

Perfective OV- and VO-constructions in Estonian Swedish

Henrik Rosenkvist

1. Introduction

Among the standard Germanic languages, Swedish is unique in distinguishing between past perfects and a non-agreeing form – the supine – that only is used in periphrastic HAVE-perfects. This feature facilitates the exploration of the linguistic properties associated with past participles and HAVE- and BE-perfects. However, it appears that in Eastern Swedish, spoken in Finland and (formerly) in Estonia, there are numerous ways to express perfective meaning, being differentiated not only by their meaning, but also by morphology and syntax. The most complex system seems to be found in Estonian Swedish (ESw), a language variety that accordingly may provide vital clues as to how perfective meaning interacts with morphosyntax and the HAVE/BE-variation.

In the following section (2), three different ways to express perfective meaning in ESw are introduced and exemplified, and in the following section (3) similar constructions in two Fenno-Swedish varieties of Eastern Swedish, Ostrobothnian and Nylandic, are discussed. In section 4, the topic is what

type of temporal and/or aspectual meaning these constructions express, how they relate to similar constructions in Old and Modern Swedish, and whether they are compatible with the analyses provided by Broekhuis (2017) and Klingvall (2011). The paper is concluded in section 5 with a summarizing discussion.

All Eastern Swedish examples are taken from Lagman (1967, 1990), Lundström (1939), Ivars (2010), from the small Estonian-Swedish corpus online (ESw. corp.; the URL can be found in the list of references), and from transcribed ESw archive texts from the beginning of the 20th century, the details of which are presented in the list of references. A handful of informants have also been consulted. However, the speakers of ESw are elderly, and most of them have not been speaking ESw regularly since 1945; accordingly, their ESw linguistic intuitions are not as reliable as a field working linguist would have wished, with influences from standard Swedish constantly seeming to interfere.

The source is provided at each example.

2. Perfective constructions in Estonian Swedish

From the Middle Ages to World War 2, a population of Swedish coastal farmers resided along the western and northern shores of Estonia. These Estonian Swedes were recognized as an ethnic minority by the catholic church as early as in the 14th century, and they preserved their culture and their language, Estonian Swedish (ESw), throughout the continuous shifts in Estonian history until the advance of the Soviet forces eventually compelled them to escape to Sweden.¹ About 8 000 Estonian Swedes were welcomed by the Swedish government during 1943–1944, while around 1 000 stayed behind, for different reasons. Having arrived in Sweden, virtually all of the adults decided not to pass down their variety of Swedish out of consideration for their children, who were taught standard Swedish as a means of a quick adaptation to the new circumstances. Hence, the last remaining speakers are those who arrived to Sweden as children or adolescents 1943–1944.

Estonian Swedish has traditionally been classified as an Eastern Swedish dialect (Wessén 1958:43ff), along with Fenno-Swedish, although it hardly is intelligible for a speaker of standard Swedish. Having been spoken for many centuries in relative isolation from other Swedish-speaking areas, but in close contact with several surrounding languages, ESw has developed a number of linguistic innovations – and it has also preserved some archaic features from Old Swedish which have been lost in standard Swedish.

¹ A brief introduction (in Swedish) to the Estonian Swedes and their language can be found in Rosenkvist (2018).

ESw data has not been included in recent surveys of Scandinavian perfect constructions (cf. Larsson 2014, 2015), a circumstance which motivates a more detailed description. It should be underlined, however, that the syntax of ESw still is relatively poorly studied. Furthermore, the available resources (previous research, texts, native speakers etc.) are quite scarce, and consequently it is at the present stage of investigation not always possible to assess e.g. fine-graded semantic nuances that may differentiate various syntactic constructions (cf. Brandner 2012 for a discussion about the conditions for the study of micro-comparative syntax).

Lagman (1967) explores present and past participial constructions in Nuckö-Swedish, one out of four ESw-dialects. As for past participles, he notes that a Swedish perfect construction such as *Jag har inte ätit* ('I have not eaten') may be rendered in three different ways in ESw (1–3; cf. Lagman 1967:117).

1. Ia är o ite.

I am un eaten

'I haven't eaten'

2. Ia har o ite.

I have un eaten

'I haven't eaten'

3. I ha änt ite.

I ha not eaten

'I haven't eaten'

While (1–3) are semantically similar, there are fine-graded differences in meaning, and there are also distinct morphosyntactic differences between these three ways to express perfective meaning. Below, I will use the terms VARA-construction, HÅVA-construction and HA-construction for examples such as (1–3), respectively.

As illustrated by (1–3), the main verb – the participle – may have the same form in the three perfective constructions, even if it is a strong verb (in standard Swedish, past participles and the supine of strong verbs have separate forms). This is probably due to sound change. In Old Swedish, perfect participles of strong verbs ended in *-in* or *-it*, but in ESw, [i] has been lowered to [æ] or [e], and the final consonant has been lost (apocope). Hence, Old Swedish forms such as *supin* ('eaten soup', masc./fem.) and *supit* ('eaten

soup’, neut.) both appear as *supe* in ESw, and the form *ite* is of course to be explained in the same way.

In older Swedish, the suffix vowel varied. Both *-it/-in* and *-et/-en* occurred, but this was standardized during the 18th century – for strong verbs, the *it*-suffix now exclusively marks the supine form in the periphrastic perfect tense. However, while it is obvious that the main verb has the shape of a perfect participle in the VARA- and HÅVA-constructions, this is not the case in the HA-construction. Since the HA-construction is quite similar to the standard Swedish perfect-construction, I will use the label supine for the main verb form in the HA-construction.

2.1. The VARA-construction

In (1), the verb *vara* (‘be’) is used instead of *håva* (‘have’) – that HAVE and BE alternates in many languages is of course well-known (cf. Johannisson 1945, Larsson 2012b, 2015, Ackema & Sorace 2017) – but in this case the main verb does not seem to be unaccusative, which in standard Swedish is a condition for selecting BE (cf. SAG 2:606, Larsson 2015:165ff).

In the VARA-construction, the finite verb and the participle agrees with the subject in number, and in number and gender, respectively (4). Unaccusative and transitive verbs such as *höra* ‘to hear’ acquire a passive interpretation in the VARA-construction (4, 5), but intransitives are understood as active (6, 7). In some examples, a VARA-construction is surrounded by perfective HA-constructions, giving the impression that the VARA-construction and the HA-construction are more or less synonymous (6), and that the choice between them is related to whether the main verb is intransitive or transitive.

4. Föta ära å-hårastor. (Lagman 1967:120).

feet.MASC are.PL off-hared.PL.MASC.

‘The feet have been weathered’²

5. Wippal herrskape tåla svensk, som alder seinare er herd från hoe. (Vippal; Stackvika Hans)

Vippal gentry spoke Swedish that never later is heard from manor

‘The gentry from Vippal spoke Swedish, that never has been heard on the manor again’

² Being weathered is in ESw expressed as ‘to look like a hare’ or ‘to be hared off’.

6. Måren ha mor gista berja eild on, å tå vörke vare brunne, ha ho berja steik fisk fisk opa kålena till måresmålte. (Vippal. Ut i granngårde)

morning ha mother directly begin fire oven and when firewood was burned ha she begun fry fish on charcoals to breakfast

‘In the morning mother has directly started a fire in the oven, and when the firewood had burned out, she has begun frying fish on the charcoals for breakfast’

7. Som e er rehtet varmt å gräse er växt, toa berjas tach-acht ut. (Runö. Fårvallning)

as it is really warm and grass is grown then begins sheep-herding out

‘When it is really warm and the grass has grown, then you begin herding the sheep out [in the pastures]’

Predicative participle agreement is only observable in (4), due to paradigmatic differences between verb conjugations that determine whether predicative participles agree visibly or not. In table 1, based on the Nuckö-dialect (cf. Brunberg 2015:24ff), it is illustrated that only weak verbs belonging to the second or third conjugations do not conflate the forms for the supine and the perfect participle. Weak verbs belonging to conjugation 1 have a non-agreeing syncretic form, while weak verbs in conjugations 2 and 3 thus have separate forms. However, number and gender agreement are only clearly visible in masculine singular and plural (-*or*), and in feminine plural (-*ar*). Strong verbs vary in this respect, allowing for a conflated form, or for two separate forms (cf. Brunberg 2015:24ff, Västerdal 2018).

conjugation	infinitive	supine	past participle
weak 1	<i>kast</i> ‘throw’	kasta	
weak 2+3	<i>gaim</i> ‘hide’	gaimd	<i>gaimdor</i> (masc. sg.)
strong	<i>bind</i> ‘bind’	bunde	
		bunde	<i>bundendor</i> (masc. sg.)

Table 1. Agreement in predicative past participles in ESw.

The agreeing participles follow the general pattern for nominal predicative agreement in ESw (cf. Västerdal 2018) – the masculine suffix -*or* is also used on predicative adjectives and pronouns, for instance.

The negation is in the VARA-construction often expressed with *o*, a former negating prefix, (a cognate to the English *un-*) that has detached from its host and now seems to serve as a separate negation (8).

8. Ia är gåle ite, båra han är o. (Lagman 1967:120).

I am already eaten but he is un

‘I’ve already eaten, but he hasn’t’

The *o*-negation only occurs as a negator for participles and adjectives and cannot be utilized as a common clausal negation (see further below).

2.2. The HÅVA-construction

The HÅVA-construction is used with intransitive as well as transitive verbs, and with both unaccusative and unergative verbs (9–13). However, the VARA-construction is the preferred alternative for unaccusative inchoative verbs such as *somna å* ‘fall asleep’.

9. Ia har gåle málka. (Lagman 1967:117)

I have.SG already milked

‘I’m done milking’

10. Håva ne händre vaska? (Lagman 1967:119)

have.PL you.PL hands washed

‘Have you washed your hands?’

11. hann fotstigen har ja gae tär manng å manng ganngar. (Esw. corp.)

he footpath have.SG I walked there many and many times

‘I have walked that footpath many, many times’

12. Allstäistend måtska in håva betra äggver fai, enn Gud har ått ar fålki gevi. (Lagman 1990:138)

still may-shall he have better eyes got than God has.SG to other people given

‘Still, he must have got better eyes than God has given to others’

13. Har papa märke ondespant å hoa ne krame opalagt? (Ormsö. När en Ormsöflicka)

has.SG dad mare harnessed and have.PL you.PL things on-laid

‘Has dad harnessed the mare, and have you laid the things on [the wagon]?’

In similarity with the VARA-construction, the finite verb agrees with the subject in number – the singular form is *har* and the plural *håva*, with dialectal variations. As shown by (10, 12, 13), the direct object in transitive HÅVA-constructions in general precedes the participle, yielding OV-word order. The examples below furthermore illustrate that particles are prefixed to the participle in the HÅVA-construction (14, 15), that inanimate subjects and non-possessive structures occur (15), and that a temporal adverb such as *jusst* ‘just’ is possible in the HÅVA-construction (16).

14. Ia har dāmbe å-båsta frām kle. (Lagman 1967:119)

I have.SG dust off-brushed from clothes

‘I have brushed off the dust from the clothes’

15. Aild’n har tårr gräse å-svie. (Lagman 1967:119)

fire has.SG dry grass off-burnt

‘The fire has burnt off the dry grass’

16. Ja had jusst påtela ördrukke, når... (Esw. corp.)

I had just bottle outdrunk when

‘I had just finished the bottle, when...’

Negations in the HÅVA-construction may be expressed with *o* (as in 2), showing that the main verb in the HÅVA-construction is a past participle. The negated examples in Lagman (1967) indicate that negated transitive HÅVA constructions appear to require VO-word order, in contrast with the examples above.

17. Ia har o bästa klere än. (Lagman 1967:120)

I have not brushed clothes yet

‘I haven’t brushed the clothes yet’

18. Hån har o málka kudona. (Lagman 1967:120)

she has un milked cows

‘She hasn’t milked the cows’

Some informants reject sentences such as (8) and (17, 18), probably because they do not use *o* as a separate negation, but only as a negative prefix (like in standard Swedish). This may be one of the ESw morphosyntactic features that has not been able to survive in a standard Swedish context; another example would be the modal verb *mike* ‘may-not’ (cf. Rosenkvist 2018b). However, other informants do accept sentences with *o*-negation and OV-word order (e.g., *Hån har kudona o málka*). Due to these inconsistencies and to the scarcity of ESw written examples, it is at present probably not possible to pursue this particular line of inquiry further.

2.3. The HA-construction

All types of verbs may be used in the HA-construction. Unlike the VARA- and HÅVA-constructions, the finite verb does not agree in number with the subject, but appears as a reduced, non-inflectable particle *ha*. Lagman (1967:116) underlines that “It is to be noticed that the auxiliary when forming perfect tense has a reduced form and does not inflect for plural”.³ Furthermore, there is no agreement in transitive clauses in the HA-construction, OV-word order is unattested (19), only the common clausal negation (*änt*) is possible (20), and particles are not prefixed but appear in isolation, after the main verb (21).

19. Ha ne vaska händre? (Lagman 1967:119; cf. 7)

ha you.PL washed hands

‘Have you washed your hands?’

20. Ia ha änt bästa stivlana. (Lagman 1967:120)

I ha not brushed boots

‘I haven’t brushed the boots’

³ All quotes from Lundström (1939), Lagman (1967), and Ivars (2010) have been translated from Swedish by me.

21. Han ha give anan å. (Lagman 1967:120)

he ha given other off

‘He has betrayed the other’

All examples with the HA-construction match the standard Swedish perfect-construction regarding word order, lack of agreement, choice of negation and placement of particles. Lexical differences do of course exist. In (21), the ESw particle verb *giva å* has no direct standard Swedish cognate, for instance. It is however reasonable to categorize the HA-construction as a cognate to the Standard Swedish perfect-construction.

2.4. VARA-, HÅVA-, and HA-constructions – similarities and differences

The three constructions that are discussed above differ from each other in several morphosyntactic aspects: agreement of the finite verb and the participle, word order (VO/OV), choice of negation (*o/änt*), and choice of auxiliary (BE or HAVE).

con- struction	verb form	verb agr.	part. agr.	main verb	OV/VO	ne- gation
VARA	full	yes	yes	parti- ciple	(no objects)	o
HÅVA	full	yes	yes	parti- ciple	OV	o
HA	redu- ced	no	no	su- pine	VO	änt

Table 2. Comparison between the three perfective constructions.

In the extensive linguistic discussion about HAVE- and BE-perfective constructions (cf. Larsson 2015, Ackema & Sorace 2017 etc.), it is emphasized that a crucial component in the choice between HAVE or BE is the semantic aspects of the main verb. As for standard Swedish, Larsson (2015:168) points out that only verbs that express change of location are systematically possible as participial complements of BE (22), while some other verbs may occur after BE if they incorporate a particle denoting a target state (23).

22. Är grannen hemkommen?
is neighbour home-come
‘Has the neighbour come home?’

23. Barnen är färdigbadade.
children are ready-bathed
‘The children are done bathing’

It seems that ESw is more liberal than standard Swedish in this respect, given the variation illustrated above. In section 4, the ESw perfective constructions are discussed further.

3. Perfective constructions in Southern Ostrobothnian and Nylandic

In a number of works, Ann-Marie Ivars (1988, 2010, 2015 etc.) has explored the grammar of Southern Ostrobothnian (SOB), a Feno-Swedish variety that is spoken in the western parts of Finland. In Ivars (2010:166ff), she describes and analyses three perfective constructions, that are illustrated below (24–26).

24. Han e no övärjivi. (Ivars 2010:166)
he is probably abandoned
‘It [a certain place] has probably been abandoned’

25. Di har an övärjivi. (Ivars 2010:166)
they have him abandoned
‘They have abandoned it’

26. Di a övärjivi an. (Ivars 2010:166)
they have abandoned him
‘They have abandoned it’

Ivars (2010:157ff) uses the terms VARA-construction, HA-construction and perfect for the examples in (24–26), respectively, which of course matches

the ESw VARA-construction, HÅVA-construction and HA-construction. In order to minimize the risk for confusion, I will however stick to the terms used to describe the ESw constructions, adding regional designations when it is called for (ESw or SOb).

Just as in ESw, the SOb VARA-construction is interpreted as passive when it occurs with a transitive main verb (27) and as active when the main verb is intransitive (28).

26. Men naon sjtjild brudskoål va int laga tier. (Ivars 2010:159)

but any special bride-cup was not made there

‘But no special bride’s cup had been made there’

27. Å tå va ju mjölkflaskår frusi fö ås. (Ivars 2010:159)

and then were well milk-bottles frozen for us

‘And then the milkbottles had frozen for us’

Ivars (2010:160) identifies four distinct morphosyntactic features separating the SOb HÅVA- and HA-constructions. First, in the HÅVA-construction the finite verb appears in full forms, inflected for tense (SOB has no number agreement): *har* (present tense), *ha/hav/hag* (preterite). In the HA-construction, the verb is reduced and appears as *ha* or just *a*. Furthermore, the HÅVA-construction has OV-word order, in general, unlike the HA-construction, and as for the negation, the VARA- and HÅVA constructions are negated with the prefix *o-*, while the common negation (*it*) is used in the HA-construction. Finally, particles are adjoined to the main verb in the VARA- and HÅVA-constructions, but not in the HA-construction. Two examples are given in (28, 29).

28. Han har allti bilin sin bårttappa. (Ivars 2010:162)

he has always car his away-dropped

‘He has always lost his car’

29. men jag a it stöipt na jus. (Ivars 2010:167)

but I ha not made any candles

‘But I haven’t made any candles’

The similarities between ESw and SOb perfective constructions are striking, but there are also some noteworthy differences. In SOb, Ivars (2010:160) notes that the subject in the HÅVA-construction must be human, and very often a personal pronoun is employed as a subject. In ESw, on the other hand, also non-human and inanimate subjects appear, even if they seem to be low-frequency (cf. 15, 30, 31).

30. Tå räven hav all fiska ått skon bure satt han å berja ita. (Vippal. Vart har björnens)

when fox had all fish to woods carried sat he and began eat

‘When the fox had carried all of the fish to the woods, then he sat down and started eating’

31. tär fikk en ligge så lenget te en hav raitt fäe (Lagman 1990:91)

there got he lie so long to he had rot got

‘There it [the hemp] lied until it had started to rot’

Another notable difference is that SOb lacks participial agreement, and for this reason there is no formal difference between participial and supine main verbs – clues to the status of the main verb must accordingly be attained from the surrounding clausal context.

The description of Nylandic⁴ (NYI) perfective constructions in Lundström (1939:109ff) is not very extensive, but a handful of examples are provided. Perfect participles occur both after BE and HAVE, and OV-word order occurs with HAVE and transitive verbs (32, 33). Non-human subjects occur with HAVE and OV-word order (34).

32. Säkert va no injin gol oryörder. (Lundström 1939:110)

surely was probably no farm.MASC untouched.MASC

‘Surely no farm was untouched’

33. Dom had boten follastager me sprit. (Lundström 1939:110)

they had boat.MASC full-loaded.MASC with spirits

‘They had loaded the boat full with vodka’

⁴ Nylandic is also a Fenno-Swedish variety. It is spoken on Finland's southern coast, east and west of Helsinki.

34. Hästn har fotn sjuker. (Lundström 1939:42)

horse has foot.MASC sick.MASC

‘The horse has a sick hoof’

Like in ESw, the participles agree with the subject in intransitive clauses and with the direct object in transitive clauses: “The participle conforms with its head word in gender and number” (Lundström 1939:109). A perfect construction of the standard Swedish type is also available, which displays VO-word order and non-agreement – compare (35) with (36).

35. Vi hadd boken bortlonager en gong. (Lundström 1939:112)

we had book.MASC away-loaned.MASC once

‘We had lended the book once’

36. En gong hadd vi lona bort den där boken. (Lundström 1939:112)

once had we loaned away that there book

‘We had lended the book once’

It is to be noted that the form of the verb *hadd* ‘had’ is identical in (35) and (36), and Lundström (1939) does not mention any formal differences depending on usages of the verb, although some examples (such as *a flytta* ‘has moved’) indicate that the verb is weakened in present tense perfect constructions.

Summing up, it may be concluded that three eastern varieties of Swedish (ESw, SOB, and NYI) have strikingly similar ways of expressing perfective meaning, from a morphosyntactic perspective. Three different constructions are available. They all seem to be quite frequent, and in many instances it appears that they also overlap, expressing more or less the same perfective meaning. Ivars (2010:126) argues that the choice between the HÅVA- and HA-constructions are governed by non-semantic factors.

The supine phrase [=HA-construction] has in Southern Ostrobothnian a more restricted usage than in the standard language. This is due to the extended usage of the HA-construction [=HÅVA-construction], that in many cases replaces perfect and pluperfect in the standard language. The division is principally that supine [=HA-construction] is used with intransitive verbs and verbs that cannot form participles, the HA-construction [=HÅVA-construction] is used with transitive verbs that may form participles. (Ivars 2010:126)

In the following section (4), the data presented above will be further discussed, along with possible analyses.

4. Perfective constructions in Swedish and in Eastern Swedish

In many languages, periphrastic perfect constructions have developed from possessive or resultative HAVE-constructions. An oftenmentioned example is the Latin perfect construction:

As we have seen, the Late Latin verb *habere* ‘to have’ was reanalyzed in post-verbal (OV) position as a future inflection marker. As Romance languages developed, a new periphrastic complex perfect construction emerged alongside of the future inflection, replacing the earlier perfect inflection -v; e.g., *probavi* ‘I have tried’ was replaced by *habeo probatum*. This complex perfect, like the future, arose out of a *habere* construction, but in this case it originated in a construction consisting of an inflected form of *habere* ‘to have’ and a past participle that agreed with the object of *habere* [...] (Hopper & Traugott 2003:62)

[...] the path from *habere* to the perfect was via the locative-possessive existential in transitive contexts of cognitive and sensory states [...] (Hopper & Traugott 2003:63)

The rise of perfect constructions in Germanic and the alteration between HAVE and BE has been studied since at least Paul (1902; cf. e.g. McFadden & Alexiadou 2010 for English, and Coussé 2014, Broekhuis 2017 for Dutch). In Swedish, HAVE-perfects are attested in the earliest stages of the language (cf. Johannisson 1945, Larsson 2009, 2015:154), and a distinct periphrastic perfect construction with auxiliary *have* and a supine main verb (which differs in form from participles) was established during the 17th century (Larsson 2015:165ff). At that time, the frequency of BE plus participle dropped, and the verb types that could occur with BE was restricted. In modern standard Swedish, BE-participles are uncommon (although there is some regional variation), and only verbs that express change of location or state involving a target state – the typical verb is *komma* ‘to arrive’ – are possible with BE plus participle (cf. 17, 18 above). Thus, a direct translation into Swedish of the ES_w sentences in (1–3) would be ungrammatical in two out of three cases – see (37–39). Only a regular perfect (as in 39) is possible.

37. *Jag är oäten.

I am uneaten.PART.MASC/FEM

‘I haven’t eaten’

38. *Jag har oätet.

I have uneaten.PART.NEUT

‘I haven’t eaten’

39. Jag har inte ätit.

I have not eaten.SUP

‘I haven’t eaten’

There is also a HAVE-construction in Swedish (cf. SAG 4:350), which resembles the ESw HÅVA-construction; it displays OV-word order and the participle agrees with the direct object (40).

40. Vi har väskorna packade.

we have bags packed.PART.PL

‘We have the bags packed’

However, in contrast with the HÅVA-construction, the Swedish construction is clearly possessive, requiring an animate subject and a transitive affecting predicate – i.e., the participle must be derived from a verb that expresses an event type that affects a direct object. The event must furthermore be resultative. A sentence such as (41) is thus not possible, due to a mix of factors.

41. *Regnet har vandrarna förföljda.

rain has walkers persecuted.PL

‘The rain has persecuted the walkers’

The Swedish perfect and the HAVE-construction, and the ESw HÅVA-construction, have their roots in Old Scandinavian, where it was possible to express perfective meaning with HAVE in two different fashions.⁵

⁵ Both in Old Swedish, Modern Swedish and ESw the verb *få* ‘get’ (and a few other verbs) appear in a quite similar construction (cf. Wessén III:166, Lagman 1967:120), corresponding to *We got our windows cleaned*. Due to reasons of time and space, GET is not discussed here –

Discussing this variation, Noreen (1923:§541) notes that in Old Icelandic, postverbal participles agree, whereas proverbal do not (42). The angled brackets in (42) indicate alternative positions and morphological forms of the participle.

42. Ek hefe <kallat> hann <kallapan>

I have called.NEUT him called.MASC

‘I have called him’

The construction with HAVE plus post verbal participle has eventually developed into the possessive HAVE-construction in standard Swedish, but, as we have seen, in ESw the HÅVA-construction has a wider range of functions, seeming to serve as an intermediate between the VARA- and HA-constructions.

Both Lagman (1967:117) and Ivars (2010:166ff) discuss the semantic properties of the HÅVA-construction in comparison with the VARA- and HA-constructions in ESw and SOb, respectively. Lagman (1967:117) asserts that when using the HÅVA-construction, the speaker underlines “the participle’s adjectival or adverbial features (resultative meaning)”, while “the action as such” is in focus when the HA-construction is used. In the VARA-construction, the result of some action is the centre of attention. Lagman notes, however, that HÅVA- and VARA-constructions in many cases appear to be synonymous, as in (43).

43. Han är/har blue. (Lagman 1967:117)

he is/has become.PART

‘He is dead/he has died’

Lagman also points out that in mutative (i.e., inchoative) contexts, the preferred option is to use a VARA-construction.

Ivars (2010:166ff) makes similar statements about the corresponding constructions in SOb. The VARA-construction is non-agentive and expresses a state, while the HÅVA-construction is agentive and may express either a state or a result. The HA-construction in turn underlines the action and is also used to express that the event is relevant at the time of speech. So, the HÅVA-construction may express a state or a result, in similarity with the VARA-construction, but like the HA-construction it is also agentive.

see Gronemeyer (1999) for an account of the grammaticalization of GET in English. Klingvall (2011) and Larsson 2012a) discuss *få* + participle in Swedish.

In a recent contribution to the discussion about HAVE- and BE-perfects, Broekhuis (2017) presents an account of how BE- and HAVE-perfects have developed in Dutch which may shed some light on the properties of the ES_w perfective constructions. He assumes that the Dutch perfect construction has gone through three diachronic stages.

stage 1:	BE/HAVE	+	(state denoting) adjectival participle
stage 2:	BE/HAVE	+	(process denoting) verbal participle (derived from adjectival participles)
stage 3:	HAVE	+	verbal participle (derived from verb)

In the first stage, HAVE is semi-copular, allowing both adjectives and adjectival participles in constructions such as (44, 45). Since the predication of the adjectival constituent requires a direct object, HAVE only occur with transitive verbs at this stage.

44. Jane always has the window open_{ADJ}.

45. Jane always has the window closed_{ADJ.PART.}.

Assuming that HAVE is semi-copular in (44), it follows that the subject is an internal argument to HAVE and thus non-agentive. It is rather “a recipient in the metaphorical sense that it ‘has control over’ the state of the window being open” (Broekhuis 2017:15). The structure is the same in (45), where the adjectival participle denotes a property of the direct object.

The predication relation between the adjective or the adjectival participle and the nominal is mediated in a PredP (46).

46. Jane has [_{PredP} the window _{Pred} [_{AP} closed_{ADJ.PART.}]].

In this analysis, the direct object is attracted by the Pred-feature and is internally merged into SpecPredP, resulting in OV-word order.

The non-agentive subject has a control function in semi-copular HAVE-constructions, which – according to Broekhuis (2017:17) – facilitates a reinterpretation of the subject as an external, agentive argument. Consequently, in such a structure the participle cannot be adjectival, since adjectival participles in semi-copular contexts do not project external arguments. In stead, the participle is understood as denoting an event, i.e., as a verbal participle, which does not require or allow for a PredP. The result of this change is a periphrastic perfect construction which does not require a transitive participle.

While the Dutch word order is not affected, this change is visible in both English and Swedish, since the direct object no longer precedes the participle, not having to move to SpecPredP (47, 48).

47. Jane has [VP closed VERB.PART. the window].

48. Jan har [VP stängt VERB.PART. fönstret].

At stage II, BE-constructions are affected too, since the change opens up for two possible analyses of Dutch BE-constructions – participles can be either adjectival or verbal (49, 50).

49. Het ijs_i is [PredP t_i Pred [AP gesmolten ADJ.PART..]]

the ice is melted

‘The ice is melted’

50. Het ijs_i is [VP t_i gesmolten VERB.PART..]

the ice is melted

‘The ice has melted’

In stage III, the perfect with HAVE eventually spreads to intransitive verbs such as *sleep*.

Applying Broekhuis’s (2017) hypothesis to the ESw perfective constructions, it is plausible that a similar development has occurred in ESw, and that all of the discussed alternative structures still are operational. Accordingly, ESw would have two semi-copular constructions, and three constructions for expressing perfect tense: BE + verbal participle, HÅVA + verbal participle, and the HA-construction. Analysed examples are provided in (51–55).

51. Ia_i är [PredP t_i Pred [AP o ite ADJ.PART.]].

[= 1: BE + adjectival participle]

52. Ia har [PredP dāmbe Pred [AP å-båsta]].

[= 14: HAVE + adjectival participle]

53. gräse_i er [VP växt VERB.PART.]].

[= 7: BE + verbal participle]

54. Ja had jusst [VP påtela ördrukke VERB.PART.]].
 [= 16: HAVE + verbal participle]
55. Ve ha [VP gåle målka VERB.PART./SUP.]]. (Lagman 1967:117)
we ha already milked
 'We have already milked'
 [HAVE + intransitive verbal participle]

Under the assumption that objects in the HÅVA-construction need to move to SpecPredP (as in 52), a straight-forward explanation to the OV-word order is provided. However, Broekhuis (2017:6f) points out that when a participle denotes a process, it must be analysed as verbal. Temporal adverbials such as Dutch *daarnet* 'just.now' and *gisteren* 'yesterday' are incompatible with a state-reading, he claims (and the same must be assumed for embedded adverbial clauses expressing similar temporal meanings). For this reason, the participles in (53) and (54) must denote processes and hence be verbal, and no PredP is projected. Still, we find that ESw has participle agreement in structures such as (53), and OV-word order in (54), although the temporal context shows that the participle is verbal in both of these structures, and hence no PredP can be projected.

Likewise, the hypothesis also predicts that all instances of HAVE + participle should be transitive, but still some intransitive (but not unaccusative) HÅVA-constructions are attested (2; repeated below as 56).

56. Ia har o ite.
I have un eaten
 'I haven't eaten'

The ESw variation in word order accordingly does not seem to be related to the status of the participle (adjectival or verbal), but to whether the main verb appears as an agreeing participle or as the supine.

Another approach to participles is presented by Klingvall (2011). In her discussion about Swedish *få* ('get') plus participles, Klingvall (2011:75; cf. also Larsson 2009, 2012a) argues that there are three types of past participles in Swedish, with different semanto-syntactic properties – see below (the perfect participle is identical with the the supine).

Perfect participle:	T + Voice + V _{past}
Active past participle:	Voice + V _{Agr} + V
Passive past participle:	Pass + Voice + V _{Agr} + V

Voice is the site for the participles' external argument, and – following Larson (2009:61f) – it is assumed that perfect participles (supines) have an inherent past tense feature with a separate T (i.e., the structure is bi-clausal) whereas active and passive past participles are tenseless. The latter two also differ from the perfect in having an agreement projection, which is possible since the V in these cases does not have tense (and thus is less “verbal” than a tensed V).

Applying the idea that there are three participial categories to ESw, the assumption that perfect participles/supines are tensed may explain why the auxiliary in ESw HA-constructions is reduced phonetically, and non-agreeing. If the participle's tense feature can percolate upwards in the structure, to T in the matrix clause, it is possible that the reduced auxiliary only marks finiteness in HA-constructions, being merged directly into C. If this is the case, the lack of verb agreement in ESw HA-constructions is explained by the fact that the auxiliary and the subject does not establish any Agree-relation in TP; the tense features in T would be satisfied by sharing features with the embedded T. Also the fact that perfects (the ESw HA-constructions) in general denote events, while VARA- and HÅVA-constructions mainly express states or results, may be a consequence of the absence of tense in the projections of active and passive past participles.

Furthermore, the V_{AGR}-projection, corresponding to Broekhuis' (2017) PredP, would in turn explain why participles agree with the direct object, why the HÅVA-construction allows OV-word order, and why particles are incorporated with the participle in the VARA- and HÅVA-constructions, V_{AGR} acting as a trigger for particle incorporation (Klingvall 2011:75).

In ESw, BE may select for both passive and active participles, in contrast with standard Swedish. This explains the ungrammaticality of (37) – like in English, a clause such as *I am eaten* must be interpreted as ‘someone has eaten me’ in standard Swedish, but in ESw it is possible for BE to select an active, intransitive participle which yields the interpretation ‘I have eaten’.

In the ESw HÅVA-construction, the verb only selects active participles, but also intransitive verbs are possible (unlike Swedish), as in (56). It also seems to be the case that both BE and HAVE may select unaccusative verbs, as in (43).

Since *få* ‘get’ does not select unaccusative participles (**I got died*), Klingvall (2011) does not discuss how passive past participles derived from unaccusatives are to be integrated in the suggested analysis, or whether it is possible at all, given that unaccusatives in general cannot be passivized (**It was died*).

5. Conclusions

In Eastern Swedish, perfect tense may be expressed with three different constructions, each with its own characteristic morphosyntax. The most clearly differentiated system is to be found in Estonian Swedish, where we find three different auxiliaries, as well as differences in verb agreement, participle agreement, word order, and negation. Estonian Swedish is accordingly well suited as a proving ground for the investigation of how perfect tense correlates with meaning and verb types, for instance, but unfortunately the prerequisites for obtaining data in the form of e.g. texts or speaker judgements are far from ideal. In this paper, I have made a first attempt to describe and analyse the three basic ESw perfective constructions: the VARA-construction, the HÅVA-construction, and the HA-construction. The provided examples show very clearly that ESw differ from standard Swedish in many relevant aspects, but in some cases it has not been possible to get a clear picture of the investigated constructions, due to lack of data or to contradicting speaker judgements. The possible interaction between negation and word order is such an unsolved issue. In future studies, it would be natural to turn to speakers of Nylandic to achieve a better understanding of the Eastern Swedish perfect constructions, since Nylandic is a living language variety that – at least according to Lundström (1939) – appears to offer more or less the same rich differentiation as ESw.

References

- Ackema, Peter & Antonella Sorace. 2017. Auxiliary selection. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.). 424-455.
- Brandner, Ellen 2012. Syntactic Microvariation. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6,2:113–130.
- Broekhuis, Hans. 2017. The rise of the periphrastic perfect tense in the continental West Germanic languages. *LingBuzz*: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003206>.
- Brunberg, Göte 2015. Nucköområdet, formlära. In: *Ordbok för rickulmålet med formlära för nuckösvenskan*. 9–28. Rickul/Nuckö hembygdsförening.
- Coussé, Evie. 2014. Lexical expansion in the HAVE and BE perfect in Dutch. A constructionist prototype account. *Diachronica* 31:159–191.
- Gronemeyer, Claire. (1999). On deriving complex polysemy: The grammaticalization of get. *English Language and Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-39.

- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ivars 1988, 2010, 2015
- Ivars, Ann-Marie. 1988. *Närpesdialekten på 1980-talet*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Ivars, Ann-Marie 2010. *Sydösterbottnisk syntax*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Ivars, Ann-Marie 2015. *Dialekter och småstadsspråk: Svenskan i Finland - i dag och i går*. Helsingfors: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Johannisson, Ture. 1945. *HAVA och VARA som tempusbildande hjälpverb i de nordiska språken*. Lund: Gleerup
- Klingvall, Eva. 2011. On past participles and their external arguments. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 87: 53–80.
- Lagman, Edvin 1967. Participle i Nucköområdet. *Svio-Estonica* 18:106–124.
- Lagman, Edvin. 1979. *En bok om Estlands svenskar 3A. Estlandssvenskarnas språkförhållanden*. Stockholm: Kulturföreningen Svenska Odlingens Vänner.
- Lagman, Edvin. 1990. *En bok om Estlands svenskar 3B. Estlandssvenskar berättar. Dialekttexter med översättning och kommentar*. Stockholm: Kulturföreningen Svenska Odlingens Vänner.
- Larsson, Ida. 2009. *Participles in Time. The Development of the Perfect Tense in Swedish*. Göteborg.
- Larsson, Ida. 2012a. Inte helt passiv: konstruktion med *få* + particip i tal och skrift. *Språk och stil* 22:27–61.
- Larsson, Ida. 2012b. On the Development of the Perfect (Participle). I: Ans van Kemenade & Nynke de Haas (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2009: selected papers from the 19th International Conference of Historical Linguistics*. John Benjamins. 191–210.
- Larsson, Ida. 2014. GET and HAVE + past participle or supine. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 2014 ;Volum 1. s. 165–181.
- Larsson, Ida. 2015. The HAVE/BE alternation in Scandinavian - Perfects, Resultatives and Unaccusative Structure, In Rolf Kailuweit & Malte Rosemeyer (ed.), *Auxiliary selection revisited: Gradience and Gradualness*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Lundström, Gudrun 1939. *Studier i nyländsk syntax*. Stockholm: Norstedt.
- McFadden, Thomas & Artemis Alexiadou. 2010. Perfects, Resultatives, and Auxiliaries in Earlier English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2010 41:3: 389-425.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1923. *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut- und Flexionslehre) unter Berücksichtigung des urnordischen*, 4th revised edition. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Paul, Hermann. 1902. *Die Umschreibung des Perfekts im Deutschen mit haben und sein*. München.

- Rosenkvist, Henrik. 2012. Forskning i svensk dialektsyntax – förutsättningar och frågeställningar. *Vetenskaps societetens i Lund årsbok* 2012, 102–122.
- Rosenkvist, Henrik 2018a. Estlandssvenskarna – en historisk och språklig bakgrund. In: Henrik Rosenkvist (ed.), *Estlandssvenskans språkstruktur*. Inst. för svenska språket, Göteborgs universitet. S. 7–32.
- Rosenkvist, Henrik 2018b. Estlandssvenska negationer, negationsharmoni och verbet *mike*. In: Henrik Rosenkvist (ed.), *Estlandssvenskans språkstruktur*. Inst. för svenska språket, Göteborgs universitet. S. 173–187.
- SAG = Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.
- Wessén, Elias. 1958 [1992]. *Svensk språkhistoria III. Grundlinjer till en historisk syntax*. Edsbruk: Akademitryck.
- Västerdal, Ida 2018. *Ingan kast sto tomor*. Attributiv och predikativ kongruens i nucköområdet. In: Henrik Rosenkvist (ed.), *Estlandssvenskans språkstruktur*. Inst. för svenska språket, Göteborgs universitet. S. 97–116.

The ES_w corpus

<https://www.hf.uio.no/iln/om/organisasjon/tekstlab/prosjekter/estlandssvenska/>

Texts

All texts are taken from the Department of Dialectology and Folklore Research, Uppsala.

Ormsö. När en Ormsöflicka. Acc. nr: 1126:1. 2514 words.

Vippal. Stackvika Hans. Acc. nr: 17926. 306 words.

Vippal. Uti granngårde. Acc. nr: 17926. 288 words.

Runö. Fårvallning. Acc. nr: 16561. 607 words.