

DECOMPOSING MANNER *HOW* IN COLLOQUIAL SCANDINAVIAN*

Øystein Alexander Vangsnes

Abstract. The shape of manner *how* varies to considerable extent across Scandinavian dialects, and many of them quite clearly have a complex internal structure. This paper investigates the internal structure of these many forms, and it will be argued that all forms of complex manner *how* can be derived from just two abstract templates. Furthermore, it will be shown that the complex forms of manner *how* unlike the simplex ones interact with other *wh*-items morphologically speaking: the *wh*-part will always be identical to the degree *wh*-item in the various varieties, which in turn will be identical in form to either *where* or *what*. The few simplex forms that exist are identical to degree *how*, but do not share internal structure (apart from *wh*-) with other *wh*-items. Moreover, many of the complex forms of manner *how* are also used as determiners, and a comparison with complex *wh*-determiners will reveal that at a certain level of abstraction such *wh*-items share important parts of structure.

1. Introduction

The present paper is part of larger investigation into the morpho-syntactic properties of manner *how* (as in e.g. *How did you solve the problem?*) in Scandinavian. In this presentation I will concentrate on the internal structure of the *wh*-word and show what insights we can gain by taking data from non-standard, spoken varieties into consideration. I will furthermore point in what directions we can exploit these insights in more in-depth investigations of *wh*-grammar.

Across Norwegian dialects the shape of the *wh*-item that corresponds to manner *how* is subject to an amazing amount of variation. The following is a non-exhaustive list where the forms sanctioned by the written standards are italicized (BM = Bokmål, NN = Nynorsk).

- (1) {koss, kass, korsn, kossen, *åssen* (BM), hossen, høssen, kessn, kelais, kåles, kelaisen, *korleis* (NN), kelessen, korleisen, *hvorledes* (archaic BM), *hvordan* (BM), kordan, ...}

Several of the forms in (1) are clearly similar to each other and at first glance even potentially completely parallel in structure. The main objective of this paper is in fact to argue that all of the forms are derivable from just two distinct templates which can be represented as follows:

* This paper is in part based on seminar and conference presentations given during 2006 and 2007 in (listed chronologically) Tromsø, Konstanz, Utrecht, Oslo, Reykjavík, and Nicosia. I thank the audiences for feedback and useful discussion. For very fruitful discussions of the topic at various points in time I am especially indebted to Klaus Abels and Peter Svenonius. For advice and discussion concerning previous versions of the present paper I would like to thank David Adger and Janne Bondi Johannessen. For information concerning the Icelandic data presented here I am indebted to Ásta Svavarsdóttir, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Höskuldur Thráinsson, and Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson. Remaining shortcomings are of course my responsibility alone.

- (2) a. WH – (WAY) – s – (en)
 b. WH – DONE

Small caps indicate abstract morphemes, and in other words I will argue that the first template involves a *wh*-element plus an incorporated directional noun, followed by two other (non-abstract) formatives. The second template involves a *wh*-element plus an incorporated past participle of ‘do’. A crucial prerequisite for the reasoning to carry through, is that the bits in parentheses in the first template can be left unpronounced.

A second objective of the paper is to show that the *wh*-part of both templates systematically corresponds to the *wh*-element used in degree questions in the various dialects. In fact, I will demonstrate that the following generalization can be shown to hold across Scandinavian, standard and non-standard varieties alike.

$$(3) \quad \text{WH}_{\text{DEG}} \leq \text{WH}_{\text{MANNER}}$$

In other words, degree *how* will be shown to constitute an integral part of manner *how*. The English and German situation, in which degree *how* and manner *how* are identical in form (*how* and *wie*, respectively), is found also in some varieties of Scandinavian (e.g. Swedish and Faroese), but in all cases where they differ in form, it seems that manner *how* is always “bigger”, consisting of degree *how* plus something else on the right edge. A potentially interesting fact about the varieties where manner and degree *how* differ is that the degree *wh*-item seems to always be identical in form to either *where* or *what*: when the two *how*’s are the same, however, it is also distinct from both *where* and *what* (as is indeed the case for English and German).

A third aspect concerning the correlate(s) of manner *how* in Scandinavian, is the fact that many, and mostly non-standard, varieties use this *wh*-word as a *wh*-determiner. The following examples of the Sogn dialect of Western Norwegian illustrates the determiner use.¹

- (4) a. Kelais bil køyre han? (Rannveig S40.5)
 how_{MNR} car drives he
 ‘What car does he drive?’
 b. Kelais ha dagen vore pá <...> arbai í dag dá? (Rannveig S40.5)
 how_{MNR} has day-DEF been on work in day then
 ‘How has the day been at work today?’

This extended use of manner *how* is widespread across Norwegian dialects, and as shown in Vangsnes (2008) it is also a feature of spoken Oslo Norwegian, hence of the

¹ The examples, uttered by a female speaker from Sogndal, are taken from a corpus of video recordings of speakers from the municipalities Sogndal and Gaupne collected by myself in 2003 and 2005. The corpus was originally collected for the purpose of investigating the lack of Verb Second in matrix *wh*-questions. Pairs of informants were asked to interrogate each other and given tasks that facilitated the production of *wh*-questions (over yes/no-questions). This resulted in a corpus containing abundant examples of a wide variety of different *wh*-expressions. The original project, and thus the data collection, was financed by grant no. 148440/530 from the Research Council of Norway.

most dominant variety of colloquial Norwegian. In some varieties “determiner *how*” can be used to query for both kinds and tokens (on a par with English *what* as a determiner) whereas in other varieties it can only be used to query for kinds (on a par with English *what kind of*). As we will see later the phenomenon is also found in Icelandic, and we will also see that Swedish possesses a *wh*-item composed according to the second template above which, however, can only be used as a determiner, never as a manner querying adverb.

The determiner use of manner *how* is crucially not sanctioned by the standard Norwegian orthographies, and although this is ultimately the more intriguing syntactic property of manner *how* across Scandinavian varieties, it will lead too far here to study these aspects of the *wh*-item in the desired depth. I will, however, on the basis of the proposed decomposition of manner *how* point out possible avenues for reaching a broader understanding of the dynamics concerning the relationship between *wh*-adverbs and -determiners, in particular focusing on apparent parallelisms between (Scandinavian) manner *how* and the *which*-type determiner of Germanic languages.

A quite fundamental overarching question which can be drawn from the general exposition is the following: does the decomposition that I propose merely show an interesting diachronic path for the grammaticalization of manner *how* or does it have an active status in the contemporary grammar? In other words, are the various forms of manner *how* across Scandinavian varieties lexicalized and morphosyntactically inactive items, or are they decomposable also from a synchronic point of view? I will not address the issue in the present paper since it will lead too far. Concluding either way will bring our understanding of the structure of manner *how* further, but I will reveal that I find the latter stand more interesting and also more challenging, and the one that I want to pursue in future investigations.

Crucially, the insights to be gained will rely on data from non-standard language, both data from dialects in the traditional sense and from varieties/registers not sanctioned by official and/or unofficial norms for written language. Actual examples will in many cases be drawn from spoken language corpora, and I will also to some extent consider dialect data collected from the web: since the practice of writing dialect in informal communication channels is widespread in Norway, this makes the web a quite useful and easily accessible source of information about non-standard varieties of Norwegian. In addition to this I will also base the discussion on examples construed on the basis of available knowledge and personal experience.

The structure of the paper is as follows. I will start the examination of manner *how* by looking at the relationship between it and other *wh*-elements, in particular degree *how*. This will lead to the generalization in (3) above. In section 3 I will then turn to the decomposition of manner *how* and eventually establish the templates in (2). In section 4 I will consider the determiner use of manner *how* and compare the *wh*-item with more standardly recognized *wh*-determiners like *which*. In addition to pointing out similarities in the internal structure of these items, I will also point out a case drawn from Övdalian, a variety of Scandinavian spoken in Älvdalen, Sweden, where a *which*-type item is used in an adverbial context, thus illustrating the dynamism at play in this part of grammar.

2. The *wh*-part of manner *how*

2.1 Manner *how* versus degree *how*

As already mentioned Swedish and Faroese shares with English (and German) the property that the *wh*-degree item is also used as the *wh*-manner adverb.

- (5) a. Hur gammal är du? Swedish
 how old are you
 ‘How old are you?’
 b. Hur gick det på tävlingen?
 how went it on competition-DEF
 ‘How did it go in the competition?’
- (6) a. Hvussu gamal ert tú? Faroese
 how old are you
 ‘How old are you?’
 b. Hvussu gekst í kappingini?
 how went in competition-DEF
 ‘How did it go in the competition?’

In the other standard varieties of Scandinavian—Norwegian, Danish, and Icelandic—distinct elements are used in the two contexts. This is shown by the examples in (7) and (8) for Nynorsk Norwegian and Danish, respectively—Bokmål Norwegian will be just like Danish in this respect, using *hvor* in the degree context and *hvordan* in the manner context.² We will return to Icelandic in a short while.

- (7) a. Kor/*korleis gammal er du? Nynorsk Norwegian
 wh_{DEG}/how_{MNR} old are you
 ‘How old are you?’
 b. Korleis/*kor gjekk det i konkurransen?
 how_{MNR}/wh_{DEG} went it in competition-DEF
 ‘How did it go in the competition?’
- (8) a. Hvor/*hvordan gammel er du? Danish
 wh_{DEG}/how_{MNR} old are you
 ‘How old are you?’
 b. Hvordan/*hvor gikk det i konkurransen?
 how_{MNR}/wh_{DEG} went it in competition-DEF
 ‘How did it go in the competition?’

Notice that for Norwegian and Danish it is quite clear that although there is not full identity across the two contexts, the element used for manner *how* includes the expression used for degree *how* (*kor* vs. *kor-leis*, *hvor* vs. *hvor-dan*).

² The *wh*-expression *åssen* for ‘manner *how*’ is also permitted by the official Bokmål orthography. Another item for ‘manner *how*’, *hvorledes*, also exists in written Danish and conservative Bokmål, cf. (1).

2.2 Manner *how* versus *other wh-items*

Turning now to the Norwegian dialect of Sogn, we saw above that manner *how* takes on the form *kelais*. The following example shows that the degree *wh*-item is *ke*, hence corresponding to the first part of *kelais*.

- (9) Ke gammal e ho? (Rakel S40.6)
 WH old is she
 ‘How old is she?’

The item *ke* can in turn be used on its own as a *wh*-pronoun corresponding to English *what* as illustrated by the example in (10).

- (10) Ke du tykkje om Sógndal Fotball? (Rannveig S40.5)
 WH you think about Sogndal Football
 ‘What do you think about Sogndal Football?’

Furthermore, the *ke* element seems also to be an integral part of the *wh*-item corresponding to English *where*, namely *kest*. Consider the following example.

- (11) Kest í Sógndal e'ra han búr dá? (Rannveig S40.5)
 where in Sogndal is-it he lives then
 ‘Where in Sogndal does he live?’

In other words, in the Sogn dialect the degree *wh*-item is homophonous to *what* and constitutes an integral part of both manner *how* and *where*. We can summarize this as in the following table.³

Table 1: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* in Sogn Western Norwegian

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
Sogn	<i>ke-lais</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>ke-st</i>	<i>ke</i>

If we now turn back to the standard varieties, we will see that the relationship between various *wh*-items is a bit different. First of all, we can observe that for Danish and Norwegian the degree item is identical in form to *where* but distinct from, and not subsumed by, *what*. This is shown by the following examples where again Bokmål Norwegian would be almost identical to the Danish examples.

- (12) a. Hvor/*hvad bor du? Danish
 where/what live you
 ‘Where do you live?’

³ The situation is in fact a bit more complex. Alongside *kelais* we also find the variant *kolais*, and furthermore we find *ko* as a variant of *ke* for both ‘what’ and ‘degree how’. There is both intra- and inter-speaker variation with respect to these forms, and although more detailed studies of the variation remains to be done, it seems clear that the *ko*-forms are mostly found among older speakers. Crucially there exists no form *kost* for ‘where’.

- b. H vad/*hvor mener du med det?
 what/where mean you with that
 ‘What do you mean by that?’

- (13) a. Kor/*kva bur du? *Nynorsk Norwegian*
 where/what live you
 ‘Where do you live?’
 b. Kva/*kor meiner du med det?
 what/where mean you with that
 ‘What do you mean by that?’

The relationship between various *wh*-items in the standard varieties of Danish and Norwegian can be summarized by the following table.

Table 2: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* in Danish, Bokmål Norwegian, and Nynorsk Norwegian

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
Danish/Bokmål Norwegian	<i>hvor-dan</i> (<i>hvor-ledes</i>)	<i>hvor</i>	<i>hvor</i>	<i>hva(d)</i>
Nynorsk Norw.	<i>kor-leis</i>	<i>kor</i>	<i>kor</i>	<i>kva</i>

In Swedish and Faroese, where manner and degree *how* are identical in form, *how* is distinct from both *where* and *what* and cannot easily be considered a part of the latter forms. This is shown by the examples in (14) and (15).

- (14) a. Var/*vad bor du? *Swedish*
 where/what live you
 ‘Where do you live?’
 b. Vad/*var menar du med det?
 what/where mean you with that
 ‘What do you mean by that?’

- (15) a. Hvar/*hvat byrt tú? *Faroese*
 where/what live you
 ‘Where do you live?’
 b. Hvat/*hvar meiner tú við tað?
 what/where mean you with that
 ‘What do you mean by that?’

Hence, for Swedish and Faroese we get the following table.

Table 3: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* in Swedish and Faroese

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
Swedish	<i>hur</i>	<i>hur</i>	<i>var</i>	<i>vad</i>
Faroese	<i>hvussu</i>	<i>hvussu</i>	<i>hvar</i>	<i>hvat</i>

On the basis of the varieties encountered so far there is some evidence in favor of the generalization that degree *how* is either identical to or an integral part of manner *how* in Scandinavian (and English and German). The generalization is repeated here.

$$(3) \quad \text{WH}_{\text{DEG}} \leq \text{WH}_{\text{MANNER}}$$

2.3 Icelandic what way

Icelandic does not straightforwardly conform to the generalization. Consider the examples in (16).

- (16) a. Hversu/??hvað/%hve/*hvernig gamall ertu? *Icelandic*
 how_{DEG}/ what/how_{DEG}/ how_{MNR} old are-you
 ‘How old are you?’
- b. Hvernig/*hvað/*hversu/*hve gekk í keppinni?
 how_{MNR}/ what /how_{DEG} /how_{DEG} went in competition-DEF
 ‘How did it go in the competition?’
- c. Hvað/*hversu/*hve ertu gamall?
 what are-you old
 ‘How old are you?’

Manner *how* takes on the form *hvernig* in Icelandic. Degree questions can be formed in basically two ways: one may either use the degree *wh*-item *hversu* which obligatorily pied-pipes the degree phrase to the left periphery or one can use (uninflected) *hvað* ‘what’ which splits and leaves the rest of the degree phrase in situ. One speaker consulted allows *hvað* to pied-pipe the degree phrase whereas other speakers find this option clearly ungrammatical. No speaker allows splitting with *hversu*. All speakers consulted consider the degree *wh*-item *hve*, which obligatorily pied-pipes on a par with *hversu*, highly archaic/literary.

None of the degree items can be used to query for manner. Moreover, at first glance none of them seem to be candidates for being an integral part of *hvernig* (‘manner *how*’). However, etymologically speaking *hvernig* derives from the phrase *hvern veg* ‘what.ACC way.ACC’. The following example from the non-normalized Old Norse text *Barlaams ok Josaphats saga*⁴ supports the claim about etymology insofar as the initial *v*- of *veg* is retained.

- (17) ... oc se huernveg lios guðs miskunnar er ollum er boðet oc buit.
 and see what-way light God’s mercy REL all-DAT.PL is invited and ready
 ‘...and look how the light of God’s mercy is there for everyone.’

In effect this means that the *wh*-part of *hvernig* is indeed ‘what’, at least historically speaking. And crucially for our discussion, as far as degree questions are concerned all speakers that I have consulted consider the option with *hvað* plus splitting the most natural one in everyday spoken language. On the basis of this we can in fact argue

⁴ The example is excerpted from the online corpus of the Medieval Nordic Text Archive (MENOTA), see <http://www.menota.org/>.

that Icelandic too conforms to the generalization that morphologically speaking the degree *wh*-item stand in an inclusive relationship to manner *how*.

As already noted the default degree element is a form of *what*.

- (18) Hvað áttu við? *Icelandic*
 what owe-you by
 ‘What do you mean?’

Consider then the threefold set of locative *wh*-items in Icelandic.

- (19) a. Hvar byrðu? *Icelandic*
 where live-you
 b. Hvaðan ertu?
 where-from are-you
 c. Hvert ertu á leiðinni
 where-to are-you on way-DEF

It is in fact possible to argue that locative *wh*-items are derived from the same stem as *hvað*. If we consider the paradigm for the pronoun, given here in table 4, we will see a stem alternation between *hva(ð)*- and *hver*-. the exact same alternation can be observed in the locative paradigm (*hva-r*, *hvað-an*, *hver-t*).

Table 4: The inflection of *what* in Icelandic

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
	MASC	FEM	NEUT	MASC	FEM	NEUT
NOM	<i>hver</i>	<i>hver</i>	<i>hvað</i>	<i>hverjir</i>	<i>hverjar</i>	<i>hver</i>
ACC	<i>hvern</i>	<i>hverja</i>	<i>hvað</i>	<i>hverja</i>	<i>hverjar</i>	<i>hver</i>
DAT	<i>hverjum</i>	<i>hverri</i>	<i>hverju</i>	<i>hverjum</i>	<i>hverjum</i>	<i>hverjum</i>
GEN	<i>hvers</i>	<i>hverrar</i>	<i>hvers</i>	<i>hverra</i>	<i>hverra</i>	<i>hverra</i>

In other words I will take it that Icelandic is like Sogn Norwegian in that the expression for *where* and *what* are intimately connected and involve a common *wh*-formative. The situation for Icelandic can then be summarized as follows.

Table 5: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* in Icelandic

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
Icelandic	<i>hvern-ig</i>	<i>hvað</i>	<i>hvar...</i>	<i>hvað...</i>

We have now seen that Icelandic *hvernig* contains, at least historically speaking, a noun meaning ‘way’. The same is quite clearly the case with the Nynorsk Norwegian variant *korleis* and the corresponding Sogn variant *kelais* as well as the older Danish/Bokmål variant *hvorledes*. These latter forms all contain the noun *lei/led* which means ‘track, direction’. This of course points towards one of the templates for manner *how* introduced at the very beginning. The form *hvordan* in Danish and Bokmål Norwegian on the other hand is different and will be related to the other template involving incorporation of the past participle of ‘do’. Before we turn to this,

however, let us consider some other forms which do not show any overt reflex of either WAY or DONE.

2.4 Norwegian -sn variants

In the dialect of Tromsø as well as a great many of Northern Norwegian dialects manner *how* takes on the shape *korsn*. The following examples from the dialect of Northern Senja⁵ illustrate the relationship between manner *how* and other *wh*-items in the dialect.

- (20) a. Jammen, **korsn** e han no [...] når han e bidd gammel? (Marion; Mfj18)
 well-but how_{MNR} is he now when he is become old
 ‘Well, but how is he now that he has become old?’
- b. **Korsn** bil kjøre du? (Marion; Mfj18)
 how_{MNR} car drive you
 ‘What car do you drive?’
- c. Men **kor** mange har du hadd på si? ... (Marion; Mfj18)
 but wh_{DEG} many have you had on side
 ‘But how many have you had on the side?’
- d. **Kor** bor du? (Marion; Mfj18)
 where live you
 ‘Where do you live?’
- e. **Ka** du heite? (Marion; Mfj18)
 what you are-called
 ‘What are you called?’

The facts for the Tromsø city dialect are the same as for the Senja dialect—it would not be possible to replace *kor* by *ka* in (6d) or *ka* by *kor* in (6e). Hence, the Senja/Tromsø dialects can be added to the table as follows.

Table 6: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* in Senja and Tromsø Northern Norwegian

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
Senja/Tromsø	<i>kor-sn</i>	<i>kor</i>	<i>kor</i>	<i>ka</i>

Another variant of manner *how* which involves the same piece of morphology is the form *åssen*. This form is in fact sanctioned, alongside *hvordan*, by the official orthography for Bokmål Norwegian. Both forms are furthermore well-represented in the NoTa corpus of spoken Oslo Norwegian,⁶ but as shown by Vangsnes (2008) *åssen* is quite clearly the less prestigious ones of the two.

⁵ Senja is an island of 1586 km² (Norway’s second largest) on the coast just south of Tromsø, and the examples stem from a corpus of video recordings collected during a NORMS fieldwork on the island in October/November 2006. NORMS stands for *Nordic Center of Excellence in Microcomparative Syntax* and is a network project with seven partners from all five Nordic countries. The project is supported by the Joint Nordic Committee for Research Councils in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NOS-HS) and the Nordic Research Board (NordForsk). For further information see <http://norms.uit.no/>.

⁶ *Norsk talespråkskorpus – Oslodelen*, Tekstlaboratoriet, ILN, Universitetet i Oslo.
<http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nota/oslo/index.html>

Åssen is furthermore the most common form of the traditional dialects in the Central Eastern Norwegian dialect area, i.e. the area surrounding Oslo, and when we consider these dialects we see that the relationship between manner *how* and other *wh*-items has more in common with the system of the Sogn dialect than with the standard varieties, at least as far as the *wh*-part is concerned. The following examples, which are construed, but which nevertheless give an adequate picture of the system of the traditional dialects in a wide area surrounding Oslo, show that the element *å*-appears as a separate word in queries for degree, location, and (non-human) pronominal reference.

- (21) a. *Åssen har du det?* *Eastern Norwegian*
how_{MNR} have you it
‘How’s it going?’
b. *Å gammal er du?*
wh old are you
‘How old are you?’
c. *Å bor du henne?*
wh live you LOC
‘Where do you live?’
d. *Å sa du for no?*
wh said you for something
‘What did you say?’

The facts for Eastern Norwegian can thus be summarized as in table 7.

Table 7: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* in Eastern Norwegian dialects

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
Eastern Norwegian	<i>å-ssen</i>	<i>å</i>	<i>å... hen</i>	<i>å... (for no)</i>

2.5 Summary

All the tables for the individual varieties can now be brought together as follows where the grey cells indicate forms that are either identical or stand in a morphological part/whole relationship to each other.

Table 8: Manner *how* vs. degree *how*, *where*, and *what* across Scandinavian varieties (and English)

	wh _{MANNER}	wh _{DEG}	wh _{LOC}	wh _{PRON}
English	<i>how</i>	<i>how</i>	<i>where</i>	<i>what</i>
Swedish	<i>hur</i>	<i>hur</i>	<i>var</i>	<i>vad</i>
Faroese	<i>hvussu</i>	<i>hvussu</i>	<i>hvar</i>	<i>hvat</i>
Danish/Bokmål Norwegian	<i>hvor-dan</i> (<i>hvor-ledes</i>)	<i>hvor</i>	<i>hvor</i>	<i>hva(d)</i>
Nynorsk Norw.	<i>kor-leis</i>	<i>kor</i>	<i>kor</i>	<i>kva</i>
Sogn Norwegian	<i>ke-lais</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>ke-st</i>	<i>ke</i>
Eastern Norwegian	<i>å-ssen</i>	<i>å</i>	<i>å... hen</i>	<i>å... (for no)</i>
Icelandic	<i>hvern-ig</i>	<i>hvað</i>	<i>hvar...</i>	<i>hvað...</i>

This table underscores on the one hand the finding that degree *how* constitutes an integral part of manner *how* across Scandinavian varieties, and on the other hand that in the varieties where degree *how* and manner *how* are identical, the common form does not, morphologically speaking, interact with other *wh*-items the way we see in the varieties where manner *how* is “bigger” than degree *how*.

Let us next consider the non-*wh* part of the complex variants of manner *how*.

3. The complex internal structure of manner *how*

3.1 Sorting among types: towards a template for complex manner *how*'s

This far we have encountered essentially four different types of complex manner *how*'s in the Scandinavian varieties: (i) *kor-leis/ke-lais/hvor-ledes*, (ii) *hvern-ig*, (iii) *hvor-dan*, and (iv) *åssen/kor-sn*. As we have seen, the first two types share the property of containing an incorporated directional noun. That manner *how* should involve the incorporation of such a noun appears quite straightforward even when we consider English: in some cases (manner) *how* can be paraphrased by the PP *in what way* in English.

- (22) a. How are you going to solve the problem?
 b. In what way are you going to solve the problem?
 c. In what manner are you going to solve the problem?

In fact, *way* may in this context be taken to mean ‘manner’, and hence the incorporated noun can be viewed as an overt realization of an abstract *manner* noun.

The third type of Scandinavian manner *how* (*hvordan*) will be discussed below: its internal structure clearly seems to be of a different type than the other variants. As far as the fourth type is concerned, it is quite clear that the non-*wh* part of the two variants *åssen* (/ʰosn/) and *korsn* (/ʰkuʂn/) is indeed the same: *-sn*. This piece of morphology does not seem to exist outside manner *how*, and the question of its status of course immediately arises.

Notice that the *korleis* type contains a final *-s* attached to the directional noun, suggesting the parse *kor-lei-s*. We may then ask whether this *-s* is the same as the one found in the *-sn* of *åssen/korsn* and hence whether there is any relationship between the *korleis/kelais* type and the *åssen/korsn* type. A prime argument for this is the fact that there exist variants that seem to combine the two. In fact, for the Sogn dialect the alternative variant *kelaisen* exists. The following example was found in a discussion forum on the internet—the profile of the user revealed that it was written by a woman born in 1989 from Leikanger, and the example is clearly an orthographic rendering of the local dialect.⁷

⁷ Leikanger is the municipality immediately to the west of Sogndal, and there are no sharp isoglosses that distinguish the two varieties. The web example can be clearly identified as dialectal on the basis of the three instances of the diphthong <ao>, which all correspond to Standard Norwegian <å>, and from the form of the expletive (*da* versus Standard *det*; ‘it’). Both are highly characteristic features of the dialect. In addition comes the form of manner *how*: the fact that the diphthong is represented by <ei> rather than <ai>, as I have done in my corpus examples, can be attributed to the fact that there is a systematic correspondance between <ei> of standard Norwegian orthography and the pronunciation

- (23) Du dao? Keleisen gaor da pao Kaupanger? Sogn
 you then / how_{MNR} goes it on Kaupanger
 ‘You then? How’s it going in Kaupanger?’

Corresponding forms exist for several other dialects as well: the following web example involves the form *kelessn*, characteristic of the Rana dialect in Nordland county (Northern Norway), and stems from the blog of a woman from the municipality of Hemnes.

- (24) [...] dåkk kan jo så sjå **kelessn** eg bor [...] Rana
 you.PL can PRT so see how I live
 ‘... you may then see how I live...’

The variant *kessn* is furthermore found in dialects of the same area, possibly also in Rana itself, thus supporting the idea that the variants ending in *-sn* are related to the forms ending in *-leis(en)*.

This in turn suggests that the *-sn* ending really consists of two separate formatives, *-s* and *-n*. At this point we should observe that there are also variants of (complex) manner *how* that are “smaller” than the ones we have encountered so far. A case in point are the dialects of the county Rogaland in Southwestern Norway, including the urban area around Stavanger, which use the variant *koss*. Consider the following web example which in addition to the form of manner *how* contains several markers that strongly place the dialect in the Rogaland area.⁸

- (25) Men ka gjer du når du ikkje kan forstå **koss**
 but what do you when you not can understand how_{MNR}
 någen av de tri modellane kan forklara problemet.
 any of the three models-DEF can explain problem-DEF
 ‘But what do you do when you can’t understand how any of the three models can explain the problem.’

In the Rogaland dialect the form of ‘where’ will be *kor* (/kuɾ/) and ‘what’ *ka* (cf. the example). The form *koss* (/kus/) can be considered a combination of *kor* + *s* with assimilation of [ɾs] to [s].⁹

[ai] in the dialect, and hence dialect writers may be less conscious about their non-standard pronunciation in such cases.

⁸ The most evident signal of Rogaland dialect is the determiner *någen* (versus Standard Norwegian *nokon* or *noen*): that variant is only found in this area of Norway, and complements information like *-a* as the infinitival ending (*forklara*) and *tri* for ‘three’ (standard *tre*).

⁹ For most speakers of Rogaland Norwegian the degree *wh*-item will be *kor*, but an emerging variety seems to be using the form *koss* also in the degree context. Consider the following web example which illustrates this conflated use.

- (i) [Eg] lurte bare på **koss** du visste **koss** mange
 I wondered only on how you knew how many
 som hadde besøkt bloggen din, eg?!
 SOM had visited blog-DEF your I
 ‘I just wondered how you knew how many had visited your blog.’

This emerging variety of the Rogaland dialect is interesting since it is similar to Faroese and Swedish in that manner and degree *how* have the same form, but different from them in that this element appears to include the *wh* locative adverb.

The situation in the Rogaland dialect, where *-s* alone rather than *-sn* combines with a *wh*-element, supports treating *-sn* as a combination of two separate formatives. If we submit to this line of reasoning we can now derive the various forms of the *korleis* and *åssen* type on the basis of one single template, namely the following:

$$(26) \quad \text{WH} + \text{WAY} + s + n$$

By allowing either the *n*-formative or the *lei*-part to be silent, the derivation of the various forms would be as follows (see note 2 for the form in (27g)).

(27) a.	<i>kor + lei + s + Ø</i>	—>	<i>korleis</i>	(Nynorsk)
b.	<i>ke + lai + s + n</i>	—>	<i>kelaisen</i>	(Sogn)
c.	<i>ke + le + s + n</i>	—>	<i>kelessn</i>	(Rana)
d.	<i>å + Ø + s + n</i>	—>	<i>åssen</i>	(Eastern Nor.)
e.	<i>kor + Ø + s + n</i>	—>	<i>korsn</i>	(Senja)
f.	<i>kor + Ø + s + Ø</i>	—>	<i>koss</i>	(Rogaland)
g.	<i>hvor + led + s + Ø</i>	—>	<i>hvorledes</i>	(archaic Dan./Bm.)

3.2 The *-s* formative: a case morpheme

A question that arises is whether the *s*-formative could also be silent. That is first and foremost an empirical question, and I know of no instances from Mainland Scandinavian where manner *how* consists of just the *wh*-part or combines the *wh*-part with *-lei* and/or *-n* without also involving the *s*-formative (hence **kor-lei-n*, **ke-n* etc.). Swedish *hur* is of course a case of a monomorphemic variant of manner *how*, but crucially this *wh*-morpheme is not in a part/whole relation with other *wh*-items. The presence of the *s*-formative may thus turn out to be an obligatory part of the template proposed, and accordingly this would be something we would like to capture by our analysis.

However, Icelandic *hvernig* is a case in point where the *-s* formative is not involved. This variant of manner *how* would be parsed according to the template as follows.

$$(28) \quad \text{hvern} + \text{ig} + \text{Ø} + \text{Ø} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{hvernig} \quad (\text{Icelandic})$$

One important fact about the Icelandic variant is that it arguably bears accusative case. If we now entertain the idea that the *-s* formative in the Norwegian variants, which none of them has an active morphological case system, is an overt case marker we now have a window for understanding why the *-s* formative appears to be obligatory in the complex Norwegian variants: the complex variants of manner *how* need an overt expression of case. For the time being we may loosely assume that this case requirement pertains to some aspect of linking the various bits of internal structure.

This would allow us to argue that the *s*-formative we see in manner *how* is the same *-s* that can be found in the Mainland Scandinavian counterpart of *what kind of*, illustrated here by an example from Nynorsk Norwegian.

$$(29) \quad \text{Kva slags} \quad \text{bil} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{du?}$$

what kind.S car have you
 ‘What kind of car do you have?’

We will return to the issue of the *-s* formative below when we turn to the determiner use of manner *how*. Let us in the meantime consider the *hvordan* variant type.

3.3. *A borrowed past participle*

The variant *hvordan* is arguably the unmarked variant for manner *how* in Bokmål Norwegian and in Danish. The form *kordan* also exists in Norwegian non-standard language use: despite not being sanctioned by the official orthography a Google search for this form in domains ending in “.no” gives almost 37.000 hits.¹⁰ The internal structure of this variant cannot be derived from the template discussed above.

According to received lexicographic wisdom (see e.g. *Bokmålsordboka*), the *hvordan* variant is borrowed from Low German as a translation of the form *wodan*. This form is in turn composed of the *wh*-element *wo* plus *dan* which arguably is the past participle of *don* ‘do’ (cf. English *done* and High German *getan*). The *dan*-formative also exists in the words *sådan* ‘so, such’ and *likedan* ‘same, equal’.

In other words, a naive translation reflecting the structure of *hvordan* would be “where done”, and accordingly we can suggest the following template for this type of manner *how* in Scandinavian:

(30) WH + DONE

The generalization that the forms subsumes the *wh* degree item in the varieties in question still holds, but it is an open question whether the *wh*-part of this second template could ever be something which is identical to ‘what’: I have so far not come across any form like **ka-dan*, **å-dan*, **hva-dan* etc.

Although the Swedish variant *hur* of manner *how* does not conform to either of the templates proposed, there does exist a *wh*-item which is derivable from the WH+DONE template, namely *hur(u)dan*. The interesting thing about this item is that it is exclusively used as a *wh*-determiner, never as manner *how*. Consider the following pair of examples where I have glossed *hurdan* in line with the etymology discussed above.

- (31) a. Hurdan/*hur bil kjøpte du? Swedish
 how-done/how car bought you
 ‘What kind of car did you buy?’
 b. Hur/*hurdan går det?
 how/how-done goes it
 ‘How is it going?’

¹⁰ My general impression is that *kordan* is used as a more neutral variant alongside the traditional dialect forms discussed in this paper, perhaps primarily by younger speakers, perhaps because the only sanctioned form in Nynorsk (*korleis*) feels too alien, and perhaps because of direct influence from the Bokmål form *hvordan*. Systematic studies of these matters would of course be necessary before any conclusions of this sort could be drawn.

At this point it is quite appropriate to have a look at the determiner use of manner *how* and compare this to other *wh*-determiners.

4. The determiner use of *how* and DP-internal case assignment

4.1. *Query for kind versus query for token*

As mentioned in the introduction the use of manner *how* as determiner is widespread across Norwegian dialects and non-standard varieties. The Icelandic variant *hvernig* can also be used as a determiner, and although Icelandic linguists that I have consulted consider it non-standard and report that they would not use it themselves in writing, there are reasons to believe that there are many Icelanders who do not share the same inhibition: a Google search for the string {*hvernig bíl*} ‘how car.ACC’ gave about 24,500 hits, two of which are the following.¹¹

- (32) a. Hvernig bíl á maður að fá sér??? *Icelandic*
 how_{MNR} car ought man to to get REFL
 ‘What car should one get?’
 b. Hvernig bíl átt þú?
 how_{MNR} car owe you
 ‘What car do you have?’

Both Icelandic *hvernig* and Swedish *hurdan* are only compatible with queries for types, not for tokens. In many of the Norwegian dialects on the other hand both type and token queries can be formed with manner *how* used as a determiner. As corroborative evidence for this difference we can consider some results from a Google search for the string {*how dag*} using various variants of manner *how*. For both Icelandic (*hvernig dag*) and Swedish (*hurdan dag*) I got about ten examples all of which clearly involve the reading ‘what kind of day’, i.e. questions which could only be answered with for example “a {sunny, dreary, joyful...} day” and not by say “Wednesday” or “June 1st”. However, for the Norwegian strings {*åssen dag*} and {*korsn dag*} I got some 40-50 hits in both cases, and several of the examples involved a query for a particular day, hence the reading ‘which day’. Let the following example suffice to illustrate the point, which is that it would be inappropriate to translate this particular question as “*What kind of day...*”.

- (33) Åssen dag og når på døgnet drar du oppover da?
 how day and when on day-DEF go you upwards then
 ‘Which day and at what time of the day do you head up, then?’

The interpretive difference between *which N* and *what N* has often been captured by recourse to the notion of D-linking (Pesetsky 1997, 2000): the core idea is that *which N* will refer to an available set of referents in the discourse whereas *what N* will not do so necessarily. A *what kind of N* expression in turn will be explicitly not D-

¹¹ In comparison, searches for the type querying determiner *hvers konar* ‘what type of’ in combination with *bíl* ‘car.ACC’ (hence “*hvers konar bíl*”) gave only about 70 hits.

linking. The distinction between \pm D-linking more or less corresponds to my distinction between token (+) versus kind (–) querying.

4.2. Comparison with other *wh*-determiners and predicate inversion

For the purposes of the present paper we need not go into further details about the \pm D-linking property of determiner *how* across Scandinavian varieties. What we should note, however, is that the determiner *which* and its cognates in other Germanic varieties (Mainland Scandinavian *(h)vilken*), German *welcher*, Dutch *welk*), which yield obligatorily D-linked noun phrases, historically speaking were uniquely kind querying (i.e. non-D-linking). The common Germanic etymology for this *wh*-item is, according to received lexicographic tradition,¹² that it consists of an old instrumental form of *what* plus the adjective *like* which in turn stems from a noun meaning ‘body, form’. In other words we have the paraphrase ‘what like’. (The function words *such* and *each* apparently have a corresponding origin, both involving the adjective/noun *like*.)

We can now then list several different kinds of complex *wh*-determiners in the abstract: in (34) I have taken the liberty to also, without further ado, introduce the *what for* type determiner well-known from German and Dutch (see e.g. Leu, to appear, Bennis et al. 1998 and references given there).

- | | | | |
|------|----|-------------------|--------------------------|
| (34) | a. | what like N | (<i>which</i> etc.) |
| | b. | how done N | (<i>hurdan</i> etc.) |
| | c. | what/how way of N | (<i>korleis</i> etc.) |
| | d. | what kind of N | (<i>kva slags</i> etc.) |
| | e. | what for N | (<i>was für</i> etc.) |

What is striking here is that all instances involve a case assigner. In (34a) we find the adjective *like* which for instance in contemporary Icelandic assigns dative case to its complement.¹³ The abstract form in (34b) involves a dummy (transitive) verb, hence another case assigner, and in the remaining three complex forms we find a preposition.

Given this way of looking at the structure of the complex *wh*-determiners it makes even more sense to argue that the *-s* formative of forms like *korleis* and *ássen* is indeed a case morpheme. As long as we view these forms as determiners we can make reasonable sense of what the function of the case assigner is: it establishes a link between the noun and the query expression on a par with what we see in partitive constructions etc.

The question is nevertheless *what* is assigned case. From languages with overt case marking we can observe that the noun of a *wh*-DP is assigned case from an external case assigner, not from the internal case assigner in question here. Consider the following set of Icelandic examples.

¹² See for example *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*, Webster 1913, or *Svensk Etymologisk Ordbok* and other sources which are freely available online.

¹³ Consider the following example:

(i) Hann er líkur þér.
 he is like you.DAT
 ‘He looks like you.’

- (35) a. Hvers konar / hvernig bílar voru á sýningunni?
 what.GEN type.GEN /how_{MNR} cars.NOM were on display-DEF
 ‘What kind of cars were there at the exhibit?’
 b. Hvers konar / hvernig bíla áttu?
 what.GEN type.GEN /how_{MNR} cars.ACC own-you
 ‘What kind of cars do you have?’
 c. Hvers konar / hvernig bílum keyrir hann?
 what.GEN type.GEN /how_{MNR} cars.DAT drives he

The determiner *hvers konar* ‘what kind of’ includes an overt expression of genitive case, but the examples clearly show that the morphological case of the “head noun” in the *wh*-DP is determined by the sentential predicate and not by the determiner.

If we now invoke the general idea in Bennis et al. (1998) that determiners originate as predicates of the noun which through the derivation invert DP-internally from a postnominal to a prenominal position, we have a straightforward way of approaching the case assignment issue. According to the predicate inversion idea we could argue that the base structure for the expressions listed in (34) are as follows.

- (36) a. N like what (*which* etc.)
 b. N done how (*hurdan* etc.)
 c. N of (a) what/how way (*korleis* etc.)
 d. N of what kind (*kva slags* etc.)
 e. N for what (*was für* etc.)

In other words the case recipient for the DP-internal case assigners is the *wh*-item, not the noun.

Needless to say this general approach should be evaluated against a more detailed and spelled-out syntactic analysis, but that lies outside the scope of the present paper as well as the objectives of the present volume which is to highlight the advantages of focusing on spoken language. It should nevertheless hopefully be clear in what directions further syntax-theoretic considerations might take us: whatever we would like to propose for the *what kind of* determiner for example should ideally influence our analysis of the complex manner *how*'s as well.

Notice that in (36c) I have added an indefinite article to the formula. The intention of doing so is to suggest a possible analysis for the *n*-formative of the *korleis* template. It is not obvious how this formative can be successfully treated as an instance of an indefinite article in the structure at hand, and this is yet another thing we will need to leave for future research.

4.3. *Determiner versus adverb*

Notice that by invoking the predicate inversion idea we now have a way of understanding why manner *how* can be used both as a determiner and as an adverb. Since the case assigner internal to the complex structure targets the *wh*-item, case will be absorbed also if the expression is used in a non-case clausal position, i.e. as an adverb.

A question that could be addressed is why the other complex determiners are not also used as adverbs. I will end this exposition with a note on a construction in the Scandinavian variety Övdalian, spoken in Älvdalen, Sweden, which suggests that at least the *which* type determiner indeed may have adverbial uses.¹⁴

In Övdalian the cognate of *which* is *ukin*. This item, which inflects for gender and number (and historically for case) is used both as a determiner and as a pronoun corresponding to English *who*. These uses are illustrated in (37).

- (37) a. Ukin bil ir denn? Övdalian
 which car is yours
 ‘Which car belongs to you?’
 b. Ukin al du råk i Stokkol?
 which shall you meet in Stockholm
 ‘Who will you meet in Stockholm?’

When asking for someone’s physical appearance it is also possible to use *ukin* as an alternative to the regular expression for manner *how*, which is *ur* (compare Swedish *hur*). This use of *ukin* is illustrated in (38), and notice that *ukin* agrees in gender with the subject of the clause in these cases.

- (38) a. Ur / ukin sir an aut i kråise? Övdalian
 how/which.M looks he out in face-DEF
 ‘What does he look like in his face?’
 b. Ur / ukų sir å aut i kråise?
 how/which.F looks she out in face-DEF
 ‘What does she look like in the face?’
 c. Ur / ukað sir eð aut?
 how/which.N looks it out
 ‘What does it look like?’

A generalized manner use of *ukin* is not found, however, as illustrated by the following example.

- (39) Ur/*ukin/*ukað al du tågā dig niði Stokkol?
 how/which.M/which.N shall you take you down-in St.holm
 ‘How will you get yourself to Stockholm?’

In other varieties of Scandinavian one would use the complex manner *how*’s that have been discussed here and not the cognate of *which*. The Bokmål Norwegian example in (40) illustrates the point.

- (40) Hvordan/*hvilken ser han ut i ansiktet? Bokmål
 how/which looks he out in face-DEF
 ‘What does he look like in his face?’

¹⁴ The data and information on Övdalian presented here were collected (by myself) during the NORMS fieldwork in Älvdalen May/June 2007. I am grateful to Lars Steensland for pointing out the existence of the construction involving an adverbial use of ‘which’.

It is however striking that although English would not allow the use of *which* in (38) (**Which does he look in his face?*), the translations do involve expressions that correspond to the etymology of *which*, i.e. *what...like*. Further investigations of this particular syntactic context should seek to illuminate why these alternatives to manner *how* are possible in English and Övdalian.¹⁵ In any case these facts do complement the dual adverb/determiner property of the complex *how*'s in Scandinavian and show that there is indeed a dynamic relationship between manner and determiner expressions.¹⁶

6. Conclusion

This paper has discussed how we can systematize the amazing amount of variation that we see regarding the forms and structure that manner *how* take on across Scandinavian varieties, standard and non-standard alike. The main findings have been the following:

- (41) a. Manner *how* is always identical to or includes degree *how* across the varieties.
- b. Whenever manner *how* is not identical to degree *how*, manner *how* contains more material and can be shown to have complex internal structure.

¹⁵ Further investigations may for instance reveal that this use of *ukin* is restricted to a certain class of predicates. In Finnish for instance verbs of appearance and sensation form a class which select ablative complements.

- (i) a. Miltä hän näyttää? Finnish
what-ABL he looks
‘What does he look like?’
- b. Miltä maistuu?
what-ABL tastes
‘How does it taste?’ (or ‘What does it taste like?’)

Whether a corresponding class can be discerned for the adverbial use of *ukin* in Övdalian remains to be investigated.

¹⁶ The *what for* determiner could in fact also be argued to have an adverbial use, however corresponding then to English *why* rather than manner *how*. Throughout Mainland Scandinavian the counterpart of *why* is complex just like manner *how* and consist of the preposition *for* preceded by the same initial *wh*-item that we find in the complex *how* forms, i.e. sometimes homophonous to *where*, sometimes to *what* (which in turn sometimes are identical). Hence we have forms like *hvor-for*, *kor-for*, *ke-fø*, *å-ffer*, etc. Moreover, for English we can use the same formatives as an alternative way of expressing *why* as in for example (ia).

- (i) a. What did you do that for?
- b. Why did you do that?

Finally, *why* and *how* may in fact have the same etymological origin, both stemming from an instrumental/dative form of *what*. In this respect we may note that the Old Norse *hvi* ‘why’ had a variant *hvé* which could be used both as a degree element (cf. the Icelandic examples in (16) and to convey the meaning of manner *how*. All in all there is clearly quite some flexibility involved in this area of the syntax/lexicon interface.

- c. All cases of a complex manner *how* can be related to just two different abstract templates, one involving an incorporated direction noun and a case marker, the other a past participle of the verb ‘do’.
- d. All cases of a complex manner *how* exploit some other *wh*-item in the system, a form corresponding to either *where* or *what*.
- e. A proper subset of the varieties with a complex manner *how* also uses this *wh*-item as a *wh*-determiner, and we can draw parallels between the templates for complex manner *how* and the structure of various complex *wh*-determiners.

Regarding the latter point, it seems that the non-complex variants of manner *how* which do not interact with other *wh*-items morphologically speaking (i.e. Swedish and Faroese), cannot be used as determiners.

These findings are valuable regardless of what particular theoretical analysis one wishes to pursue, and it paves the ground for further investigations of the dynamics of both the *wh*-system and the relationship between adverbials and determiners.

I leave further syntax-theoretic investigations to the future, including also the question of whether the decomposition that we now have established for manner *how* in Scandinavian has any psychological reality in the mind of contemporary speakers. I will continue my investigations on the presumption that it does, but I would at the same time point out that also more modest research goals can be based on the insights established here.

Finally, it is worth re-stating the importance of taking data from non-standard language into account in grammar research. It is quite unlikely that we would have reached the set of findings in (41) had it not been for the plentiful source of information that dialects and other spoken varieties provide. Microcomparative investigations of this kind establishes a much more detailed and many-faceted understanding than would have been possible merely on the basis of just standard, written varieties.

References

- BENNIS, H., N. CORVER & M. DEN DIKKEN. 1998. Predication in nominal phrases. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1, 85-117.
- Bokmålsordboka*. Kunnskapsforlaget. Available online at <http://www.dokpro.uio.no/ordboksoek.html>
- The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LEU, T. To appear. ‘What for’ internally. Ms., NYU, forthcoming in *Syntax*.
- PESETSKY, D. (1987). Wh-in-situ: movement and unselective binding. The Representation of (In)definiteness. eds. E. REULAND & A. TER MEULEN, 98-129. MA: MIT Press.
- PESETSKY, D. 2000. *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

VANGSNES, Ø.A. 2008. Omkring adnominalt *åssen/hvordan* i Oslo-målet. Ms., University of Tromsø, in *Språk i Oslo. Ny forskning omkring talespråk*, eds. J.B. JOHANNESSEN & K. HAGEN, 50-62. Oslo: Novus.
Webster 1913. Available online at http://everything2.net/index.pl?node_id=176726.

*Øystein Alexander Vangsnes
Dept. of Language and Linguistics
& CASTL
Faculty of Humanities
University of Tromsø
NO-9037 Tromsø
Norway*