

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 5*

© 2005. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Microparameters for Norwegian *wh*-grammars*

Øystein Alexander Vangsnes

University of Tromsø

The absence of V2 in mainclause *wh*-questions is geographically speaking a very widespread phenomenon in Norwegian, absent only in central eastern and southeastern Norwegian dialects. The characteristics of the phenomenon are nevertheless not uniform across the dialects – three descriptive variables can be discerned: (i) whether or not V2 is required, (ii) whether or not V2 is optional alongside non-V2, and (iii) whether or not non-V2 is allowed with short *wh*-elements only. In addition these variables are relative to a \pm subjecthood distinction on the *wh*-constituent. The phenomenon has received considerable attention by both dialectologists and theoretical syntacticians, and the main purpose of this paper is to systematize the information available in previous works. On the basis of the resulting overview a microparametric account of the variation will be proposed whereby the variation hinges on three microparameters: (i) whether or not interrogative C must be lexicalized, (ii) whether or not short *wh*-elements are heads that may lexicalize C, and (iii) whether or not the element *som* that appears in subject *wh*-questions is a head or not. Diachronic speculations concerning the development of the variation will also be raised.

Keywords: Verb Second, V2, inversion, *wh*-questions, microparameters, syntactic variation, dialects, Norwegian, Scandinavian

1. Introduction

Many Norwegian dialects allow, to varying degrees, the absence of subject/verb inversion in main clause *wh*-questions. In Standard Norwegian,¹ inversion is an absolute requirement. As a first illustration, compare the examples in (1)

Linguistic Variation Yearbook 5 (2005), 187–226.

ISSN 1568–1483 / E-ISSN 1569–9900 © John Benjamins Publishing Company

from the Tromsø dialect with the examples in (2), which are of the Nynorsk standard of written Norwegian.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---|------------------------------|
| (1) | a. | <i>Ka du sa?</i>
what you said
'What did you say?' | Tromsø |
| | b. | <i>Ka sa du?</i>
what said you
'What did you say?' | |
| (2) | a. | * <i>Kva du sa?</i>
what you said | Standard (Nynorsk) Norwegian |
| | b. | <i>Kva sa du?</i>
what said you
'What did you say?' | |

The example in (2a) is ungrammatical: subject/verb inversion is obligatory in Standard Norwegian. The corresponding word order is, however, fine for the Tromsø dialect, as illustrated by (1a).

Such a lack of subject/verb inversion, or Verb Second, in main clause *wh*-questions is geographically speaking widespread across Norwegian dialects. In fact, judging from the existing literature, in particular Nordgård (1985) and Lie (1992), the phenomenon can be encountered in all dialect areas except central eastern Norway (which includes the capital Oslo) and the adjacent southeastern Norway ('Sørlandet').²

This paper presents a survey of the lack of Verb Second (henceforth 'V2') in main clause *wh*-questions based on existing literature. This phenomenon is one of the few *syntactic* points of variation in Norwegian dialects that have received considerable attention,³ but as I will show here the phenomenon is far from having been exhaustively studied. Exhaustiveness will not be reached by this article either, but a more organized picture of the variation will hopefully emerge along with a set of valuable working hypotheses for future research on the phenomenon. Additionally, I aim to present some suggestions of a more general theoretical interest.

Before we look more closely at dialectal Norwegian let us consider some basic properties of clausal word order in Standard Norwegian. Standard Norwegian is a "well-behaved" V2 language and exhibits subject/verb inversion both in declarative and interrogative clauses.⁴ This is exemplified in (3) and (4) for a non-subject initial declarative clause and a *wh*-question, respectively.

- (3) a. *I dag bles det veldig mykje.* Standard Norwegian
 in day blows it very much
 ‘Today there is a very strong wind.’
 b. **I dag det bles veldig mykje.*
- (4) a. *Kor ofte bles det på denne måten*
 how often blows it on this way-DEF
 her? Standard Norwegian
 here
 ‘How often do you have such strong winds here?’
 b. **Kor ofte det bles på denne måten her?*

Subject initial clauses such as in (5) also exhibit V2, made evident by the fact that the finite verb must precede negation and other sentence adverbs.

- (5) a. *Det bles heldigvis ikkje lenger ute.* Standard Norwegian
 it blows fortunately not longer outside
 ‘It’s fortunately not blowing any longer outside’
 b. **Det heldigvis ikkje bles lenger ute.*
 c. **Det heldigvis bles ikkje lenger ute*

These are well-known facts that hold for Mainland Scandinavian more generally.

There is no general V2 requirement in Standard Norwegian embedded clauses. Moreover there is no “V-to-I movement” either: the finite verb appears to the right of IP adverbs. This root/embedded asymmetry with respect to verb movement, which holds for Mainland Scandinavian in general, is exemplified by the *wh*-questions in (6) and (7) and by the declarative clauses in (8) and (9).

- (6) a. *Kva sa han egentleg?* Standard Norwegian
 what said he actually
 ‘What did he actually say?’
 b. **Kva han egentleg sa?*
 c. **Kva han sa egentleg?*
 d. **Kva egentleg sa han?*
 e. **Kva egentleg han sa?*
- (7) a. *Eg lurer på kva han egentleg sa.* Standard Norwegian
 I wonder on what he actually said
 ‘I wonder what he actually said.’
 b. **Eg lurer på kva sa han egentleg.*
 I wonder on what said he actually

- c. **Eg lurer på kva han sa egentleg.*
I wonder on what he said actually
- (8) a. *Eg likte faktisk denne filmen.* Standard Norwegian
I liked in-fact this movie-DEF
'I actually liked this movie.'
b. **Eg faktisk likte denne filmen.*
I in-fact liked this movie-DEF
- (9) a. *Eg lurer på om han egentleg likte den filmen.* St. Nor.
I wonder on if he really liked that movie-DEF
'I wonder if he really liked that movie.'
b. **Eg lurer på om han likte egentleg den filmen.*
I wonder on if he liked really that movie-DEF

With respect to embedded *wh*-questions Standard Norwegian exhibits an asymmetry between subject and non-subject questions: the element *som* obligatorily follows *wh*-subjects but is illicit after non-subject *wh*-constituents.⁵ Again this is a common trait of the Mainland Scandinavian varieties in general.

- (10) a. *Eg lurer på kven*(som) kjem på konferansen.* St. Nor.
I wonder on who SOM comes on conference-DEF
'I wonder who will come to the conference.'
b. *Eg lurer på kva (*som) han skal snakke om.*
I wonder on what SOM he shall talk about
'I wonder what he will talk about.'
c. *Eg lurer på kor (*som) han bur.*
I wonder on where SOM he lives
'I wonder where he lives.'
d. *Eg lurer på korleis (*som) du kan vite det.*
I wonder on how SOM you can know that
'I wonder how you can know that.'

The general word order pattern for Standard Norwegian (and Mainland Scandinavian) *wh*-questions can thus be summarized as in (11) and (12) for main and embedded clauses, respectively.

- (11) a. Main: *Wh*_[-subject] **Vfin** Subject (Adverb) (V) (Object)
b. Main: *Wh*_[+subject] **Vfin** (Adverb) (V) (Object)
- (12) a. Embedded: *Wh*_[-subject] Subject (Adverb) **Vfin** (V) (Object)
b. Embedded: *Wh*_[+subject] **SOM** (Adverb) **Vfin** (V) (Object)

If we then turn to main clause *wh*-clauses without V2 in the dialects we should notice that one general property of such clauses is that they conform to the word order pattern in embedded *wh*-clauses in Standard Norwegian in the sense that there is *som*-insertion after *wh*-subjects and that there is no verb movement. We can illustrate this with examples from the Tromsø city dialect, which is a northern Norwegian ('nordnorsk') dialect, and possibly the one Norwegian dialect which has been most extensively studied with respect to the phenomenon (cf. Iversen 1918; Elstad 1982; Taraldsen 1986a; Fiva 1996; Rice & Svenonius 1998; Westergaard 2003a, 2003b, 2005a, 2005b; Westergaard & Vangsnes 2005). The examples in (13) show that *som* can be inserted after a *wh*-subject only, the examples in (14) show that *som*-insertion is not compatible with moving the finite verb past a sentence adverb, and the examples in (15) show that the finite verb cannot move to a position between the subject and a sentence adverb in a non-subject *wh*-clause.

- (13) a. *Kem som kom på konferansen?* Tromsø
 who SOM came on conference-DEF
 'Who came to the conference?'
 b. *Ka (*som) han snakka om?*
 what SOM he talked about
 'What did he talk about?'
 c. *Kor (*som) han bor?*
 Where SOM he lives
 'Where does he live?'
- (14) a. *Kem som faktisk kom på konferansen?* Tromsø
 who SOM in-fact came on conference-DEF
 'Who did actually come to the conference?'
 b. **Kem som kom faktisk på konferansen?*
 who SOM came actually on conference-DEF
- (15) a. *Ka han Josef aldri fikk vite?* Tromsø
 what ART Joseph never got know
 'What did Joseph never get to know?'
 b. **Ka han Josef fikk aldri vite?*
 what ART Joseph got never know

Importantly, the Tromsø dialect as well as the other dialects which exhibit non-V2 in main clause *wh*-questions have V2 in declarative main clauses. In other words the examples in (16)–(18) are representative for Norwegian dialects in general.⁶

- (16) a. *Æ kommer dessverre ikkje på seminaret.* Tromsø
 I come unfortunately not on seminar-DEF
 'I will unfortunately not come to the seminar.'
 b. **Æ dessverre kommer ikkje på seminaret.*
 c. **Æ dessverre ikkje kommer på seminaret.*
- (17) a. *Dessverre kommer æ ikkje på seminaret.* Tromsø
 Unfortunately come I not on seminar-DEF
 'Unfortunately I will not come to the seminar.'
 b. **Dessverre æ kommer ikkje på seminaret.*
 c. **Dessverre æ ikkje kommer på seminaret.*
- (18) a. *På seminaret kommer æ dessverre ikkje.* Tromsø
 on seminar-DEF come I unfortunately not
 'To the seminar I can unfortunately not come.'
 b. **På seminaret æ kommer dessverre ikkje.*
 c. **På seminaret æ dessverre kommer ikkje.*

Although the V2 requirement in declaratives is uniform across the dialects, the lack of V2 in *wh*-questions is in fact *not* uniform across the dialects which exhibit it. As we will see, there appear to be three major variables: (i) first of all whether or not non-V2 is allowed in root *wh*-questions at all, (ii) then whether or not non-V2 is optional, i.e. whether V2 and non-V2 can co-exist, and (iii) whether or not non-V2 is restricted to short *wh*-elements only. Moreover, these variables can be shown to be relative to the \pm subject status of the *wh*-constituent. This means that we have a typology for (main clause) *wh*-grammars across Norwegian dialects as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. Typology for *wh*-grammars in Norwegian dialects

	non-V2	"optional" V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	\pm	\pm	\pm
<i>wh</i> [-SUBJ]	\pm	\pm	\pm

There is necessarily a dependency among the variables from right to left in this table: the issue of optional V2 cannot arise unless non-V2 is allowed in the first place, and moreover if V2 is not an option, then we would not expect non-V2 to be restricted to short *wh*-constituents only (i.e. there would not be any way for longer *wh*-constituents to be licit if V2 is not an option). This interdependency between the variables means that the typology predicts 16 possible varieties. Fewer than half of these varieties are attested in existing



Map 1. Map of Norway with indication of some districts/counties and cities/towns

literature. Further empirical investigations may reveal additional varieties, but at the same time there may be theory-internal reasons for not expecting all 16 predicted varieties to be possible. The theoretical account to be developed in this paper does indeed reduce the number of expected varieties.

Below I will discuss seven dialects/dialect areas in the light of this typology. These seven varieties are rendered in bold face characters in Map 1. The other names on the map show the location of additional varieties that have been or will be mentioned. Names in small capital letters indicate areas, districts or counties, names in regular letters indicate cities, towns, or municipalities.

In the following section I will now explain the variables in the typology in somewhat more detail. In Section 3 I will then relate six dialects described in the literature to the typology. In Section 4 I will propose a microparametric account for the variation, and also present some speculations regarding the development of the variation, taking strict V2 to be starting point. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Variables in Norwegian *wh*-grammars

2.1 A constraint on complexity

In the Tromsø dialect there are only three *wh*-constituents that allow non-V2 in non-subject (root) *wh*-questions, an observation generally attributed to Elstad (1982) and sometimes referred to as “Elstad’s generalization”. These three *wh*-constituents are the monosyllabic *ka* ‘what’, *kem* ‘who’, and *kor* ‘where’. Longer and/or composite *wh*-expressions are not allowed. This “complexity constraint” on non-V2 can be illustrated with examples involving the combination of the *wh*-element *kor* ‘where’ and the locative particle *hen*.⁷ The locative particle can either be fronted along with the *wh*-element or left in situ in the thematic position, but notice that non-V2 is only compatible with the in situ option in the Tromsø dialect. This is shown by the examples in (19) and (20): the crucial ungrammatical example is (20a).

- (19) a. *Kor du bor hen?*
 where you live LOC
 b. *Kor bor du hen?*
 where live you LOC
 ‘Where do you live?’

- (20) a. **Korhen du bor?* Tromsø
 where-LOC you live
 b. *Korhen bor du?*
 where-LOC live you
 ‘Where do you live?’

The difference between the short, monosyllabic *wh*-elements and longer constituents is further exemplified by the examples in (21) and (22).

- (21) a. *Ka han Jens sa?* Tromsø
 what ART Jens said
 ‘What did Jens say?’
 b. *Kem han Jens snakka me?*
 who ART Jens talked with
 ‘Who did Jens talk to?’
 c. *Kor han Jens bor?*
 where ART Jens lives
 ‘Where does Jens live?’
- (22) a. **Korsn han Jens vesste det?* Tromsø
 how ART Jens knew that
 b. **Koffør han Jens sa det?*
 why ART Jens said that
 c. **Katti han Jens kommer?*
 when ART Jens comes
 d. **Ka slags bil han Jens har kjøpt sæ?*
 what kind-of car ART Jens has bought himself

These examples all have non-V2, and as we see the disyllabic adverbial *wh*-elements *korsn* ‘how’, *koffør* ‘why’, and *katti* ‘when’ cannot be immediately followed by the subject. The example in (22d) furthermore shows that the same holds for a fronted noun phrase with a *wh*-determiner.

The complexity constraint on non-V2 is not present in all dialects, however. The dialect of Nordmøre, spoken in northwestern Norway,⁸ contrasts with the Tromsø dialect in this respect. The examples in (23) and (24) are the equivalents of (19) and (20) in this dialect, and (24a) shows that *kar* ‘where’ and the locative particle (*hen*) can be fronted together when there is non-V2, unlike what we saw for the Tromsø dialect.

- (23) a. *Kar du bor hen?*
 where you live LOC

- b. *Kar bor du hen?*
 where live you LOC
 'Where do you live?'
 (24) a. *Karhen du bor?* Nordmøre
 where-LOC you live
 b. *Karhen bor du?*
 where-LOC live you
 'Where do you live?'

The Nordmøre dialect has been studied by Åfarli (1986), and the examples in (25)–(27), taken from his paper, illustrate that complex *wh*-constituents can occur with both V2 and non-V2 in the dialect.⁹

- (25) a. *Kåles bil kjøpte du deg?* Nordmøre
 how car bought you yourself
 'What [kind of] car did you buy?'
 b. *Kåles bil du kjøpte deg?*
 how car you bought yourself
 'What [kind of] car did you buy?'
 (26) a. *OK Kåfer kjem du hit?* Nordmøre
 why come you here
 b. *??Kåfer du kjem hit?*
 why you come here
 (27) a. *OK Ka tid kjem du?* Nordmøre
 what time come you
 b. *?Ka tid du kjem?*
 what time you come

There is thus a significant difference between the Tromsø and the Nordmøre dialect with respect to the complexity constraint. One interesting question is what exactly 'complexity' refers to: is it phonological complexity or is it morphosyntactic complexity that matters? Earlier accounts, e.g. Elstad (1982) and Rice and Svenonius (1998), have claimed that it is syllabicity that is the decisive factor in the Tromsø dialect: non-V2 is only allowed with monosyllabic *wh*-constituents.

There are however some reasons to think that the complexity constraint is morphosyntactic in nature. One piece of evidence pointed out by Merete Anderssen and Marit R. Westergaard (p.c.) concerns the contracted form *kas* of the *wh*-determiner *ka slags* 'what kind-of'. Both the contracted and the full form of the determiner may felicitously appear with a null noun, but a DP

with the contracted form as the only overt phonological material (i.e. *kas Ø*) is nevertheless not compatible with non-V2. In other words *kas Ø* is no different from *ka slags Ø* in this respect. This is exemplified by the examples in (28) and (29): if the complexity constraint were purely phonological in nature we would expect (29a) to be grammatical.

- (28) a. *Kas* ___ *kjøpte han?* Tromsø
 what-kn'a bought he
 b. *Ka slags* ___ *kjøpte han?*
 what kind-of bought he
 'Which kind did he buy?'
 (29) a. **Kas* ___ *han kjøpte?* Tromsø
 what-kn'a he bought
 b. **Ka slags* ___ *han kjøpte?*
 what kind-of he bought
 'Which kind did he buy?'

Another piece of evidence against a purely phonological account of the complexity constraint (noted by Rice and Svenonius 1998 themselves) concerns the fact that short, monosyllabic *wh*-elements can combine with swear words and still be compatible with non-V2.

- (30) a. *Ka faen du sa?* Tromsø
 what devil-DEF you said
 'What the hell did you say?'
 b. *Kem faen du trur du e?*
 who devil-DEF you think you are
 'Who the hell do you think you are?'

For the purposes of the rest of the paper we will therefore assume that the complexity constraint on non-V2 has a morphosyntactic rather than a purely phonological basis.

2.2 Optional V2

As the observant reader may already have noticed both the Tromsø and the Nordmøre dialects allow both V2 and non-V2 in root *wh*-questions. For the sake of clarity we may repeat the example in (1).

- (1) a. *Ka du sa?* Tromsø
 what you said

‘What did you say?’

b. *Ka sa du?*

what said you

‘What did you say’

There are reasons to believe that the choice is governed by pragmatic factors, and that we thus are not dealing with true optionality.¹⁰

First of all, in a corpus investigation of the spontaneous speech of an adult speaker of the Tromsø dialect Marit R. Westergaard (see Westergaard 2003a, 2003b, 2005a, 2005b; Westergaard & Vangsnes 2005) has found a correlation between the choice of V2 on the one hand and the type of verb and the information status of the subject on the other. V2 is more frequent with full DPs and when the main verb is semantically light (typically ‘be’) whereas non-V2 is more frequent when the subject is a pronoun or an expletive and the verb is not ‘be’. Sentences (31) and (32) are thus typical examples of the V2 and non-V2 constructions with the question word *kor* ‘where’.

(31) *Kor er pingvinen henne?* (Investigator in the file “Ole.16”) Tromsø
 where is penguin-DEF LOC
 ‘Where is the penguin?’

(32) *Kor du har fått det henne?* (Investigator in the file “Ole.22”) Tromsø
 where you have got that LOC
 ‘Where did you get that?’

Westergaard’s interpretation of this correlation is that V2 is typically found with informationally *new* subjects whereas non-V2 is typically found with *given* subjects.

Also the discussion of the Nordmøre dialect in Åfarli (1986) suggests that pragmatic factors govern the choice between V2 and non-V2. Although Åfarli claims that V2 and non-V2 can be used interchangeably without significant differences in meaning, he nevertheless finds a slight preference for V2 the “heavier” the subject is. Åfarli (op. cit. 100) gives the following examples to illustrate the point.

(33) a. *Kåles gammel hattkaill du tala med i går?* Nordmøre
 which old ‘hat-man’ you talked with yesterday
 ‘Which old ‘hat-man’ were you talking to yesterday?’

- b. *³Kåles gammel hattkaill onkelen din fra Oslo tala*
 which old 'hat-man' uncle-DEF your from O. talked
med i går?
 with yesterday
 'Which old 'hat-man' was your uncle from Oslo talking to yesterday?'

When this finding for the Nordmøre dialect is brought together with Westergaard's finding for the Tromsø dialect, one could argue that the oddness of (33b) is due to the unlikeliness of the heavy subject qualifying as informationally new.¹¹

So far we have not seen an example of (syntactically) obligatory non-V2 in root *wh*-clauses, but in the next sub-section we will however see that this is exactly what we find in subject *wh*-questions in both the Nordmøre and the Tromsø dialects.

2.3 Subject/non-subject asymmetries

We have now looked at the two variables in the typology in Table 1 concerning the complexity of the *wh*-constituent and the question of optional $\pm V2$. The third "vertical" variable, namely whether a dialect allows lack of V2 in root contexts at all, should not require explication, but there is another source of variation that cuts right across the three variables just mentioned, namely whether the *wh*-constituent is the subject of the clause or not.

We saw already in the introduction that there is a syntactic asymmetry related to this in embedded *wh*-questions in Norwegian in general: in embedded *wh*-questions the element *som* will always follow *wh*-subjects, but not *wh*-constituents with other grammatical functions. The same asymmetry with respect to insertion of *som* is found in non-V2 root questions in Norwegian dialects: if the initial *wh*-constituent is the subject of the clause, *som* will immediately follow it, and if it is a non-subject *som* cannot follow it. The examples in (34) illustrate this for the Tromsø dialect.¹²

- (34) a. *Kem*(som) ikkje like fiskebolla?*
 who SOM not like fishballs
 'Who doesn't like fishballs?'
 b. *Kem (*som) du ska servere fiskebolla?*
 who SOM you shall serve fish-balls
 'Who are you going to serve fishballs?'

This appears to be a constant subject/non-subject asymmetry across the dialects: the insertion of *som* can be thought of as the manifestation of non-V2 in subject *wh*-clauses. What differs on the other hand is whether a dialect exhibits the complexity constraint in both subject and non-subject *wh*-questions or in just one of the two, and furthermore whether V2 is an option alongside non-V2 in both subject and non-subject *wh*-questions or just in one of the two.

If we start with the issue of whether only short *wh*-constituents allow non-V2, i.e. the complexity constraint, there are reasons to claim that in the Tromsø dialect this holds only for non-subject *wh*-questions. In a questionnaire survey of approximately 40 adolescent Tromsø speakers, Fiva (1996) found that subject *wh*-questions with a complex subject were judged relatively well-formed. (35) renders the relevant example (see Fiva 1996: 148) with my interpretation of the overall judgment.

- (35) ??*Kor mange eleva som møtte opp i dag?* Tromsø
 how many pupils SOM met up in day
 'How many pupils showed up today?'

Importantly, the relative acceptance of this example contrasts sharply with clear disapproval of complex *wh*-DPs in non-subject *wh*-questions with non-V2 in Fiva's study. This means that the variable as such is relative to the \pm subject status of the *wh*-constituent in this dialect.

When we then turn to the optionality of V2 in root *wh*-questions, we may first note that Åfarli (1986) explicitly states that *som*-insertion is obligatory in subject *wh*-questions. Åfarli (1986) gives the examples in (36) and (37) to illustrate the point.¹³

- (36) a. **Kåin kjem der?* Nordmøre
 who comes there
 b. *Kåin så kjem der?*
 who SOM comes there
 "Who man is coming there?"
- (37) a. **Kåles mann kjem der?* Nordmøre
 how man comes there
 b. *Kåles mann så kjem der?*
 how man SOM comes there
 "What man is coming there?"

We have already seen that Åfarli says that V2 is an option in non-subject *wh*-questions, and accordingly this is another manifestation of a subject/non-subject asymmetry within a particular grammar.

The literature on non-V2 in Norwegian main clause *wh*-questions furthermore offers examples of dialects where non-V2 itself is sensitive to the subject/non-subject status of the *wh*-constituent. According to Nordgård (1985: 17) the dialect of Hordaland county in western Norway only allows root non-V2 with *wh*-subjects. This is furthermore how Lie (1992) describes the city dialect of Haugesund in the northernmost part of Rogaland immediately to the south of Hordaland. Conversely, Lie (1992) reports that an informant of the Nordøsterdalen dialect in northeastern Norway only allow non-V2 in non-subject *wh*-questions.

2.4 Summary of the typology

This section should now have made it clear (i) that dialects differ with respect to whether non-V2 in root *wh*-questions is sensitive to the complexity of the *wh*-constituent, (ii) that dialects differ with respect to whether V2 is optionally allowed alongside non-V2, and (iii) how both of these variables (as well as the issue of non-V2 itself) is sensitive to the subject/non-subject status of the *wh*-constituent.

Nordgård (1985, 1988) has suggested that also the argument/adjunct status of the *wh*-constituent is a relevant variable for non-V2 across Norwegian dialects. However, as will become clear in the next section the single dialect in Nordgård's study which falls out as distinct on the basis of the argument/adjunct distinction, i.e. the dialect of Rogaland county, can be reinterpreted to conform to the typology lined up here. In the advent of clearer indications of sensitivity to the \pm argument status of the *wh*-constituent I will therefore proceed with the variables discussed above.

3. Attested varieties

3.1 Main sources of information

Although there are several detailed studies of particular dialects with respect to non-V2 in root *wh*-questions, there are few studies that adopt a large scale comparative approach. The most important sources of information about the over-

all geographical distribution of the phenomenon are Nordgård (1985, 1988) and Lie (1992). Lie uses a variety of methods (written surveys, oral interviews, literary texts, linguistic literature), to chart where in Norway the phenomenon can be encountered at all, and he also establishes some information about where non-V2 is only found in either subject or non-subject *wh*-questions (i.e. \pm *som*-insertion in main clauses).

However, Lie's survey does not provide detailed information about the complexity constraint, nor about where V2 is an option alongside non-V2. Nordgård on the other hand undertakes a systematic grammatical approach and is so far the main source of information available concerning how Norwegian dialects differ with respect to the degree of non-V2 allowed. It should at the same time be pointed out that Nordgård's study suffers from certain methodological flaws. First of all it only includes 25 informants for Norway as a whole, leaving as few as two and three informants for particular dialects, and there are furthermore no exact indications as to where the informants come from. Secondly, the informants were presented with a written questionnaire where the test sentences were rendered in Standard (Bokmål) Norwegian orthography. Although the informants were explicitly asked to judge the sentences on the basis of their dialects, this procedure is a serious drawback since the forms of *wh*-elements differ significantly across the dialects, both phonologically and morphologically, and we have no exact information about what forms the informants use themselves.

Despite these shortcomings a highly interesting pattern emerges in Nordgård's study, and the study will be of immense help for further explorations of the phenomenon. In the advent of such further explorations I will therefore largely base my discussion on the results presented by Nordgård as far as the lesser studied dialects are concerned. In the following we will discuss six varieties in relation to the typology established.

3.2 The Nordmøre dialect and Møre in general

For the Nordmøre dialect a detailed study is available, namely Åfarli (1986), and the properties of this dialect have already been fleshed out above. This is a variety (i) where lack of V2 is found in both subject and non-subject *wh*-questions, (ii) where V2 is optionally available, but only in non-subject *wh*-questions, and (iii) where absence of V2 is not sensitive to the complexity of the *wh*-constituent. Accordingly we get the settings in Table 2 for the Nordmøre dialect.

Table 2. *wh*-grammar for the Nordmøre dialect

Nordmøre	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	+	–	#
<i>wh</i> [–SUBJ]	+	+	–

The ‘#’ mark in the last column indicates that the question is irrelevant given the negative setting for the preceding variable.

Nordgård’s study suggests that the properties of the Nordmøre dialect holds for a wider area in the county Møre og Romsdal (see Note 13), and my personal impression from consulting speakers of the Sunnmøre dialect to the south of Nordmøre is that there is no complexity constraint in that dialect either.

3.3 The Tromsø dialect and Northern Norwegian in general

The properties of the Tromsø dialect have also by and large been fleshed out in the preceding sections. This city dialect appears to be the best studied of all Norwegian dialects with respect to non-V2 in root *wh*-questions, and it is quite clear that it differs from the Nordmøre dialect in that only short *wh*-constituents allow non-V2 in non-subject *wh*-questions. In subject *wh*-questions on the other hand complex *wh*-constituents appear to be allowed with non-V2 (cf. the discussion above) like in the Nordmøre dialect.

As for the question of optional V2 this is clearly possible in non-subject questions in the Tromsø dialect. For subject *wh*-questions the matter has not been systematically studied, but Marit R. Westergaard, who is a native speaker of the dialect, informs me that for her the insertion of *som* after main clause *wh*-subjects is obligatory no matter the complexity of the *wh*-constituent. The situation can be illustrated by the examples in (38).

- (38) a. *Kem*(som) kom på forelesninga?* Tromsø
 who SOM came on lecture-DEF
 ‘Who came to the lecture?’
 b. *Kor mange studenta*(som) kom på forelesninga?*
 how many students SOM came on lecture-DEF
 ‘How many students came to the lecture?’

In turn this can be said to bear on the lack of a complexity constraint in subject *wh*-questions. If optional V2 is not allowed in such cases, then a confinement to only short *wh*-constituents would mean that the dialect would not allow

Table 3. *wh*-grammar for the Tromsø dialect

Tromsø	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	+	–	#
<i>wh</i> [–SUBJ]	+	+	+

Table 4. *wh*-grammar for Trøndelag (based on Nordgård 1988:32)

Trøndelag	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	+	+	+
<i>wh</i> [–SUBJ]	+	+	+

complex *wh*-subjects at all. In any event, the Tromsø dialect can be assigned the settings in Table 3.

These settings are indirectly supported by Nordgård’s findings for “Northern Norwegian” which would subsume the Tromsø dialect: the informants that fall in this group in Nordgård’s study require *som*-insertion after *wh*-subjects, and they also allow complex *wh*-subjects followed by *som*. However, there were only four informants in the group, and we have no information about where they come from in this vast geographical area,¹⁴ and in particular not whether they were speakers of the Tromsø dialect or not. The northern Norwegian dialect area is indeed therefore one where more detailed studies are called for.¹⁵

3.4 The Trøndelag dialect

The dialect (group) with the highest number of informants in Nordgård’s study is “Mid Norwegian”. 10 of the 25 informants in his study belong to this group. This dialect (type) is spoken in the Trøndelag counties, i.e in the districts around the city of Trondheim, and in the following I will refer to this dialect as the ‘Trøndelag’ dialect. Trøndelag borders with Nordmøre in the southwest, eastern Norway in the southeast, Sweden (Jämtland) in the east, and Northern Norway in the north. Based on the information provided by Nordgård (1985, 1988) this dialect will have the properties given in Table 4 with respect to lack of V2 in root *wh*-questions.

The settings for non-subject *wh*-questions are the same as in the Tromsø dialect: V2 is optional, and there is a complexity constraint on the *wh*-constituent. Unlike in the Tromsø dialect the same situation holds also for subject *wh*-questions: V2 is allowed also in such questions, and complex *wh*-subjects are not allowed without V2.

Table 5. *wh*-grammar for Hordaland (based on Nordgård 1985: 17, 1988: 32)

Hordaland	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	+	+	??
<i>wh</i> [-SUBJ]	-/?	#	#

Table 6. *wh*-grammar for Rogaland (based on Nordgård 1988: 32)

Rogaland	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	+	+	+
<i>wh</i> [-SUBJ]	+	+	+

3.5 The Hordaland dialect

The dialect(s) of the county Hordaland, i.e the districts around the city of Bergen was briefly mentioned above as one where non-V2 is allowed in subject *wh*-questions only. There were only 3 Hordaland informants in Nordgård’s study, however, and on certain points the picture is somewhat unclear for this dialect. Nordgård notes the following:

“Only one of the sentences with complex *wh*-phrases without inversion is accepted [...] It is impossible in the Hordaland dialects to have non-inverted word-order when the fronted complex determiner [e.g. *how many*] is a non-subject. However, judgements vary when subject *wh*-phrases of this sort are fronted. 50% of these constructions are accepted. [...] Fronted *wh*-adjuncts without inversion cause ungrammaticality, though one informant accepts the variant with *hvor* (=where).” (Nordgård 1985: 17)

On the basis of this I would therefore render the properties of the Hordaland dialect as in Table 5: the question marks indicate uncertainty.

Below I will reveal that I expect further studies to show that, at least for one consistent group of speakers, non-V2 is only possible in subject *wh*-questions and furthermore that for these speakers there is no complexity constraint on the subject *wh*-constituent.¹⁶

3.6 The Rogaland dialect

The dialect of the county Rogaland is represented by only 2 informants in Nordgård’s study, and the properties of this dialect is given in Table 6.

Notice that the Rogaland dialect thus gets the same settings as the Trøndelag dialect. The two dialects are nevertheless distinct in Nordgård’s study:

Table 7. *wh*-grammar for the Nord-Østerdalen dialect (based on Lie 1992:69)

N.-Østerdalen	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	–	#	#
<i>wh</i> [–SUBJ]	+	+	?

(bare) *wh*-adverbs are better with non-V2 in Rogaland than in Trøndelag. In other words, this finding in Nordgård’s study may suggest that the Rogaland dialect is sensitive to a distinction between arguments and adjuncts and allow adjuncts to be more complex than arguments.

However, the finding may coincide with a difference in complexity for one of the two *wh*-adverbs (‘how’ and ‘when’) used in Nordgård’s investigation: the standard (Bokmål) *hvordan* ‘how’ used in the questionnaire normally has the form *koss* (monosyllabic) in Rogaland but *korsn* (disyllabic; syllabic *-n*) in Trøndelag. This fact, paired with the modest number of informants, certainly calls for more detailed investigations of the Rogaland dialect(s) – for the purpose of the present discussion I will interpret the uncertainty in favor of grouping the Rogaland dialect with the Trøndelag dialect.

3.7 Eastern Norwegian dialects

Lie (1992:69) notes that the dialect of Nord-Østerdalen is yet different from the varieties that we have described above. Nord-Østerdalen lies in the north-eastern part of eastern Norway, adjacent to Trøndelag to the north and Sweden (Härjedalen) to the east. According to Lie a speaker of this dialect informs him that non-V2 is only possible with non-subjects, and moreover optionally so (cf. Section 2.3). No information is given as to whether a complexity constraint accompanies the non-V2 option. The reported properties of the Nord-Østerdalen dialect can thus be rendered as in Table 7. Along with the Hordaland dialect the Nord-Østerdalen dialect would then represent a dialect type with the least degree of non-V2 in main clause *wh*-questions.

For the sake of completeness we may finally give the properties of the Norwegian dialects that just like Standard Norwegian do not allow non-V2 in root *wh*-questions at all, i.e. central eastern Norwegian and southeastern Norwegian (henceforth ‘Eastern Norwegian’ for simplicity). These dialects have the properties in Table 8.

Altogether we have now described seven dialects and seen how they differ from each other at a more fine-grained level with respect to the lack of V2 in

Table 8. *wh*-grammar for Eastern Norwegian

Eastern Norwegian	non-V2	“optional” V2	short <i>wh</i> only
<i>wh</i> [+SUBJ]	–	#	#
<i>wh</i> [–SUBJ]	–	#	#

main clause *wh*-questions. Given that two of them, Trøndelag and Rogaland, have the same (idealized) settings in the typology, we have six different varieties. At a purely descriptive level we can order these varieties as follows with respect to degree of non-V2 allowed.

- (39) Nordmøre >> Tromsø >> Trøndelag/Rogaland >> Hordaland and Nord-Østerdalen

Six varieties are less than half of what the typology predicts to be possible *a priori* (6 of 16), and an interesting question is of course whether the descriptive typology can be further restricted on theoretical grounds. Below, when developing a microparametric account of the variation, I will argue that this is indeed the case.

4. A microparametric account

4.1 The basic logic

My account of the variation across *wh*-grammars in Norwegian dialects will largely rest on the following three ‘parameters’:

- (40) i. Whether or not there is a lexicalization requirement on interrogative C.
 ii. Whether or not short *wh*-elements may lexicalize C.
 iii. Whether or not the element *som* can lexicalize C.

In turn these three parameters will hinge on a variety of theoretical assumptions, some of which will be either introduced or alluded to when necessary. Consider first, however, the basics of the account.

Verb Second, *qua* V-to-C movement, can be regarded as a lexicalization requirement on the C head: the finite verb (head)moves to C to meet the lexicalization requirement. If then C is really a variety of heads, viewed either as a sequence of heads as in the split-CP approach initiated by Rizzi (1997) or as different feature compositions in C, one may easily envisage that the lexicaliza-

tion requirement is distributional over the set of C heads. In other words, the source of partial V2 could simply be that the lexicalization requirement does not apply to all C heads, only to some of them. This is the general idea to be advocated here.

For the sake of simplicity let us initially take the set of C heads to have just two members, *declarative* and *interrogative* C, henceforth C^{decl} and C^{int} . For Standard Norwegian, and Germanic more generally (except English), there will then be a lexicalization requirement on both of the C heads, hence V2 in both declarative and interrogative clauses.

As for the majority of the Norwegian dialects described in the previous section I will actually argue that also they just like Standard Norwegian, have a lexicalization requirement on both of the C heads. However, in some of these dialect other elements than the verb may serve to lexicalize C^{int} . In particular, I will follow Taraldsen (1986a) in assuming that in some varieties the short/simple *wh*-elements have head status and can fill the C^{int} position. Moreover, in some of the varieties, but not in all, the element *som* has head status and can lexicalize C^{int} .

This gives us the following logic, where ‘ $[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$ ’ is used to denote the lexicalization requirement on C^{int} . In a dialect with $[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$ where short *wh*-elements are heads, V-to-C movement is not necessary/possible when a short *wh*-element fills C. Such a dialect will exhibit absence of V2 in *wh*-questions, but only when the *wh*-constituent is of the short type. In a dialect with $[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$ where *som* is a head that may fill C, V-to-C movement is not called for in subject *wh*-questions, and moreover also complex *wh*-constituents may precede a C^{int} filled by *som* since such *wh*-constituents will not be involved in the lexicalization of the head. A necessary assumption in this case is of course that only subject *wh*-constituents can trigger the merger of *som*, and this view will be elaborated on below. Finally, in a dialect where there is no $[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$ both short, simple and complex *wh*-constituents may occur with no V2. The effects of the three parameters can thus be summarized as follows:

- (41) i. No $[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$ → absence of V2 in *wh*-questions
 ii. Short *wh* = X° → short *wh* may appear without V2
 iii. *som* = X° → absence of V2 allowed in subject *wh*-questions

One may rightfully say that these three parameters do not count as parameters in the traditional syntactic sense since they only affect a very small part of grammar, and two of them even relate to specific lexical items or classes. But at the point in time of theoretical linguistics when the status of the traditional

“big” parameters (e.g. the pro-drop, directionality, polysynthesis parameters etc.) are questioned, the kind of “small”, partially lexical parameters employed here might be what we are left with in order to account for linguistic variation (and when some of them bundle up, for whatever reason, we get the impression of big parameters at work). This is needless to say a question too far reaching for the current discussion, but nevertheless one to bear in mind.

Returning to the subject matter, a number of additional questions need to be addressed in order to give a full account of the situation. First of all we need to give some motivation for why a grammar can choose to treat short *wh*-elements differently from other *wh*-elements. Second, we have already noted the necessary assumption that the merger of *som* can only be triggered by a *wh*-subject. Another issue concerns the question of optional V2 in grammars that allow non-V2. A fourth question arises with respect to the general absence of V-to-C movement in embedded clauses in all varieties of Norwegian.

These issues have all been addressed in detail in Vangsnes (2004) and Westergaard and Vangsnes (2005) where the basic account above is cast in terms of a split-CP system with a series of independent functional C heads. In the following I will address these issues to a bare minimum, but still so that the current analysis makes sense, however leaving out the fourth issue concerning the general main/embedded asymmetry with respect to V-to-C movement. For further details the reader is referred to the works mentioned (and for the fourth issue in particular to Vangsnes 2004: 50ff.).

4.2 Simple versus complex *wh*-elements

Let us first of all consider the conjecture that short *wh*-elements may be heads that can be merged in C^{int} , an idea first introduced in Taraldsen (1986a). There are certain technical problems related to this idea given that we surely would like also short *wh*-constituents to originate in argumental (specifier) positions. In other words, we would have to allow for spec-to-head movement, or some other mechanism that ensures a relation between C^{int} and the θ -position of the *wh*-constituent. Trusting that a theory of movement/displacement will indeed allow this, we should consider how it could be that some dialects make a distinction between simple and complex *wh*-elements. Let us consider the *wh*-elements of the Tromsø dialect as a basis for discussing this.

As we recall from Section 2.1 the short, monosyllabic *wh*-elements *ka* ‘what’, *kem* ‘who’, and *kor* ‘where’ all allow non-V2 whereas the disyllabic *wh*-adverbs *korsn* ‘how’, *koffør* ‘why’, and *katti* ‘when’ do not, and neither do full

noun phrases with a *wh*-determiner. The examples used to illustrate this are repeated here.

- (21) a. *Ka han Jens sa?* Tromsø
 what ART Jens said
 'What did Jens say?'
 b. *Kem han Jens snakka me?*
 who ART Jens talked with
 'Who did Jens talk to?'
 c. *Kor han Jens bor?*
 where ART Jens lives
 'Where does Jens live?'
- (22) a. **Korsn han Jens vesste det?* Tromsø
 how ART Jens knew that
 b. **Koffør han Jens sa det?*
 why ART Jens said that
 c. **Katti han Jens kommer?*
 when ART Jens comes
 d. **Ka slags bil han Jens har kjøpt sæ?*
 what kind-of car ART Jens has bought himself

The disyllabic *wh*-adverbs can clearly be argued to be morphologically complex. At least diachronically, and maybe even synchronically, they may be analyzed as indicated in (42).

- (42) a. *korsn* 'how' ← *kor* + *-sn* 'how/where'¹⁷ + *SUFF*¹⁸ Tromsø
 b. *koffør* 'why' ← *kor* + *før* 'how/where + for'
 c. *katti* 'when' ← *ka* + *tid* 'what + time'

As for the short *wh*-elements, no morphological complexity can be discerned, but we know for sure that these elements stem from lexical items that were inflected in earlier stages of Norwegian. The pronouns *ka* 'what' and *kem* 'who' stem from Old Norse *hva-t* and *hver-r*, respectively, which both were inflected for number and case (and gender) – the indicated forms are the nominative singular ones. The Old Norse equivalent of the locative *wh*-adverb *kor* on the other hand was equipped with directional affixes which were since lost: *hvar* 'where', *hva-ðan* 'where-from', *hvar-t* 'where-to'.

The idea then is that the loss of case, number, and directional affixes on the (now) simple *wh*-words made it possible to reanalyze them from being projecting (morphosyntactically complex) to being non-projecting (morphosyn-

ded subject *wh*-clauses, and subject exclamatives, and absent in the non-subject cases, *som* is also obligatory in restrictive relative clauses with a subject gap (but optional otherwise). The latter fact has a clear parallel in English relatives, cf. *the woman* *(*who*) *loves you* vs. *the woman* (*whom*) *you love*.

On the basis of this I will argue that *som* is merged in a (high) subject position below CP as a kind of expletive subject in cases where the subject is extracted directly from a lower subject position. In other words, *som* licenses a subject position that the “true” subjects skips when it moves leftwards to CP. This proposal bears a clear affinity with the treatment of *som* in Taraldsen (1986b), and for further theoretical motivation I refer to Vangsnes (2004) and Westergaard and Vangsnes (2005).¹⁹ What is important for the present discussion is that I will, as mentioned above, assume that the dialects differ with respect to treating *som* as a specifier or as a head, i.e. somewhat similar to the treatment of the short *wh*-elements. The intended effect of this will be that in a dialect where *som* is a head in the clausal structure it may (head)move to C^{int} and meet [_{lex}C^{int}], leaving V-to-C movement unnecessary, and hence opening up for lack of V2. In fact, merger of *som* will in such cases be preferred over verb movement, and this will be the account of why some dialects do not allow optional V2 in subject *wh*-questions: the merger of *som* and subsequent movement of it to C^{int} is more economical than moving the verb.

The claim that *som* differs across the dialects with respect to \pm head status may appear highly stipulative. On conceptual grounds the claim may be partially motivated with reference to diachronic/etymological facts: the element is derived from the same root as the adjective ‘same’ (Old Norse *samr*, Greek *hōmos*, Latin *simul*-), and the historically first use of the element in Old Norse is as a comparative complementizer/preposition. This adjectival and correlative (argumental) origin along with the fact that *som* in Danish may be replaced by the true expletive *der* ‘there’ in cases of subject extraction (see Note 19), can be taken in favor of treating the element as a specifier. On the other hand, it bears the many characteristics of a complementizer (short, sentence initial, stressless etc.) and one could therefore argue that it should be regarded as a clausal head. This duality is exactly what I will argue is reflected in the dialects. Admittedly, the matter deserves further exploration in future work.

4.4 Optional V2

Consider then the fact that V2 can be optional alongside non-V2 in the *wh*-questions of some of the dialects, as for instance in the non-subject *wh*-

questions of the Tromsø dialect. A set of important facts related to the $\pm V2$ distinction concerns the relative placement of non-*wh* subjects and sentence adverbs. In non-subject *wh*-questions with V2 the subject may appear either before or after a sentence adverb as illustrated by the examples in (44) from the Tromsø dialect.

- (44) a. *Ka mente egentli han Ola med det der?* Tromsø
 what meant really ART Ola with that there
 b. *Ka mente han Ola egentli med det der?*
 what meant ART Ola really with that there
 ‘What did Ola really mean by that?’

In cases with non-V2 on the other hand, the subject *must* precede sentence adverbs. This is illustrated in (45).

- (45) a. *Ka han Ola egentli mente med det der?* Tromsø
 what ART Ola really meant with that there
 b. **Ka egentli han Ola mente med det der?*
 what really ART Ola meant with that there
 ‘What did Ola really mean by that?’
 c. **Ka han Ola mente egentli med det der?*
 what ART Ola meant really with that there

This difference between V2 and non-V2 cases can be viewed in the light of combining Westergaard’s (2003a, 2003b) finding about the role of the information value of the subject with Nilsen’s (1997, 2003) general claim that subjects that follow sentence adverbs are focused (see also Svenonius 2002). Recall that Westergaard found the subjects of V2 (non-subject) *wh*-questions to be (predominantly) informationally new. Given that ‘new information’ involves focalization (in some sense), Westergaard’s finding squares with Nilsen’s claim.

This matter is discussed in detail in both Vangsnes (2004) and Westergaard and Vangsnes (2005), and slightly different accounts of the facts are given. Without going into details, however, the central claim in both accounts is that the finite verb may move for other reasons than to lexicalize interrogative C, notably to license either AgrS°/Fin(iteness)° or Foc(us)°. The first kind of movement obtains in the context of new subjects: on the assumption that new subjects occupy, and stay in, a low IP position, the verb moves leftwards to license a higher functional head which would otherwise be licensed by a *given* subject (i.e. either Agrs° or Fin°, depending on the account). Verb movement to the left peripheral Foc° head on the other hand obtains in the context

of focalization more generally, and may thus occur also in the context of a given subject.

4.5 Pulling things together

I have now sketched some of the necessary underlying assumptions for the microparametric account sketched in 4.1. More in depth discussions have been put aside in order to make the presentation of how the microparameters work clearer. In the following I will now show how the various dialects presented in Section 3 can be dealt with by the microparametric account. Let us first repeat the effects of the three microparameters.

- (41) i. No $[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$ → absence of V2 in *wh*-questions
- ii. Short *wh* = X° → short *wh* may appear without V2
- iii. *som* = X° → absence of V2 allowed in subject *wh*-questions

Consider first of all the microparameter settings for Eastern Norwegian (and Standard Norwegian), i.e. the variety which does not show any lack of V2 in *wh*-questions.

Table 9. Microparameter settings in Eastern Norwegian (and Standard Norwegian)

$[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$	short <i>wh</i> = X°	<i>som</i> = X°
+	–	–

This dialect has a lexicalization requirement on C^{int} , and since neither the short *wh*-elements nor *som* are heads no absence of V2 should arise.

The Tromsø dialect has the following settings.

Table 10. Microparameter settings in the Tromsø dialect

$[_{\text{lex}}C^{\text{int}}]$	short <i>wh</i> = X°	<i>som</i> = X°
+	+	+

The Tromsø dialect also has a lexicalization requirement on C^{int} , but since short *wh*-elements are heads they may meet this requirement. Since *som* is also a head, it too can meet the requirement, and as discussed above *som* rather than the finite verb will always be the “lexicalizer” of C^{int} in subject *wh*-questions. Moreover, since *som* lexicalizes C^{int} in subject questions, there is no complexity constraint on the *wh*-constituent in such cases. In non-subject questions

on the other hand only short *wh*-elements may occur without V2, and V2 is optionally allowed.

The Nordmøre dialect has the following settings.

Table 11. Microparameter settings in the Nordmøre dialect

$[\text{lex}C^{\text{int}}]$	short <i>wh</i> = X°	<i>som</i> = X°
–	?	+

In the Nordmøre dialect there is no lexicalization requirement on C^{int} , and therefore non-V2 obtains without any complexity constraint on the *wh*-constituents. Moreover, V2 is not possible in subject *wh*-questions since *som* is a head, the reason being that it is preferred over the finite verb as a lexicalizer of C^{int} .²⁰ V2 may optionally arise in non-subject *wh*-questions however, as a reflex of verb movement to satisfy other requirements than $[\text{lex}C^{\text{int}}]$. As for the status of the short *wh*-elements it is not possible to decide whether they are clitic or not since the effect will be overridden by the other relevant properties of the dialect.

In the Trøndelag and Rogaland dialects, which we recall are basically alike with respect to the syntax of *wh*-questions, the microparameters have the settings in Table 12.

Table 12. Microparameter settings in the Trøndelag and Rogaland dialects

$[\text{lex}C^{\text{int}}]$	short <i>wh</i> = X°	<i>som</i> = X°
+	+	–

There is a $[\text{lex}C^{\text{int}}]$ requirement, and since *som* is not a head whereas the short *wh*-elements are, non-V2 can only obtain with the short *wh*-elements in subject and non-subject questions alike. V2 may furthermore optionally obtain in both cases, since verb movement may occur to meet other licensing requirements.

We are now left with the two varieties that show the least degree of non-V2, namely the Hordland and Nord-Østerdalen dialects. These dialects show “complete separation” between subject and non-subject *wh*-questions: as we recall the Hordland dialect allows non-V2 in subject *wh*-questions only whereas the Nord-Østerdalen dialect allegedly only allows non-V2 in non-subject *wh*-questions. This is actually the most difficult kind of situation to account for by the current approach.

Recall that there were some uncertainty with respect to the complexity constraint for the Hordaland dialect. The proposed theory can however only account for a situation where the Hordaland dialect does not have a complexity constraint (in the subject *wh* cases). The reason is the following. If the Hordaland dialect only allows non-V2 in subject *wh*-questions, this must mean (i) that *som* is a head and (ii) that short *wh*-elements are not heads. If the short *wh*-elements were heads we would of course expect non-V2 to obtain also in non-subject questions, contrary to fact.²¹ On the other hand, given that *som* lexicalizes C^{int} (since it is a head), complex *wh*-constituents should be able to precede *som* (i.e. in Spec-CP).

I will therefore conjecture that the uncertainty in the data stems from the Hordaland dialect being in a transition phase, targetting the properties in Table 13. These properties entail that non-V2 obtains in subject *wh*-questions, and obligatorily so, and with no complexity constraint on the *wh*-constituent.

The variable concerning *som* in effect relates exclusively to subject *wh*-questions, but no variable that relates exclusively to non-subject *wh*-questions has been offered. Accordingly, the present theoretical approach cannot account for the reported properties of the Nord-Østerdalen dialect, i.e a situation where non-V2 is allowed in non-subject *wh*-questions only. If such cases in the dialect are due to the head status of the short *wh*-elements, there is no reason to expect that the short *wh*-elements should not also be able to lexicalize C^{int} and in turn be followed by *som* in subject *wh*-questions. Recall that the information about the Nord-Østerdalen dialect given in Lie (1992) was provided by one single speaker, and not integrated in a systematic grammatical study of the kind reported in Nordgård (1985, 1988). It therefore appears quite reasonable to await further studies of the Nord-Østerdalen dialect before we conclude that it represents a counterexample to the analysis developed here.

Lie does not provide information as to whether the Nord-Østerdalen dialect has a complexity constraint or not. In any event, neither a version with a complexity constraint nor one without can be accounted for by the present theory. This immediately reduces the number of predicted varieties from 16 to 14. Also other varieties predicted by the descriptive typology are ruled out by the present theoretical approach. We do for instance not expect any vari-

Table 13. (Targetted) microparametric settings of the Hordaland dialect

$[_{lex}C^{int}]$	short <i>wh</i> = X°	<i>som</i> = X°
+	–	+

Table 14. Summary of microparameter settings for some Norwegian *wh*-grammars

	$[\text{lex}C^{\text{int}}]$	short <i>wh</i> = X°	<i>som</i> = X°
Nordmøre	–	?	+
Tromsø	+	+	+
Trøndelag/Rogaland	+	+	–
Hordaland	+	–	+
Eastern Norwegian	+	–	–

ety to exhibit a complexity constraint in subject non-V2 *wh*-questions and not in non-subject ones: lack of a complexity constraint in the non-subject cases can only obtain if there is no $[\text{lex}C^{\text{int}}]$ requirement, in which case the requirement does not apply to subject *wh*-questions either. Moreover, the theoretical account does not leave open the possibility for obligatory non-V2 in the non-subject *wh*-questions, and varieties with this property have so far not been encountered either. All in all this means that we, according to the current approach, may expect further empirical investigations to reveal at most 5–6 additional varieties of Norwegian *wh*-grammars to exist.

4.6 Diachronic speculations

The present account leaves the Nord-Østerdalen dialect, as described in Lie (1992), unaccounted for. The proposed properties of the other varieties discussed here can be summarized as in Table 14, with Eastern Norwegian being the only dialect which does not allow absence of V2 in root *wh*-questions.

A rather interesting question is how the cross-dialectal variation has arisen. Given that obligatory V2 is the most widespread situation in Scandinavian main clause *wh*-questions in general, and given that this was the situation in Old Norse too, it appears well-founded to assume that the properties exhibited by the eastern Norwegian dialects were the original ones in all dialects.

Starting from a grammar of the eastern Norwegian type we can then envisage the following “chain of events” leading to the current cross-dialectal situation. If *som* is reanalyzed as a head, we will get the Hordaland dialect (as idealized above), i.e. a dialect with non-V2 in subject *wh*-constructions only, and without the complexity constraint. If on the other hand the short *wh*-elements are reanalyzed as heads, we will get a dialect of the Trøndelag/Rogaland type, i.e. with non-V2 in both subject and non-subject *wh*-questions, but with a complexity constraint in both contexts.

If both of the reanalyses take place we will get the Tromsø dialect, i.e. a dialect type where the complexity constraint only obtains in non-subject *wh*-questions. If on the basis of a Tromsø dialect type the $[\text{lexC}^{\text{int}}]$ requirement is lost, we get the Nordmøre dialect type, i.e. where non-V2 is required in subject *wh*-questions and possible in non-subject *wh*-questions, and where there is no complexity constraint. In fact, loss of the $[\text{lexC}^{\text{int}}]$ requirement can also obtain from the Hordaland grammar type – as we noted earlier it is not possible to tell whether the short *wh*-elements of the Nordmøre dialect are clitics since the overt evidence is overridden by the properties of the other variables.²²

These speculations can be summarized as in (46) and (47).

- (46) i. *som* is reanalyzed as $X^\circ \rightarrow$ 'Hordaland'
- ii. The $[\text{lexC}^{\text{int}}]$ requirement is lost \rightarrow 'Nordmøre'
- (47) i. short *wh* are reanalyzed as $X^\circ \rightarrow$ 'Trøndelag/Rogaland'
- ii. *som* is reanalyzed as $X^\circ \rightarrow$ 'Tromsø'
- iii. The $[\text{lexC}^{\text{int}}]$ requirement is lost \rightarrow 'Nordmøre'

This account predicts one particular unattested dialect type, namely one which is minimally different from the Nordmøre dialect in that *som* is (still) a specifier. In such a dialect type V2 should be possible alongside non-V2 in subject *wh*-questions, for example if the verb is attracted by some medial left peripheral head, e.g. Foc° . Diachronically speaking we could get this dialect type if the $[\text{lexC}^{\text{int}}]$ parameter is changed on the basis of a Trøndelag/Rogaland grammar type, i.e. without an intermediate reanalysis of *som* as a head.

Let us call this so far unattested dialect type 'Norwegian X'. The question of whether Norwegian X actually exists relates to a more general question: is it possible to change directly from a grammar type of the eastern Norwegian kind to one of the Nordmøre or Norwegian X type? In other words, is it possible to have loss of the $[\text{lexC}^{\text{int}}]$ requirement without a preceding reanalysis of either *som* or the class of short *wh*-elements? At a more general level this is a question of whether the properties of a functional head can change without being preceded by more low level changes pertaining to the morphosyntax of lexical items or classes.

On purely conceptual grounds we may argue that the change concerning C^{int} at least is more likely to take place if it is subsequent to changes in the $\pm\text{XP}$ status of *som* and/or short *wh*-elements. A first prerequisite is that we acknowledge that the C^{int} -parameter is of a different and more abstract kind than the two other microparameters. The latter two affect overt lexical elements, whereas the C^{int} -parameter affects an (abstract) functional category, and one

could argue that whereas changes in the properties of lexical elements can be triggered by (accidental) phonological and morphological changes, or maybe even more or less at will, changes affecting an (abstract) syntactic category require overt syntactic triggers in the *primary linguistic data* ('PLD'). Reanalysis of either *som* and/or the short *wh*-elements as heads in one generation of individuals arguably yields the presence of non-V2 word order in (some) main clause *wh*-questions in the PLD, and in a situation where the language-acquiring child does not detect for instance a complexity constraint in the PLD, the way is open to conclude that there is no lexicalization requirement on C^{int} in the target grammar.

Evidently, the PLD produced by speakers who have a grammar with *som* = X° will, in principle, provide the strongest "support" for loss of the $[_{lex}C^{int}]$ requirement since such a grammar will allow complex *wh*-constituents in subject *wh*-questions. It is thus also interesting to ask whether the reanalysis of *som* as X° by itself is a necessary prerequisite for the re-setting of the $[_{lex}C^{int}]$ parameter, and that in fact the Nordmøre dialect type cannot evolve directly from the Trøndelag/Rogaland dialect type without passing through a stage where it is like the Tromsø dialect type. If this is the case, Norwegian X should not exist.

If a comprehensive investigation of Norwegian dialects turns out to show that Norwegian X is never encountered we have reasons to assume that the change of the $[_{lex}C^{int}]$ parameter indeed requires the presence of complex *wh*-constituents in root non-V2 *wh*-questions in the PLD (in effect subject questions allowed by *som* being a head).

5. Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper has been to systematize information in the literature about the geographical variation pertaining to lack of V2 in main clause *wh*-questions across Norwegian dialects. On the basis of the systematization I have suggested a specific microparametric account that rests on the following variables:

- (40) i. Whether or not there is a lexicalization requirement on interrogative C.
- ii. Whether or not short *wh*-elements may lexicalize C.
- iii. Whether or not the element *som* can lexicalize C.

I have shown how these microparameters can deal with the attested variation and also how the account makes certain predictions about what other varieties we should expect to find.

A more general picture that has emerged from the exposition is that microparametric variation can be viewed to a large extent as an effect of lexical variation, i.e. variation in the inventory of and properties of lexical elements and classes. The last two variables in (40) arguably concern lexical variation in this sense. The first variable on the other hand is more syntactic in nature to the effect that it concerns a particular part of the clausal structure, not a lexical element as such (although also abstract parts of clausal structure presumably are represented in the mental lexicon).

I have also put forward some speculations concerning the diachronic development of the attested variation, and a possible restriction on a change in the syntactic parameter is that such a change must be preceded by changes in at least one of the lexical parameters. The main conceptual argument for this is that changes in the lexical parameters in turn yield the presence of non-V2 structures in the material which subsequently serve as input for the next (or later) generation(s) of speakers. In other words, the basic line of reasoning is that changes in the lexical parameters, possibly triggered by phonological and/or morphological changes pave the ground for a more radical (truly) syntactic change.

Whether this last speculation as well as all the other proposals presented in this paper can be maintained is strictly speaking an empirical matter. As should be evident from the presentation, although the lack of V2 in main clause *wh*-questions in Norwegian dialects has received considerable attention among both dialectologists and generative linguists, the phenomenon is still far from exhaustively studied. Theoretical speculations of the sort presented here will hopefully provide a better and sharpened basis for further investigations.

Notes

* Versions of this paper have been presented on a number of occasions between June 2003 and February 2005, and I thank the audiences at the various presentations for fruitful feedback. This version of the paper is a revised and much reduced version of Vangsnes (2004), and for comments, advice, and critical remarks during the revision I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer, Peter Svenonius, Michal Starke, and Marit R. Westergaard. Special thanks to Holger Hagan for invaluable help with the map in Section 1. This work has been supported by the Norwegian Research Council through grant no. 148440/530.

1. The term 'Standard Norwegian' does not have a well-defined denotation, especially not for spoken language. The use of regional and even local varieties is widespread at the national level, and there is little diglossia (i.e. standard vs. dialect) in the population. 'Standard Norwegian' should therefore be taken first and foremost to refer to the two *written* standards of Norwegian, *Nynorsk* and *Bokmål*. At the same time it should be noted that the variety spoken in and around the capital Oslo in eastern Norway is a dominant variety, and presumably comes closest to being a standard spoken variety of Norwegian. (Kristoffersen 2000 refers to this variety as *Standard Eastern Norwegian*.)

2. The fact that even the *Nynorsk* standard variety requires Verb Second is a significant one since users of the *Nynorsk* written standard very often are native speakers of dialects which in fact allow lack of V2 in *wh*-questions, the main "stronghold" of the *Nynorsk* standard being western Norway. Throughout the various dialect examples will be rendered in a way reflecting the actual pronunciation, still keeping with certain orthographical conventions that hold for read Standard Norwegian.

3. The following list, which is unlikely to be complete, indicates this: Iversen (1918:37), Elstad (1982), Sandøy (1987:104), Nordgård (1985, 1988), Åfarli (1986), Taraldsen (1986a), Lie (1992), Nilsen (1996), Fiva (1996), Rice and Svenonius (1998), Westergaard (2003a, 2003b), Westergaard and Vangsnes (2005), and Westergaard (2005a, 2005b).

4. As discussed by Nilsen (2003) for Norwegian, and Egerland (1998) for Swedish, focus particles like *berre* 'just/simply', *nesten* 'almost' etc. may intervene between a the initial constituent and the finite verb as in example (i), but on the view that Verb Second involves movement of the verb past the subject (in non-subject initial clauses), this does not involve absence of the V2-effect.

- (i) *Difor berre måtte eg ha dei skoa.*
 Therefore just had-to I have those shoes-DEF
 'For that reason I simply had to have those shoes.'

5. The presence of *som* in non-subject *wh*-clauses is to some extent possible for some speakers of Norwegian. Åfarli and Eide (2003:257f.) argue that *som* can be used if the non-subject *wh*-constituent is a complex DP, and they give the following example to illustrate this.

- (i) *Eg veit kva mann (?som) du burde treffe.*
 I know what man SOM you should meet
 'I know which man you should meet.'

In this respect it is of some interest that all four examples of *som* following a non-subject *wh*-constituent that I found in a search of the Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts (OCTN) involve the simple *wh* pronoun *kva/hva* 'what' (see Vangsnes 2004:26). To the extent that the corpus search provides any useful information it does not support the claim made by Åfarli and Eide.

6. Exceptions to this concern northern Norwegian dialects that have either replaced Finnish and/or Saami or been heavily influenced by these non-Scandinavian languages. One example of this is the dialect of the municipality Nordreisa in the northern part of Troms county, thoroughly studied by Sollid (2005) (see also Nilsen [=Sollid] 1996). Sollid investigated the

language shift in the village Sappen in Nordreisa which was predominantly Finnish-speaking a few generations ago, and found that older speakers of the contemporary dialect, to a significant degree, accept non-V2 in main clause declaratives with a non-subject initial constituent (i.e. topicalizations) and not just in main clause *wh*-questions. (See furthermore Note 15.)

7. The locative particle is presumably cognate with the German suffix *-hin* as in *wohin* 'where-to', but the Norwegian *hen* is compatible with both an illative (as in German) and an inessive meaning (unlike German).

8. Nordmøre is the northernmost of the three districts that make up the county Møre og Romsdal. The other two parts are Romsdal and Sunnmøre.

9. As indicated by the question marks Åfarli found a preference for V2 with the disyllabic adverbs *kåfer* 'why' and *ka tid* 'when'. This preference for V2 with the *wh*-adverbs is noteworthy, but it is also worth noticing that we are not dealing with sharp ungrammaticality with non-V2 as in the Tromsø dialect. The preference for V2 may in fact stem from variation among the informants in the study: there were (only) 10 informants of varying age from 6 different locations within Nordmøre, and Åfarli's presentation does not clarify how the sentences were judged by the individual informants.

10. It has been claimed (see Taraldsen 1986a; Rice & Svenonius 1998) that V2 is not allowed in the Tromsø dialect in non-subject *wh*-questions with short *wh*-elements. In other words *Wh-SUB-Vfin* should be the only option in such cases. The proponents of this view claim that to the extent that the word order *Wh-Vfin-SUB* is accepted (and/or produced) by speakers of the dialect, this is simply due to influence from Standard Norwegian. The main reason for advocating such a view is of course that many theoretical linguists hold, on principled grounds, that true grammar-internal optionality cannot exist. Given the claim here that the choice of V2 or non-V2 is pragmatically governed this principled stand need not be upheld.

11. Observations pointing to this generalization have been made also in the earliest works that mention non-V2 in root *wh*-questions. Iversen (1918:37, fn. 2) comments on Heggstad's (1914) claim that the non-inverted word order only occur with pronominal subjects and says that "[t]his may be said to be the rule also for the Tromsø city dialect, but it is by no means strongly obeyed, one can every now and then hear examples like: *ka han Nilsen si?* 'what Nilsen says?'" (my translation, ØAV). At a general level Westergaard's finding is furthermore corroborated by the following statement that Lie (1992:73) gives about his own Hedalen dialect, spoken in the district of Valdres in the "inner", western part of eastern Norway: "*Hå du si?* (What you say?) is according to my intuition preferably used to have someone repeat something. If one encourages someone to say something new, I would rather say *Hå si du?* [What say you?]" (my translation, ØAV). Although the statement is somewhat vague with respect to information value it at least suggests that pragmatic factors govern the choice of V2 over non-V2.

12. It should be noted that also subjects promoted from object position (i.e. subjects of passives and unaccusatives) trigger the insertion of *som*. Extracted *wh*-subjects of embedded clauses on the other hand do not trigger *som*-insertion at the matrix level.

- (i) *Kem (*som) du trur (som) vinne Idol?*
 who SOM you think SOM wins Idol
 'Who do you think will win Idol?'

On the other hand, a fact documented by Nordgård (1985, 1988) is that many speakers of dialects that allow non-V2 in root *wh*-clauses, allow *som* to be inserted at the left edge of embedded *wh*-questions when the embedded *wh*-subject is extracted, as indicated in the example above. The interesting aspect of this is that to the extent Standard Norwegian (and Eastern Norwegian dialects) would allow a complementizer in this position, it would be the default "declarative" complementizer *at* 'that' as in corresponding versions without subject extraction,

13. Åfarli's claim about the Nordmøre dialect is corroborated by the finding in Nordgård (1985). Nordgård's informants are from "Møre", which subsumes Nordmøre, and they require insertion of *som* in root questions with *wh*-subjects.

14. In general terms 'Northern Norway' signifies the three counties Nordland, Troms, and Finnmark which together make up more than half of the total stretch between the southernmost and northernmost tips of Norway. From a dialectological point of view the linguistic confinement of 'Northern Norwegian' more or less follows the county border between Nord-Trøndelag and Nordland (and the state borders with Sweden, Finland, and Russia), although the very southernmost part of Nordland may be considered a transition area (in particular with respect to prosody).

15. Variation with respect to non-V2 in *wh*-questions has indeed been noticed within the Northern Norwegian dialect area. Most importantly, Nilsen (1996) has documented that the dialect spoken in the municipality Nordreisa to the northeast of Tromsø allows complex *wh*-constituents in non-V2 non-subject clauses (see also Note 6). There is however an age difference so that younger speakers allow this to a lesser degree than older speakers. A significant factor in that respect concerns the fact that Nordreisa until recently had a significant population of Finnish-speaking inhabitants: 120 years ago Finnish was the dominant language in the municipality, and there was also a considerable Saami speaking part of the population. Both Finnish and Saami are (generalized) non-V2 languages, and the language shift that has taken place can be seen as part of the reason why many of the dialect speakers do not have a complexity constraint. In fact, in a more recent study of the dialect Sollid [=Nilsen] (2005) shows that older speakers also allow non-V2 in other main clause constructions, notably topicalizations, and furthermore allow other non-standard syntactic phenomena that can be argued to be due to a Finnish substrate. A similar situation also seem to hold for the dialect of Kåfjord, which is the municipality immediately to the south of Nordreisa, and which has recently been studied by Westergaard (2005). This municipality is also characterized by a situation of language change and contact from/with Finnish and Saami.

16. Interestingly, the way I have described the (expected) Hordaland dialect is partially how Lie (1992) describes the dialect of the city Haugesund. This city lies in the northernmost part of the county Rogaland. This part, Haugalandet, is immediately adjacent to Hordaland, and Lie reports that an informant for the Haugesund dialect considers non-V2 possible only with *wh*-subjects. No information about complexity is given, however. Since what Lie conveys is

not compatible with the settings for the Rogaland dialect based on Nordgård's findings, this information about the Haugesund dialect may in turn suggest a split within the Rogaland dialects (i.e. that the relevant dividing line does not follow the Rogaland/Hordaland county border). In this respect it is of some relevance to note that there are other (mainly phonological) traits that the Haugalandet dialect(s) shares with dialects in the southern part of (coastal) Hordaland (to the north) and which distinguish them from Rogaland dialects further to the south, one prominent property being that the Haugalandet and southern coastal Hordaland dialects are low tone dialects. (The majority of western Norwegian dialects are high tone varieties.)

17. The *wh*-element *kor* has a dual origin in contemporary Norwegian. As a separate word it exists both as a locative *wh*-adverb corresponding to English *where* (Old Norse *hvar*) and as a degree adverb corresponding to English *how* (as in *how often* or *how big*) (Old Norse *hversu*). In order not to prejudge which of the two senses is involved in the complex *wh*-adverbs both of the English correspondences are given.

18. Westergaard and Vangsnes (2005) suggest that the *-sn* part of *korsn* is a contraction of *sånn* 'so, such' (itself a contraction of *sådan*). However, in Vangsnes (in prep.) a completely different account is developed, taking as its starting point the fact that *korsn* is also used as a *wh*-determiner: *korsn bil*, literally 'how car', can mean both 'which car' and 'what kind of car'. In brief the analysis is that *-s-* is a genitival head and *-n* the suffixed definite article (in the masculine singular).

19. One piece of independent evidence for treating *som* as an expletive comes from Danish where *som* in fact can be replaced by the regular expletive *der* in (embedded) *wh*-questions and relatives. This is pointed out by Taraldsen (1986b: 151ff.) who gives the following pair of examples to illustrate the parallel use of *som* and *der*.

- (i) a. *Vi ved hvem*(der) taler med Margrethe.* Danish
 we know who there talks with Margrethe
 'We know who is talking to Margrethe.'
 b. *Vi ved hvem*(som) taler med Margrethe.*
 we know who SOM talks with Margrethe
 'We know who is talking to Margrethe.'

Importantly, *der* can only replace *som* when the *wh*-constituent is the subject. This is best shown for relative clauses where *som* is optional (as in Norwegian) when the relativized constituent is a non-subject.

- (ii) a. *manden *(som/der) taler med Margrethe* Danish
 man-DEF SOM/there talks with Margrethe
 'the man who is talking to Margrethe'
 b. *manden (som/*der) Margrethe taler med*
 man-def SOM/there Margrethe talks with
 'the man who Margrethe is talking to'

20. A qualification of the discussion concerning *som* is needed in this case. In Section 4.3 it was argued that *som* always "wins" over verb movement with respect to meeting the $[_{\text{lex}}\text{C}^{\text{int}}]$

requirement. Moreover, as argued in Vangsnes (2004) and Westergaard and Vangsnes (2005) *som* is also preferred over verb movement to meet the other licensing requirements alluded to in the section on optional V2, i.e. to license AgrS°/Fin° or Foc°. Crucially in this respect, if *som* is a specifier rather than a head then verb movement will instead be the preferred option, in turn leaving merger of *som* unnecessary since moving the verb through AgrS°/Fin° will by hypothesis meet the licensing of the empty subject position that otherwise triggers the merger of the “expletive” *som*.

21. Recall that Nordgård (1985) reports that one speaker allows non-V2 in non-subject *wh*-questions with the short locative *wh*-element *kor* ‘where’. This could in fact mean that this short *wh*-element but not the other ones has the status of being a clitic for this individual speaker. In turn similar “splits” in the class of short *wh*-elements would then be expected among other speakers (of all dialects). Future investigations should address this issue.

22. Given the geographical adjacency of Nordmøre and Trøndelag, and lack of such between Nordmøre and Hordaland, one might consider it likely that the Nordmøre dialect has gone through a stage where it was like the Trøndelag dialect (before subsequent reanalysis of *som*) and thus that the short *wh*-elements indeed are clitic in this dialect.

References

- Åfarli, Tor A. 1986. “Some syntactic structures in a dialect of Norwegian”. *University of Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics* 3.93–111.
- Åfarli, Tor A. and Kristin M. Eide. 2003. *Norsk generativ syntaks*. Oslo: Novus.
- Egerland, Verner. 1998. “On Verb Second violations and the hierarchical ordering of adverbs”. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 61.1–22.
- Elstad, Kåre. 1982. “Nordnorske dialektar”. *Nordnorsk: Språkav og språkforhold i Nord-Noreg* ed. by Tove Bull and Kjellaug Jetne, 11–100. Oslo: Samlaget.
- Fiva, Toril. 1996. “Spørresetninger i Tromsø-dialekten”. *Nordica Bergensia* 9.139–155.
- Heggstad, Leiv. 1914. *Norsk grammatik: for skuleungdom*. Kristiania: Norli.
- Iversen, Ragnvald. 1918. *Syntaksen i Tromsøbymaal*. Kristiania: Bymaals-lagets forlag.
- Kristoffersen, Gjert. 2000. *The phonology of Norwegian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lie, Svein. 1992. “Ka du sei?”. *Maal og Minne* 1992.62–77.
- Nilsen, Hilde. 1996. *Koffør dæm sir det? Spørresetninger i nordreisadialekten*. Cand. Philol. thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Nilsen, Øystein. 1997. “Adverbs and A-shift”. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 59.1–31.
- Nilsen, Øystein. 2003. *Eliminating positions: syntax and semantics of sentential modification*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utrecht. (HIL dissertation 73).
- Nordgård, Torbjørn. 1985. *Word order, Binding and the Empty Category Principle*. Cand. Philol. thesis, University of Trondheim.
- Nordgård, Torbjørn. 1988. “Omkring ordstilling i hv-spørsmål i norske dialekter”. *Skriftserie fra Institutt for fonetikk og lingvistikk, Universitetet i Bergen* 33.26–37.

- Rice, Curt and Peter Svenonius. 1998. "Prosodic V2 in Northern Norwegian". Ms., University of Tromsø.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The fine structure of the Left Periphery". *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax* ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Sandøy, Helge. 1987. *Norsk dialektkunnskap*. Oslo: Novus.
- Sollid, Hilde. 2005. *Dialektsyntaks i Nordreisa: Språkdannelse og stabilisering i møtet mellom kvensk og norsk*. Oslo: Novus.
- Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 1997. "Framväxten av obligatoriska *som*". *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 4, ed. by Patrik Åström, 171–178. Stockholm.
- Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2002. *Som-satser med och utan som*. Doctoral dissertation, published in *Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet* 58.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2002. "Subject positions and the placement of adverbials" *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP* ed. by Peter Svenonius, 201–242. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1986a. "On Verb Second and the functional content of syntactic categories". *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages* ed. by Hubert Haider and Martin Prinzhorn, 7–25. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1986b. "SOM and the Binding Theory". *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax* ed. by Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen, 149–184. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Vangsnes, Øystein Alexander. 2004. "On *wh*-questions and V2 across Norwegian dialects: a survey and some speculations". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 73.1–59.
- Vangsnes, Øystein A. In preparation. "The nanosyntax of *wh*-determiners: a Scandinavian perspective". Ms., University of Tromsø.
- Westergaard, Marit R. 2003a. "Word order in *wh*-questions in a North Norwegian dialect: some evidence from an acquisition study". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26:1.1–29.
- Westergaard, Marit R. 2003b. "On the acquisition of word order in WH-questions in the Tromsødialect". *Nordlyd* 31:3.589–605. (Published online at <http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/viewissue.php?id=3>.)
- Westergaard, Marit R. 2005a. The development of word order in Norwegian Child Language: the interaction of input and economy principles in the acquisition of V2. Doctoral dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Westergaard, Marit R. 2005b. "Optional word order in *wh*-questions in two Norwegian dialects: a diachronic analysis of synchronic variation". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28:2. 269–72.
- Westergaard, Marit R. and Øystein A. Vangsnes. 2005. "WH-questions, V2, and the left periphery of three Norwegian dialect types". *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 8:1–2. 119–160.