.SG.NOM must cut off him.NOM/OBL a.bit for me.OBL you.OBL*



Valter. (cp. Lundström 1939:56)  
 Valter  
 ‘You must cut off a bit for me, Valter.’

However, Nom is also recorded by Lundström:

- (35) Ja läter an komma, **ja**. (Lundström 1939:120)  
*I.NOM let him come I.NOM*
- (36) Vi va o spro:ka li:te, **vi**. (ibid.:131)  
*we.NOM were and talked a.bit we.NOM*  
 ‘We have talked a bit with one another.’
- (37) Ja a vari so fast me hu:vω, **ja**. (ibid.:139)  
*I.NOM have been so tied.up with head.the I.NOM*  
 ‘I have had so much to do.’

Finally Lundström gives an example with both Nom and Obl case, in spite of the fact that the two case forms are otherwise always distinct:

- (38) Dω kom ti E:knäs, **dω** **dej**, i da.  
*you.SG.NOM came to Ekenäs you.SG.NOM you.SG.OBL today*  
 (Lundström 1939:56)

A local informant provided me with this version during field work in 1994:

- (39) “Du dej” sa karisbon.  
*you.SG.NOM you.SG.OBL said Karis.resident*  
 “‘You you,’ said the man from Karis.’

Interestingly, Nyholm (1986:210) states that he knows such expressions quite well from comments, but in spite of the fact that he has lived in the area, he has never heard this construction personally.<sup>8</sup> Possibly this construction is not productive, but some kind of idiom.<sup>9</sup>

Everybody in my 1994 field work (except the youngest informants) remembered constructions of this type with Obl forms and found them typical of the older stages of the dialect. Thus, there is no doubt that Lundström’s description was accurate.

### 4.3 Comparisons with conjunctions

In Modern Swedish, comparisons may be constructed using both Nom and Obl forms without syntactic government. The same holds for Västra Nyland. Most examples in Lundström’s book have the Obl case:

- (40) Ja:, an ä li:ka gamal som **mej**.  
*yes he.NOM is equally old as me.OBL*
- (41) Ja ä länger som **dej**.  
*I.NOM am taller than you.SG.OBL*

- (42) *Nō ä Gre:ta störrē som henna.* (cp. Lundström 1939:56)  
*now is Greta taller than her.OBL*

Lundström (1939:56) claims that the Obl case is the norm, which matches many other Swedish dialects. There are some exceptions in her material:

- (43) *Ja ä ri:kari som ni.* (Lundström 1939:43)  
*I.NOM am richer than you.PL.NOM*

A few examples were included in the questionnaire for the field work, all with Obl forms (including types where Standard Swedish demands Nom). The informants generally held them to be typical of an older generation.

#### 4.4 Conjoined noun phrases

Lundström makes no explicit statement regarding this construction, but there are several examples. Often they display both Nom and Obl forms, seemingly without a clear pattern. First I shall give some examples where the case-neutral (*h*)*an* occurs next to the Obl-only forms (*h*)*onon* and (*h*)*enna*. Please note that both (*h*)*an* and (*h*)*onon* may occur in the same construction in (45) and (46):

- (44) *Ja ä so jä:vlit bikanter me-ddom, bodi an o enna.*  
*I.NOM am so hellish acquainted with-them.NOM/OBL both he.NOM/OBL and her.OBL*  
 ‘I know both of them damned well, both he and her.’
- (45) *Dom add komi övere:ns sä:kert, Linde:n o honon.*  
*they.NOM/OBL had found agreement certainly Lindén and him.OBL*
- (46) *Dom va i mitt i si:stes, kantorn o an.*  
*they.NOM/OBL were at mine recently organist.DEF and he.NOM/OBL*  
 (cp. Lundström 1939:211)

In the 1st person, both cases may occur in conjoined phrases regardless of their syntactic function:

- (47) *Hanses mamma o vi:, vi va myki övere:nskomande,*  
*his mother and we.NOM we.NOM were a.lot agreeing*  
*vi:.*  
*we.NOM*  
 ‘Her mother and we, we mostly agreed.’
- (48) *O alla mornar skō syster min o mej ti kolaskō:jin.*  
*and all mornings should sister mine and me.OBL to charcoal.wood.DEF*  
 ‘And every morning my sister and I had to go to the charcoal wood.’
- (49) *Vi va så gō: vännar, Siggavärdinnan o me.*  
*we.NOM were such good friends lady.of.Sigga.DEF and me.OBL*  
 (cp. Lundström 1939:61, 192)

Some examples display Nom in right-copying positions:

- (50) Vi va e:n older, ω:n o ja. (Lundström 1939:50)  
*we.NOM were one age she.NOM and I.NOM*

In the interviews, these examples were held to be in line with the old norms, with the exception of (48), where the conjoined Obl subject is in a clear subject position. Apparently the position in left or right copying is more acceptable. Remarkably, (48) was held to be acceptable by the younger informants, whereas the older informants (including the dialect speakers) tended to discard this example.

A possible explanation is that the dialect of Västra Nyland – just like Danish – had no absolute rule concerning coordination. The examples could be understood in such a way that coordination is influenced by the context. In coordination appearing in a direct subject position, Nom is more likely, whereas in right copying, where Obl form is the norm for single pronouns, there will be a predisposition for Obl forms. The investigation of such structures demands an authentic corpus, but it seems to be too late for this in Västra Nyland.

**4.5 Pronouns as the nucleus of a heavy NP construction**

**4.5.1 With a relative clause**

Lundström also has no clear statement in this case. With dislocated pronouns, Nom seems to have been the standard. Lundström gives a few examples with 3rd person masculine, where no clear case distinction is present.

- (51) An e:tt Tennström, an som va ägare för  
*he.NOM/OBL was.called Tennström he.NOM/OBL who was owner of*  
 Sönnnsbacka. (Lundström 1939:192)  
*Sonnnsbacka*

- (52) Han, som skω begri:p se po de härän, han  
*he.NOM/OBL who should grasp himself on this here he.NOM/OBL*  
 skω minst bω:dd va pωfessor. (ibid.:70)  
*should least ought be professor*  
 ‘He who can grasp such matters, he should at least be a professor.’

When the pronoun is a predicate nominal, an Obl form should be the norm (see above). This also seems to hold in cases where Standard Swedish demands Nom:

- (53) Jω:, de va henna, som he:tt E:klundan.  
*yes that was her.OBL who was.called Eklund*
- (54) Ä de e:r, som ä dä:r på holmen o fiskar?  
*is that you.PL.OBL who are there on inlet.DEF and fish*  
 (cp. Lundström 1939:56)  
 ‘Is that you who are fishing from the inlet?’

- (55) Det va **henna**, som sa: för me. (ibid.:157)  
*it was her.OBL who said for me.OBL*  
 ‘It was her who mentioned it to me.’
- (56) Ä de **e:r**, som ä dä:r på Dömban o bω:r?  
*is that you.PL.OBL who are there on Dömban and live*  
 ‘Is that you who live in Dömban?’
- (57) De ä **dej**, som ska slo:. (cp. Lundström 1939:56)  
*it is you.SG.OBL who should strike.*

The informants did in no way agree on such examples. Interestingly, though, examples that also correspond to Standard Swedish were rejected. Thus, we cannot claim that the Obl form was standard in this construction, but some kind of tendency may have made itself felt.

#### 4.5.2 *With an adverb P or a PP as post-modification*

Lundström gives no relevant examples. Two possible types modeled on Danish patterns were used in the field work to elicit the data: one type with the construction in a direct subject position (shown in (58) and (60) below), and one with the construction in a left-copying position (shown in (59) and (61)).

- (58) Oss på Domarebackan har det rätt trevligt.  
*us.OBL at Domarebackan have it right nice*
- (59) Oss på Domarebackan, vi har det rätt trevligt.  
*us.OBL at Domarebackan we.NOM have it right nice*  
 ‘We at Domarebackan have a nice time.’
- (60) Dej med dina talanger måste vara med.  
*you.OBL with your talents must be with*
- (61) Dej med dina talanger, du måste vara med.  
*you.OBL with your talents you.NOM must be with*  
 ‘With your talents, you should participate.’

The last three examples were in fact accepted by the dialect speakers (but again, not as part of their language, but as possible parts of previous stages). The other informants in the field work were very hesitant to accept such constructions.

Only one example with an adverb attached was tested:

- (62) **Dej där** får säga hur vi kommer dit.  
*you.OBL there should say how we.NOM get there*

This example split my informants, some accepting it, others rejecting it. It is fair to assume that such examples were at most marginal.

#### 4.5.3 *With an apposition*

Once more, Lundström has no clear-cut examples of this construction. It was tested in two versions: one with the pronoun plus apposition in a direct subject position

(see (63a) and (64a)), and one with the pronoun plus apposition in a left dislocation (see (63b) and (64b)) The examples were rejected by all informants, except one of the dialect speakers:

- (63) (a) Dej tokiger karl får inte stanna på krogen.  
*you.OBL crazy person may not stay at inn.DEF*  
 (b) Dej tokiger karl du får inte stanna på krogen.  
*you.OBL crazy person you.NOM may not stay at inn.DEF*
- (64) (a) Er snälla barn ska få godis.  
*you.PL.OBL nice kids shall have candies*  
 (b) Er snälla barn ni ska få godis.  
*you.PL.OBL nice kids you.NOM shall have candies*

One case of a pronoun in front of a personal name is found in Lundström’s material:

- (65) **an, Bärglond**, čö:fft en die:l i de där Krowokas čärre.  
*he.NOM Bärglund bought quite much at that there Krokas Kärr*  
 (cp. Lundström 1939:85)

Such a construction could reflect the northern Scandinavian usage of pronouns in front of personal names as a kind of article; in such a case they would not belong here. Freudenthal (1870:85,102) claims that this usage was present in his day, but unless (65) is an example of this usage, the feature had disappeared when Lundström’s data collection took place.<sup>10</sup>

#### 4.6 Constructions not found in Lundström’s material

##### 4.6.1 Pronominal subject in long extractions

Long extractions of adjuncts out of embedded clauses are attested, as shown in (66):

- (66) I ju:ni mo:nan ve:t ja an kommer. (Lundström 1939:200)  
*in June month.DEF know I.NOM he.NOM comes*  
 ‘I know that he comes in the month of June.’

In Danish extracted pronominal subjects must have the Obl form. Since no example of extracted subjects is found in Lundström’s book, it must remain an open question how the Västra Nyland dialect handled this. In the field work, such examples were thought to be strange, but one of the dialect speakers was inclined to recognize the following constructed example:

- (67) **Dej** vet jag får inte stanna hos oss.  
*you.SG.OBL know I.NOM may not stay with us.OBL*  
 ‘I know you may not stay with us.’

Since such examples seem to be possible in Närpes, Southern Ostrobothnia, Finland (Jørgensen 2000:226), it cannot be ruled out that such constructions were once current in Västra Nyland as well.

#### 4.6.2 Subjects in an ellipsis

Lundström has no examples of this type, and examples like (68) elicited little positive response during the field work:

- (68) Vem är det? **Mej!**  
*who is that me.OBL*

This pattern, very typical of modern Danish case incongruence, thus seems not to belong to the Västra Nyland dialect.

#### 4.7 Other constructions

Two remarkable examples from Lundström display the purely Obl form of the otherwise case-neutral 3rd person in overt subject positions:

- (69) Henna *f*ør u:t, när *ø*n va sju: o:r.  
*her.OBL traveled away when she.NOM/OBL was seven years*  
 (Lundström 1939:56)
- (70) När de fatas mjölkare, far henna o mjölkar. (*ibid.*:169)  
*when it lacks milkers goes her.OBL and milks*  
 ‘When they have no one to milk the cows, she goes milking.’

These examples are enigmatic. They may display some kind of contrast, but at least for (70) this interpretation is unlikely. From Norwegian we know cases where originally Obl forms under certain circumstances become enclitic case-neutral forms (Papazian 1978:266), but since the *henna* here is both pre- and post-verbal, this interpretation is not that plausible. The possibility that neutralization has given Obl forms access to subject positions (in addition to giving Nom forms access to non-subject positions) cannot be ruled out here.

Finally it is worth mentioning that this dialect has a few traces of a phenomenon which is also found in northern Sweden, namely the use of Nom forms in non-subject positions to mark contrast:

- (71) Je: ot **ja:g** de där.  
*give to I.NOM that there*
- (72) Hon var it me **vi:** den da:gen. (Lundström 1939:55)  
*she.NOM was not with we.NOM that day*

These examples are obviously stressed due to the presence of a long vowel in both pronouns. They are given without context, but still they seem to belong to the northern Swedish pattern.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The incongruence pattern of Västra Nyland looks very much like the Danish pattern, but differs in a number of ways. First of all, it seems that two types of Obl pronouns in direct subject positions (Section 3.1) have not been attested at all. Furthermore some of the most frequent positions of incongruent subjects in Västra Nyland were those that depended on local triggers, like coordinating conjunctions or the comparative conjunction. The incongruence effect is found only in the closest vicinity of these elements. In Danish the patterns with Obl forms in direct subject positions are obviously grammaticalized, the Obl forms being called for by structural relations, like the trace effect from the subject position in the embedded sentence to the matrix sentence (see Chomsky 1981:79–85).

The question of how this dialect pattern came about is difficult to answer. Structural pressure seems unlikely, considering the fact that the Västra Nyland incongruence pattern is the only attested instance within the Swedish-speaking areas (Jørgensen 1970). Numerous theories (e.g. Johannessen 1998, Schütze 2001, Quinn 2005 or Parrott 2009) state that the Obl is a default case in a language like English; yet neither standard nor non-standard Swedish is yielding to the supposed pressure from the default case, in spite of the fact that Swedish – from a structural point of view – should be in the same position as English, having a closely related kind of grammar. The same argument holds more strongly in comparison with Danish. Danish and Swedish grammatical structures are extremely closely related, and yet Danish has an inclination towards Obl forms in certain positions, whereas all kinds of Swedish, including the spoken standards, have nothing of this kind (cp. Jørgensen 2000:Chapter 8). Indeed, if there is some pressure from the grammatical system of the vernacular, it could be an association of Acc or Obl forms with ‘new information’, an association that would eventually lead to a re-interpretation of the grammatical forms. Jensen (2011) demonstrates that such a tendency actually caused some re-grammaticalization of Acc forms in late East Danish medieval sources.

Although not explicit about this, Emonds (1986) seems to take the grammatical structure of languages like English, Danish and Swedish to be at a point of balance. They could succumb to pressure toward case incongruence with a preference for the Obl form, like English and Danish, or they could stick to the Nom, like Swedish does. If the incongruence gains foothold, reversal should be impossible, according to Emonds. Emonds’s way of thinking underlines the importance of the social factor, indicating that the reason for the change in Västra Nyland was not a pressure from within, but the effect of some social factor, for instance language contact.

If we try to pursue the contact possibility, we must rule out influence from Danish; there is no attested case of relevant language contacts in this area during the periods when Danish developed these patterns. However, we have information about English and Belgian iron workers being employed at the first iron works of Fiskars as

early as the 17th century.<sup>11</sup> Incongruence patterns are attested for English and French from this period (Jespersen 1891; Nyrop 1925:218). Native speakers of English and French could easily have brought incongruence patterns with them from their native languages, and it is conceivable that they also imported these patterns into their Swedish interim language. Since they had a special status due to their skills, their linguistic oddity could have crept into everyday speech in the surrounding community and remained there. This assumption about the period is not really contradicted by the fact that neither Hipping (1846) nor Freudenthal (1870) observed this usage. They could have missed it because they did not focus on syntax at all. Recall that some of Lundström's speakers were old enough to have been present when Freudenthal visited the area.<sup>12</sup>

The incongruence patterns are totally lost in everyday speech in Västra Nyland today. All informants agreed on this, and no examples show up in my recordings. This loss is odd as well, since Emonds's (1986) claim that such patterns, once they are lost, cannot be reconstructed from the performance of other adult speakers, seems very likely. On the other hand, the linguistic input facing young people growing up in this area does not consist only of the adult speech around them. They encounter Standard Swedish patterns without incongruence in school, in mass media and in contacts with non-locals, and the congruent usage may be inferred from present-day Standard Swedish. The local speech community of Västra Nyland has definitely lost its power.

Thus, the most likely version of the story is that the speakers of Västra Nyland picked up these patterns because of speakers with a high social standing employing the patterns as a part of an interlanguage, and lost it again because new status persons came around who did not use the pattern.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper owes a great deal to continuous discussions over the years with Jeffrey Parrott. I would like to thank the participants at IClave 5 in Copenhagen 2009, where a first version was presented. Also I am grateful for many useful comments and suggestions from the *NJL* reviewers.

## NOTES

1. No other cases are known to the survey of Swedish dialects in Jørgensen (1970).
2. All examples in the following are adapted from Jørgensen (2000:169–192).
3. The underscore     is used to designate the position in which these subjects 'belong'.
4. As illustrated by Jørgensen (2000:170–172), there is considerable variation in this construction.



5. The 3rd plural form *Dem* 'them' is here used according to older language conventions as a way of addressing 2nd persons politely.
6. Compare the following:
  - (i) 'ham den 'dumme 'unge (Section 3.3.3)
  - (ii) vi 'dumme 'danskere (Section 3.3.4)
 The article *den* cannot be left out in (i), and it cannot be inserted in (ii).
7. The quotations from Lundström (1939) follow her quasi-phonetic orthography, apart from some technical adaptations.
8. Unfortunately I was not aware of this paper at the time of my field work in Västra Nyland.
9. According to Selenius (1974:205), the inhabitants of Karis are treated as the scapegoats of the dialect area. Odd features are said to be peculiar to Karis, even when they are common in the whole area.
10. In Lundström's material, this construction has a parallel, namely the use of a definite enclitic article on personal names, like *Eklundan* 'Eklund.DEF', i.e. 'Mr. or Ms. Eklund'. Well known from older Standard Swedish, this construction also signals some degree of familiarity with the person mentioned (see Johannessen 2008).
11. Björkman & Heporauta (1993:15, 16–23) mention French or Belgian workers from the 17th century and English workers (and owners) from the 18th and the 19th century.
12. As one of the reviewers points out, this line of thinking raises the question of what happened at those places in present-day Sweden where English and French workers were also strongly present. It is conceivable that case incongruence may have existed here, but without documentation, this is pure speculation. The geographical position of the Swedish-speaking community of Västra Nyland in a relatively narrow coastal zone may have played a role in this.

## REFERENCES

- Askedal, John Ole. 1987. On the morphosyntactic properties and pragmatic functions of correlative right dislocation (right copying) in modern colloquial Norwegian. In Pirkko Lilius & Mirja Saari (eds.), *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics* 6, 93–110. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Björkman, Sten & Arne Heporauta. 1993. *Fiskars 1649*. Fiskars: Fiskars Oy Ab.
- Brink, Lars & Jørn Lund. 1975. *Dansk Rigsmål 1–2* [Danish standard language]. København: Gyldendal.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1986. Grammatically deviant prestige constructions. In Michael Braeme, Heles Contreras & Fredrick J. Newmeyer (eds.), *A Festschrift for Sol Saporta*, 93–129. Seattle, WA: Noit Amrofer.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie & Kjell Ivar Vanneboe. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk* [Norwegian reference grammar]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Freudenthal, Axel Olof. 1870. *Om Svenska Allmogemålet i Nyland* [On the Swedish vernacular in Nyland]. Helsingfors: Finska Litteratur-sällskapets tryckeri.
- Hansen, Erik & Jørn Lund. 1983. *Sæt tryk på* [Put on the stress]. København: Lærerforeningernes Materialeudvalg.
- Hipping, Andreas Johannes 1846. *Om svenska språkdialecten i Nyland* [On the Swedish dialect of Nyland] (*Acta Soc. Scient. Fennicæ* II(2)). Helsingfors.

- Jensen, Eva Skaftø. 2011. *Nominativ i gammelskånsk – afvikling og udviklinger* [Nominative in Old Scanian: Dismantling and developments]. København: Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1891. *Studier over engelske kasus* [Studies on case in English]. København: Kleins Forlag.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 2008. The pronominal psychological demonstrative in Scandinavian: Its syntax, semantics and pragmatics. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 31(2), 161–192.
- Jørgensen, Nils. 1970. *Syntaktiska drag i svenska dialekter* [Syntactic features in Swedish dialects]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Jørgensen, Henrik. 2000. *Studien zur Morphologie und Syntax der festlandskandinavischen Personalpronomina* [Studies on the morphology and syntax of Mainland Scandinavian personal pronouns]. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Kuen, Heinrich. 1957. Die Gewohnheit der mehrfachen Bezeichnung des Subjekts in der Romania und die Gründe ihres Aufkommens [The habit of pleonastic designation of the Subject in the Romance area and the reasons why it came into existence]. *Syntactica et stilistica. Festschrift für Ernst Gamillschek zum 70. Geburtstag 28. Oktober 1957*, 293–326. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Lundström, Gudrun. 1939. *Studier i nyländsk syntax* [Studies in Nyland syntax]. Stockholm: Norstedt och Söner.
- Nyholm, Leif. 1986. Svansdubblingen den västnyländska [The tail-doubling in Västra Nyland]. In Mirja Saari, Anne-Marie Londen & Kim Nilsson (eds.), *Xenia Huldéniana: en vänskrift tillägnad Lars Huldén på hans 60-årsdag 5.2.1986* (Meddelanden från institutionen för nordiska språk och nordisk litteratur vid Helsingfors Universitet, Serie B, 10), 205–217. Helsingfors: Helsingfors universitet.
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1925. *Grammaire historique de la langue française* [Historical grammar of the French language]. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel Nordisk Forlag.
- Papazian, Eric. 1978. Han og ho [He and she]. In Ingeborg Hoff (ed.), *På leit etter ord*, 235–281. Oslo, Bergen & Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- Parrott, Jeffrey K. 2009. Danish vestigial case and the acquisition of vocabulary in Distributed Morphology. *Biolinguistics* 3(2–3), 270–304.
- Quinn, Heidi. 2005. *The Distribution of Pronoun Case Forms in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Riegel, Martin, Jean-Christophe Pellat & René Rioul. 1994. *Grammaire méthodique du français* [Methodical grammar of French]. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Schütze, Carson T. 2001. On the nature of default case. *Syntax* 4(3) 205–238.
- Selenius, Ebba. 1974. Den västnyländska dialekten av i dag [The dialect of Västra Nyland today]. In *Brages Årsskrift 1958–1973*, 197–206. Helsinki.
- Togeby, Ole. 2003. *Fungerer denne sætning?* [Does this sentence do its job?]. København: G. E. C. Gad.