

# **Norwegian examples in international linguistics literature**

**An inventory of defective documentation**

**Jan Engh**

**Universitetsbiblioteket i Oslo  
2006**

**UBO Skrifter: 32**

**ISBN 82-8037-007-2**

## Table of contents

Introduction: The query	1
The result	4
Norwegian characters	4
Word level errors	15
Accidental errors	15
Interference?	26
Phrase level errors	35
Correct morphological form used in an incorrect way	35
What kind of Norwegian?	40
Written standards. The Bokmål/Nynorsk confusion	40
Awareness of written standard	44
Inconsistency as to written standard	45
What is Norwegian after all?	48
Regional variants	48
Archaisms	55
Atypical language use	56
What was the name of this language again ... ?	57
Syntactic errors	58
Odd sentences	71
Absurdities	84
Incorrect interpretation	85
Incorrect asterisks	89
It's six of one and half a dozen of the other	89
Interference at a phrase or sentence level	90
Strange assertions	91

Spurious references	102
Informants	102
Bibliographical references	104
Correct references	104
Erroneous references	108
Inheritance	111
From published information, written by other foreigners	111
From “personal communication” with other foreign linguists	113
From published information written by Norwegians	114
From “personal communication” with Norwegian linguists	115
“Transitive” inheritance	115
References (reviewed titles with defects)	117
Unpublished or non-refereed material	131
Norwegian characters	131
Accidental errors	132
Interference?	134
Syntactic errors	135
Odd sentences	138
Incorrect asterisks and other results of lack of understanding	147
Strange assertions	148
Spurious references	149
References (reviewed titles with defects) - not refereed	150
Other languages – a small sample	152
References (reviewed titles with defects) - other languages	155
Final observations	156
Bibliography (general)	158

## Introduction: The query\*

The present inventory contains incorrect Norwegian examples found in the international literature on theoretical linguistics. The authors are all non-native speakers of Norwegian. They are considered to be the authors as long as no Norwegian source is specified by them nor otherwise identified. Errors committed by Norwegian linguists that are quoted correctly by non-Norwegian linguists have been left out. On the other hand, errors made by foreign linguists when quoting Norwegian linguists have been included.

The texts where the errors appear are all properly published and/or refereed, i.e. they have been published a) in linguistics journals, b) by publishers of high esteem, c) in reports from refereed linguistics conferences, or d) they have been accepted as Ph.D. theses by highly respected universities. For the sake of comparison, a smaller sample of incorrect examples from unpublished papers or non-refereed sources will be presented at the end of the report.

Asterisked sentences have not been taken into consideration, since they are incorrect per definition. However, starred sentences are intended to be incorrect with respect to one particular dimension only or as far as one descriptive level is concerned, e.g. syntax. As a consequence, errors pertaining to different levels such as “pa”, “vill”, and “lose” in “\*Hvordan lurer du pa hvilket problem Jon vill lose?” or “renst” in “\*Jeg har renst ham (hans) bilen”<sup>1</sup> have not been registered.

Allegedly correct examples only containing punctuation errors have not been included in the inventory. Examples exhibiting all other types of errors (at character level, word level, phrase level, and sentence level, etc.) have been included - with the notable exception of examples simply displaying word forms spelled according to obsolete orthography or Dano-Norwegian. Such errors are basically the result of conscious political choices made either by the linguists or their informants, and cannot be automatically construed as anomalies at any level in the usual sense. E.g. “tyve” ‘twenty’ and “forsent” ‘too late’ instead of “tjue” and “for sent”.

At character level and word level, there is a general consensus as to what is an error. Accordingly, errors identification is easy in principle. No theoretical considerations are involved. As far as errors at a “higher” descriptive level (phrase level and sentence level etc.) are concerned, full consensus cannot be expected. Thus, it is essential to adopt a robust definition for the identification of errors at any descriptive level, preferably one with no theoretical connotations, which are liable to derail the task at hand. As notion and designation are intimately linked in linguistics, the author will refrain from the use of designations such as “ungrammatical” and “unacceptable” in their usual chomskyan meaning, in order not to engage in any futile discussion of linguistic theory. Additionally, the pre-theoretical designations<sup>2</sup> “wrong”/“error” and “odd”/“oddity” will be used extensively.<sup>3</sup> A phrase or

---

\* Thanks to Even Hovdhaugen and Stig Johansson who read a preliminary version and to a number of Norwegian non linguist friends and colleagues who were subjected to hundreds of linguists’ sentences during the query reported.

<sup>1</sup> Rizzi 1990, 126n and Hoekstra 1995, 122 respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Following Bach among others in principle: “Sequences of words that are claimed to be impossible sentences in a language are marked (---) with an asterisk; (---) question marks (---) will be used in an obvious manner to indicate questionable utterances.” (Bach 1974, 9n)

sentence is *ungrammatical* or *wrong*, when it is not considered Norwegian neither by the present author (a native speaker of the Oslo dialect and a regular user of the Bokmål written standard, with a linguist's knowledge of other dialects) nor by members of informal panels of non linguist native speakers with a varied dialect background. A phrase or sentence is *odd* when two conditions apply: a) the sentence is considered Norwegian, although marginal (also in relationship to possible dialects etc.). b) Neither the author nor a panel of non linguist native speakers are able to imagine that the phrase or sentence in question will be used correctly in any situation.

In an initial phase, all new foreign linguistics books purchased by the University of Oslo library during a three years period were searched. These monographs, proceedings etc. are supposed to be of the highest scientific quality and/or greatest relevance (although with a clear Anglo-American bias).<sup>4</sup> In parallel, the electronic versions of the following linguistic journals were systematically searched for Norwegian material from the year indicated (inclusive) till the last number available by 1 March 2005: *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics* (1997-), *Journal of linguistics* (1997-), *Journal of semantics* (2001- with the exception of 2001/1), *Language* (2001-), *Languages in contrast* (2000-), *Lingua* (May/1995-), *Linguistic inquiry* (1998-), *Linguistics* (1999-), *Linguistics and philosophy* (1997-), *Natural language semantics* (1997-), *Natural language & linguistic theory* (1997-), *Studies in language* (2001-), *Syntax* (1998- with a few exceptions)<sup>5</sup> The material found was checked against the printed versions whenever possible in order to avoid formatting or character encoding errors due to the electronic media. Additionally, the printed versions of *Linguistic inquiry* 1978-1991 and 1993-1997 and *Natural language & linguistic theory* 1983-5 were searched, as well as the paper copies of *Linguistic analysis* (a sample of 20 issues 1984-2000), *The Linguistic review* (2001-), and *Theoretical linguistics* (1993-2002). The defective Norwegian examples turned out to pertain almost exclusively to syntax and typology.<sup>6</sup> So, in a second phase, the library's remaining stock of syntax and typology books from the last 50 years was searched in order to detect more examples, approximately 1500 books. No excerpts from titles published after 2005 has been included in the inventory.

The result, approximately 346 excerpts<sup>7</sup> containing at least one case of deficient documentation<sup>8</sup> made by 139 linguists under 167 titles, is displayed below.<sup>9</sup> On the face of it, the result may not seem impressive, given the extent of the search domain. Yet, the number of Norwegian examples is high compared to the peripheral status of Norwegian

---

<sup>3</sup> The two notions should not be considered as a strict dichotomy, though. Rather they ought to be regarded as referring to prototypical notions of description.

<sup>4</sup> The University of Oslo library caters for researchers and students of theoretical as well as descriptive linguistics at all levels, including Ph.D. courses.

<sup>5</sup> Evidently, the value of this particular query result is conditioned by an adequate indexation of the books and the reliability of the search function of the document handling program.

<sup>6</sup> Very few Norwegian examples were found in the literature on phonetics, phonology, or morphology. They did not contain any significant errors.

<sup>7</sup> Depending of the way of counting.

<sup>8</sup> In fact, quite a few contain many examples each containing one or more errors.

<sup>9</sup> Also displayed are several excerpts containing correct examples or contentions. These are, of course, not counted in the above crude statistics. This also holds for the sociolinguists referred to below in connection with the use of 'code-switching'.

among the world's languages and, most important in the present context, to the comparatively infrequent references to Norwegian in international linguistics monographs and journals.<sup>10</sup> Also, the examples exhibit a surprisingly rich variety of errors, ranging from character representation errors and mere misspellings to sheer nonsense. Most astonishing, though, is the *extent* of the deficient documentation of Norwegian. No sophisticated statistics is needed to detect a clear tendency: Of all the papers with Norwegian material written by foreign theoretical linguists, more than two thirds contained errors.<sup>11</sup> In most cases many errors. This inevitably raises the question as to the validity of the argumentation that the examples are meant to support, a subject that will not be discussed here.

---

<sup>10</sup> Norwegian has fewer than 5 million native speakers. In principle, they all live in Norway. In spite of the relative interest it has attracted as far as topics such as long-distance reflexives, parasitic gaps, adverb placement are concerned, Norwegian has kept its position as a "minor" language - also in linguistics literature.

<sup>11</sup> Even when the less offensive ones are left out, cf. above.

## The result

Every type of error has been given its own separate entry: In many cases, the error has been repeated in several contexts by the same author. In other cases, the error has been copied by others. All such instances have been included in the inventory. In cases where the example contains more than one type of error, it has been repeated under each relevant heading.

Each excerpt has been given a light blue colour in order to distinguish it from bibliographic and other factual information and comments. Comments are indented. The graphic representation of each excerpt is similar to the original publication with various exceptions: exact margins, and tabs, fonts and font size. Bold face characters have been converted to regular.

### Norwegian characters

- (25) (---)  
b. Dette er de dikte, som laereren spurte hvem vi trodde hadde skrevet (\*dem).  
(---)  
'These are the poems that the teacher asked (us) who we thought wrote (them).'
- (Maling 1978a, 87)  
Error: "laereren". Correct: "læreren".

This example contains more errors than the one identified here. As mentioned in the introduction, they will be identified and commented in the relevant subsection below.

- (32) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss hvem vi trodde hadde skrevet. (N)  
(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 241)  
Error: "laererin". Correct: "læreren". Repeated later as:
- (32) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss hvem vi trodde hadde skrivet. (N)  
'These are the poems that the teacher asked us who we thought had written.'
- (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 245)  
Error: "laererin". Correct: "læreren".

Consider, for example, the following Norwegian example from Maling/Zaenen (1981):

- (56) Dette er de diktene som  
These are the poems COMP  
laererin spurte oss [hvem vi trodde  
teacher asked us who we thought  
hadde skrevet]  
had written  
'These are the poems that the teacher

asked us who we thought had written.’  
(Borsley 1993, 578)

Error: “laererin”. Correct: “læreren”. Borsley’s reference is inexact. The quotation appears to be from Maling and Zaenen 1982, 241.<sup>12</sup>

(5) Det vil alltid vaere dem som sier noe annet  
it will always be those(ACC) who say something different

A more striking piece of evidence is found in sentences such as those in (6), which are mentioned in Askedal (1986). (---)

(6) a. Det ble påstott å komme mange tilhørere  
it was claimed to come many listeners

(---)  
(Hoekstra 1990, 213)

Error: “vaere”. Correct: “være”.

Askedal 1986, 31 contains a sentence similar to (5). Correct, but slightly different:

(27) Det vil alltid være dem som mener noe annet.

This author is unable to find any sentence similar to (6) in Askedal (1986).

The embedded clause variant of (1a) is given in (17). (17) immediately shows that *ingen fuglar* cannot be in the SPEC of the complement of *vaere*. (---).

(17) at det ingen fuglar var skotne  
that it no birds were shot+AGR3pl

(18) at det NP<sub>i</sub> vaere [<sub>AGRP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> AGR [<sub>VP</sub> skotne t<sub>i</sub>]]

(Hoekstra 1990, 216)

Errors: “vaere”. Correct: “være”.<sup>13</sup>

(9) (---)  
b. John synnes ham [ vaere en god venn]

(Hoekstra 1995, 121)

Error: “vaere”. Correct: “være”<sup>14</sup>

(63) Norwegian (Øystein Vangsnes, p.c.)

---

<sup>12</sup> Except for the square brackets. By the way, the translation must be Borsley’s own - as an adaptation of the translation provided by Maling and Zaenen of a similar Swedish sentence right above the Norwegian one in their article.

<sup>13</sup> I.e. ‘correct as intended’. At any rate, “vaere”/“være” is the wrong form. See below.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. also Hoekstra’s structural description

(12) NP<sub>i</sub> vaere [<sub>AGRP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> AGR [<sub>VP</sub> V t<sub>i</sub>]]

(Hoekstra 1990, 215)

And numerous “vaere” cited in the body of his article.

a. ?Hvilken oppdagelsesreisende spurte laereren deg hvilket kontinent \_ oppdaget \_?  
(Richards 2001, 77)

Error: "laereren". Correct: "læreren".<sup>15</sup>

(100) a. den ulovlige kopieringen av populaere sanger  
that illegal-DEF copying-DEF of popular-PL songs-PL

(Ackema and Neeleman 2004, 181)

Error: "populaere". Correct: "populære".

(12) No.a. lareren gav elevene bøkene  
teacher-the gave students-the books-the

(Giusti 1990a, 140)

Error: "lareren". Correct: "læreren". Cf. Giusti 1990b, 638 below.

(18) a. Lareren gav elevene bøkene.  
teacher-the gave students-the books-the

(Giusti 1990b, 638)

Error: "Lareren". Correct: "Læreren". "I thank Tarald Taraldsen for Norwegian examples. (Giusti 1990b, 638n). Evidently, Giusti is responsible for the error. Cf. Giusti 1990a, 140

[51] det vart kjøpt bøk-er  
fut acheté livre-PL  
"Il a été acheté des livres"

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 234)

Error: "bøk-er". Correct: "bøker".<sup>16</sup> Observe the correct "ø" in the otherwise misspelled word "køpt".

"ö" instead of "ø" is possible, although uncommon. However, 'o Umlaut' is clearly Swedish in a context where all other instances of <ø> are written as "ø", i.e. 'o slash', in the same article (or even the same sentence), as shown above, or in the same journal or book:

(3) (---)  
d. Det var kjøpt en hund  
it was bought a dog

(Hoekstra 1990, 212)

Error: "kjøpt". Correct: "kjøpt". A quotation from Åfarli 1992, 19, where the o slash character is used.

A more striking piece of evidence is found in sentences such as those in (6), which are mentioned in Askedal (1986). (---)

<sup>15</sup> This example has been included since Richards cannot prove that Vangsnes actually mentioned this sentence exactly as it is represented here.

<sup>16</sup> As for the "pedagogical" hyphen here and in later examples, I shall leave them without any comment, although I think they are, in general, both useless and misleading.

- (6) a. Det ble påstott å komme mange tilhørere  
it was claimed to come(ACC) many listeners  
b. Det var ikke lett å få det til å komme så mange tilhørere  
it was not easy to get it to come so many listeners  
“it wasn’t easy to manage to get many listeners to come”

- (7) a. Det ble påstott at det kommer så mange tilhørere  
b. Det var ikke let å få det til at det kommer så mange tilhørere

(Hoekstra 1990, 213)

Errors: “tilhørere”. Correct: “tilhørere”.

- (23) \*Jeg spurte om det var [AGRP mange fuglar skote/skotne]  
I asked whether it was many birds shot

(Hoekstra 1990, 217)<sup>17</sup>

Error: “spurte”. The “ö” is incorrect for “ø”. But the correct form of the verb is *spurte*, “spurte” being a phonetic adoption of the dialect pronunciation.

- (12N) Hans sier [(at) Peter har moett Eva]  
Hans says that Peter has met Eva

(Webelhuth 1992, 84)

Error: “moett”. Correct: “møtt”.

- (64N) [Hvor fort] loep Hans  
how fast ran Hans

(Webelhuth 1992, 123)

Error: “loep”. Correct: “løp”.

(---) its Norwegian counterpart 33b) was acceptable to some of our informants, but not all.

(---)

- (33) a. (---)  
b. Slike foelsomme politiska fragor har jeg flere studenter som  
det ikke finnes noen som jeg tror ville våge å prata med om.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 242)

Error: “foelsomme”. Correct: “følsomme”.

(---) in a 1989 talk by Tarald Taraldsen, cited by Giorgi and Longobardi (1991:201).

(---)

- (25) a. hans boker om syntaks  
his books of syntax  
b. bokene hans om syntaks

---

<sup>17</sup> This asterisked sentence has been included since it is debatable whether it is a Norwegian sentence or not, see below.

book-the-s his of syntax

(Safir 1999, 588)

Errors: “boker” and “bokene”. Correct: “bøker” and “bøkene”. In Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, the correct letters are used.

(ii) Hvem skjønner du ikke hva sier ?  
‘Who understand you not what say?’

(Rizzi 1990, 126n)

Error: “skjonner”. Correct: “skjønner”.

(101) Jeg vet om jobber som du bruker mer tid på bilen enn vil ta å  
utføre \_\_\_\_\_. (N)  
‘I know of a-job<sub>i</sub> that you spend more time on the-car than will  
take to finish Ø<sub>i</sub>’.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 270)

Error: “utfore”. Correct: “utføre”. UTFORE *v* is a carpentry term: ‘widen (e.g. a window frame)’.<sup>18</sup>

(208) a. Jon apnet doren  
Jon opened door  
‘Jon opened the door’  
b. doren apnet seg langsomt  
door opened REFL slowly  
‘The door opened slowly’

(Lidz 1996, 135)

Errors: “doren”. Correct: “døren”. (Spelled correctly in Hellan 1988a, 113f.)  
“doren” means ‘the nail punch’ (of DOR *m*).

(212) John hadde hort meg snakke nedsettende om seg, og det hadde  
John had heard me talk depreciatorily about self, and it had  
de som stod rundt ogs\_  
those who stood around too  
‘John heard me talking depreciatorily about him, and those who were  
standing around also heard me talking that way about him/them’

(Lidz 1996, 137)

Error: “hort”. Correct: “hørt”. (Spelled correctly in Hellan 1988a, 231.)

Lidz (1996, 118) has examples for Norwegian drawn from work by Hellan and by Hestvik.

(---)

67) John hadde hort meg snakke nedsettende om seg, og det hadde de som  
stod rundt også.

---

<sup>18</sup> Now, this piece of information appears rather farfetched in the present context. However, it may be useful to remind foreign linguists. Especially many American linguists think that slashes, overcircles etc. are just accents that can be omitted. Cf. below.

John had heard me talk deprecatingly about SIG, and it had those who stood around too

“John heard me talking deprecatingly about *him*, and those who were standing around also heard me talking that way about *him/them*.”

(Safir 2004, 135)

Error: “hort”. Correct: “hørt”<sup>19</sup> (This example represents a slight modification of Lidz 1996, 137.)

(73) norvégien

a. boke-ne vert selde  
livre-PL deviennent vendu  
<Les livres sont (dans le procès d’être) vendus>

[373]<sup>20</sup>

b. boke-ne er selde  
livre-PL sont vendu  
<Les livres ont été vendus>

(Giusti 1998, 372f.)

Errors: “boke-ne”. Correct: “bøkene”.

(i) Jens har ingen bøker [lese t]  
Jens hat keine Bücher gelesen.’

(ii) \*Jens har ingen bøker prØd [ä lese t]  
Jens hat keine Bücher versucht zu lesen.’

(Sabel 1996, 85n)<sup>21</sup>

The ø characters are taken from a different font set or they represent a substitute character. I.e. either the Greek character with a certain resemblance, ‘phi’, or a zero or not applicable sign. There are no font problems of this kind in Christensen and Taraldsen 1989, 72f.<sup>22</sup>

(9) Det har ingen lingvist/\*en lingvist kjøpt boken.  
there has no linguist/\*a linguist bought a book

[16]

(10) Jon har ingen bøker/\* en bok kjøpt.

<sup>19</sup> For those who do not belong to the happy few who are able to speak Norwegian (or any Scandinavian language for that matter): This example shows in full the consequences of regarding “ø” as an accented version of “o”, where the slash may be omitted at will. “hort” is the past participle of HORE ‘fornicate’, while “hørt” is the participle of HØRE ‘hear’. Which probably was not what Burzio had in mind (Burzio 1996, 37) when he misrepresented Vikner’s Danish example from 1985:

at Susan<sub>i</sub> overtalte Anne til [ at hore på {sig<sub>i</sub>/ ende<sub>i</sub>} ]  
that Susan persuaded Anne to [ that listen to self / her ]  
‘that Susan<sub>i</sub> persuaded Anne to listen to her<sub>i</sub>’

<sup>20</sup> Numbers in square brackets are used to signal a new page in the text quoted.

<sup>21</sup> Just like the case of Hoekstra’s sentence above (Hoekstra 1990, 217), this asterisked sentence has been included since it is debatable whether it is more or less correct than the other sentences of the set.

<sup>22</sup> Sabel is not to blame for the erroneous “ä” instead of “å”, though, since the Italian editor of the Norwegian paper cited (Christensen and Taraldsen 1989) got it all wrong in the first place.

John has no book/ a book bought  
(Ingham 2000, 15f.)

With one exception, the “ö” (o Umlaut) of (10), the ø is printed with a character taken from a different font set and represents a substitute character: The Greek character ‘phi’. Correct in Christensen 1991, 149.

(29c) *at Jon aldri kjøper bøker (Norwegian)*  
That John never buys books

(Reuland and Kosmeijer 1991, 55)

The ø character is taken from a different font set and represents a substitute character: The Greek character ‘phi’.

(34b) *hvilke bøker spurte Jon hvem (som) hadde skrevet? (N)*

(Fanselow 1991, 223)

The ø character is taken from a different font set and represents a substitute character: The Greek character ‘phi’. Correct in Maling and Zaenen 1982, 231.

(48) *dette er en type oppgave som, Kalle hevder at om Pelle greide a*  
*dies ist ein Typ Aufgabe die Kalle sagt daß ob Pelle Erfolg-hat im*  
*løse den,\*t, vil vise om han er intelligent*  
*lösen sie wird zeigen ob er ist intelligent*

(Fanselow 1991, 270)

The ø character is taken from a different font set and represents a substitute character: The Greek character ‘phi’. Correct in Maling and Zaenen 1982, 235.<sup>23</sup>

(13a) *Ola kan jeg ikke skjønne hva sier*  
*Ola kann ich nicht verstehen was sagt*

(Fanselow 1991, 326)

The ø character is taken from a different font set and represents a substitute character: The Greek character ‘phi’. Correct in Maling and Zaenen 1982, 238 from where the example is taken

(27Da) *løbe [meget hurtigt]*  
*run very fast*

(28N) *løp [veldig fort]*  
*run very fast*

(Webelhuth 1992, 70)

Substitute characters, zeros or ‘not applicable’ signs. No proper ø characters.

(73N) *[vant løpet]*  
*won the race*

(Webelhuth 1992, 75)

Substitute characters, zeros or ‘not applicable’ signs. No proper ø characters.

---

<sup>23</sup> Note, by the way, that Maling and Zaenen write "greidde" instead of "greide". (Both correct.)

(88N) [ødeleggelsen av byen]  
destruction of the city

(Webelhuth 1992, 76)

Substitute characters, zeros or ‘not applicable’ signs. No proper ø characters.

(ii) ?Begynne<sub>i</sub> vil han nok ikke t<sub>i</sub> a jobbe  
begin will he probably not to work  
‘lit. begin de will probably not to work’

(Koopman and Szabolcsi: 2000, 230n)

Error: “a”. Correct: “å”.

(---)(data from Tarald Taraldsen (---), personal communications).

(8) a. Det kom inn tre menn uten a identifisere seg.  
it came in three men without (to) identify themselves.

(---)

‘There entered three men without identifying themselves.’

(Cardinaletti 1997, 525)

Error: “a”. Correct: “å”. Taraldsen would never have written the infinitival marker without an overcircle.

(11) a. (---)

b. Dette er en type oppgave som Kalle hevder at om Pelle  
greidde a løse {den/\*Ø} vil vise om han er intelligent. (N)

[236]

‘This is the kind of problem that Kalle says that whether  
Pelle succeeds in solving it will show if he is intelligent.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 235f.)<sup>24</sup>

Error: “a”. Correct: “å”.

(48) dette er en type oppgave som<sub>i</sub> Kalle hevder at om Pelle greide a  
dies ist ein Typ Aufgabe die Kalle sagt daß ob Pelle Erfolg-hat im  
løse den<sub>i</sub>/\*t<sub>i</sub> vil vise om han er intelligent  
lösen sie wird zeigen ob er ist intelligent

(Fanselow 1991, 270)

Error: “a”. Correct: “å”.

(23) (---)

(Afarli 1992: 18, 20)

(Haider 2000, 46)

Error: “Afarli”. Correct: “Åfarli”.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Here and below, those of the examples of Maling and Zaenen 1982 that contain an expression of the { } type will be represented with the elements in succession, separated by a slash, and not as in the original article (one element on top of the other).

(41) Bordet<sub>t</sub> ble laft en duk pa t<sub>i</sub>  
the-table was put a cloth on

(Hendrick 1995, 321)

Error: “pa”. Correct: “på”.

(i) Vi kledde *pa* (<sub>SC</sub> han frakken)  
(We put *on* (him the coat))

(Guéron 1990, 164n)

Error: “pa”. Correct: “på”.

(45b) na er det apenbart at John har slatt Maria  
now is EXPL obvious that John has beaten Mary

(Brandner 1993, 92)

Errors: “na”, “apenbart”, and “slatt”. Correct: “nå”, “åpenbart”, and “slått”.

(44) I gar regnet {det/\*Ø}. (N) (Ungrammatical without *det*)  
yesterday rained it  
'Yesterday it rained.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249)

Error: “gar”. Correct: “går”.

(51a) *hvem tror du at skulle vinne?*  
wer denkst du daß soll gewinnen

(51b) *i gar regnet det/\*e*  
Gestern regnete es

(Fanselow 1991, 333)

Error: “gar”. Correct: “går” although correctly copied from Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249, cf. above.

(3) a. (---)  
b. Hvem vet du ikke om Jon sa på kino? (N)  
c. (---)

who do-you-not-know whether John saw at movies  
'Who don't you know whether John saw at the movies?'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 232)

Error: “sa”. Correct: “så”. Despite the fact that “på” is spelled correctly. By the way, “sa” means ‘said’, while “så” is the correct verb, ‘saw’ (past form of SE ‘see’).

(208) a. Jon apnet doren  
Jon opened door  
'Jon opened the door'

---

<sup>25</sup> By chance, Åfarli 1992 does not appear in the bibliography of Haider 2000. By the way, Åfarli is spelled "ÅFARLÍ" in the list of previous publications in the series *Linguistik Aktuell* at the end of Austin, Engelberg, and Rauh 2004.

- b. doren apnet seg langsomt  
door opened REFL slowly  
'The door opened slowly'  
(Lidz 1996, 135)  
Errors: "apnet". Correct: "åpnet". (Spelled correctly in Hellan 1988a, 113f.)
- (iii) (---)  
d. \*... at han tidlig vaakner opp. 'that he early wakes up.'  
e. ... at han vaakner opp tidlig.  
(Cinque 1999:215 n.7)  
Errors: "vaakner". Correct: "våkner".
- (4) a. Eng Peter went to the movies, but I don't know who with.  
Nor Per har gaatt paa kino, men jeg vet ikke hvem med.  
(Merchant 2000, 1)  
Errors: "gaatt", "paa". Correct: "gått", "på".
- (2.116) Kjenner du han gammelvaktmesteren paa huset?  
know you he old.custodian-DEF at house.DEF  
'Do you know the old custodian at the house?.'  
(Larson 2005, 57)  
Error: "paa". Correct: "på".
- 28 c) Hvilke malerier, har ikke Petter noen  
vegg, å henge topp e, p å e,  
which paintings has not Peter any wall  
to hang up on  
(Haider 1993, 643)  
Errors: "å" and "på". Correct: "å" and "på".<sup>26</sup> Correct in Haider's source:  
Engdahl 1988b, 19.<sup>27</sup>
- [5] det forsvann ei bok frå hyll-a  
il disparaître/PAS un livre de rayon-ART<sup>2</sup>  
'Il a disparu un livre du rayon'  
(Lazard 2001 [1994], 220)  
Error: "frå". Correct: "frå".<sup>28</sup>
- (212) John hadde hort meg snakke nedsettende om seg, og det hadde  
John had heard me talk depreciatorily about self, and it had  
de som stod rundt ogs\_  
those who stood around too

<sup>26</sup> Haider's next example, (29a) is correct.

<sup>27</sup> Engdahl's example, (32), is itself an extremely odd sentence. However, it has been taken from an article written by a Norwegian linguist, Christensen 1982, 79.

<sup>28</sup> Correct in the sentence repeated in Lazard 2001 [1994], 234.

‘John heard me talking depreciatorily about him, and those who were standing around also heard me talking that way about him/them’

(Lidz 1996, 137)

Error: “ogs\_”. Correct: “også”. (Spelled correctly in Hellan 1988a, 231.)

Consider the following Norwegian sentences (Everaert 1986; Hestvik 1990):

(223) (---)

- c. John<sub>i</sub> bad Marit<sub>j</sub> se pF seg<sub>i/j</sub>  
John made Mary look at self  
‘John made Mary look at him’

(Lidz 1996, 142)

Error: “pF”. Correct: “på”. (This author is unable to find this sentence in Everaert 1986.)

(---) Norwegian has several such auxiliaries : *å stå*, *å sitte*, *å ligge*, *å gå*.

(Avram 1987, 210)

Error: “stå”. Correct: “stå”. Looks like a simple misspelling, given the other correct tokens of ‘a overcircle’.

In a discussion of the properties of sentences such as “Vi lar fangene henge”, literally “We let the prisoners hang”, i.e. ‘We ordered the prisoners to be hanged’, one finds the following contention:

This is the case for English *make*, Norwegian *lå* and French *laisser*.

(Hoekstra and Guéron 2004, 164)

Which, on the face of it, looks pretty much like some sort of “reversed” Norwegian character problem.<sup>29</sup> The infinitive of present “lar” is “la”. However, one later remark in the same paper indicates that the authors actually think that “lå” is the infinitive of “lar”:

The difference between these Scandinavian languages can be explained by the hypothesis that *la/lå* has to assign structural case in Danish, may assign it in Norwegian and cannot assign it in Swedish.

(Hoekstra and Guéron 2004, 166)

In the corresponding verb in Swedish is LÅTA. Norwegian LA has an alternative LATE. However, Norwegian “lå” has only one interpretation: as the past form of LIGGE ‘lie’.

---

<sup>29</sup> Or hypercorrection.

## Word level errors

### Accidental errors

There is no point in distinguishing between orthographic errors and other errors at word level in this inventory. Apparently, many of the authors have a rather restricted competence as far as the Norwegian language is concerned – if any. So, the notion of orthographic error makes no sense at all. In this paragraph, I have gathered all errors at word level without any clear *cause*, e.g. interference. I am going to refer to them as accidental errors.<sup>30</sup>

- (14) a. [<sub>NP</sub> hans [syntaks bøker]]  
           his syntax books  
       b. [<sub>DP</sub> [syntaks bøke]<sub>i</sub>-ne [<sub>NP</sub> hans t<sub>i</sub>]]  
           syntax books-the his

(Ackema and Neeleman 2002, 101)

Errors: No blank between “syntaks” and “bøker”. SYNTAKSBOK (plural indefinite form *syntaksbøker*, definite form *syntaksbøkene*) is a compound word.

- (52) (---)  
       c. [<sub>NP</sub> hans [syntaks bøker]]  
           his syntax books  
       d. [<sub>DP</sub> [syntaks bøke]<sub>i</sub>-ne [<sub>NP</sub> hans t<sub>i</sub>]]  
           syntax books-the his

(Ackema and Neeleman 2004, 44)

Errors: No blanks between “syntaks” and “bøker” or “bøkene”. SYNTAKSBOK (plural indefinite form *syntaksbøker*, plural definite form *syntaksbøkene*) is a compound word.

The analytic value of “bøke” in [syntaks bøke]<sub>i</sub>-ne” is unknown to the present author given that the paradigm goes “bok” - “boka”/“boken” - “bøker” - “bøkene”. Its only motivation seems to be as a sequence of the first four characters identical in all plural forms of the lexeme.

- (i) Hunden vart (ut) sparka (ut) [Norw.]  
       dog-the was (out) kicked (out)  
       (ii) Vi har (\*ut) sparka (ut) hunden (ut)  
           Wehave (out) kicked (out) dog-the (out)

(Haider 1997, 18n)

Errors: “(ut) sparka”. Correct: “(ut)sparka”, i.e. either “utsparka” or “sparka ut”. Incorrect copy of Åfarli 1985, 89.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup> On closer inspection, this paragraph contains orthographic errors, morphological errors, completely distorted words (probably copying errors of various degrees (due to copying history), true accidental errors and sheer misprints. The extension of the latter category indicates a serious lack of proofreading – probably even at manuscript level.

<sup>31</sup> Observe that the language label is [Norw.] , not [Nor.] as elsewhere in Haider’s article.

- (8) [NP bok en til Per ]  
book the to Per  
'Peter's book'

(Young 1988, 118)

Error: "bok en". Correct: "boken".

- (11) [NP bok en hans ]  
book the his(gen)  
'his book'

(Young 1988, 118)

Error: "bok en". Correct: "boken".<sup>32</sup>

(2.13) Norwegian

- (a) (Hellan 1991: 33)  
Jon skammet seg/\*segselv.  
Jon shamed self/self self  
'Jon was ashamed.'

- (b) (Hellan 1988)  
Jon foraktet \*seg/segselv.  
Jon despises self/self self  
'Jon despises himself.'

(Huang 2000, 20)

Errors: "segselv". Correct: "seg selv". "Jon skammet seg" is a correct sentence (Hellan 1991, 33). "Jon foraktet seg selv." is a correct sentence too and "\*Jon foraktet seg" contains no spelling errors. (Hellan 1988a, 104))

- (211) a. (---)  
b. Jonasket segselv bedre enn Per  
Jon washed himself better than Peter  
'Jon washed himself better than Peter washed himself'  
'Jon washed himself better than Peter washed him'

(Lidz 1996, 136)

Error: "segselv". Correct: "seg selv". Safir quotes the same examples – correctly – adding "Lidz (1996:118) has examples for Norwegian drawn from work by Hellan and by Hestvik." (Safir 2004, 135)

- (37) (---)  
c. Jeg har satt ham en hat på hodet

(Hoekstra 1995, 127)

Error: "hat". Correct: "hatt".<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> This error is repeated in Young's asterisked example (10).

<sup>33</sup> HAT means 'hate', while HATT means 'hat'.

Holmberg (1997, p.c.) observes that in Mainland Scandinavian, a participial main verb can appear in clause-initial position, acting as the

[124]

'first constituent' for 'verb-second' (V2).

- (12) (?) *Lest har hun den sikkert, men har hun skjønnt noe av den?*  
read has she it surely but has she understood anything of it  
"She has surely READ it, but has she understood any of it?" (Norwegian)

(Toyoshima 2001, 123f)

Error: "skjønnt". Correct: "skjønt".

- (68) a. *Elvis har [forlat bygninga].* (Nor)  
*Elvis has left the-building*

(---)

- c. *[Forlat bygninga] har Elvis allerede.* (Nor)  
*left the.building has Elvis already*

(---)

- (71) a. *At Elvis har forlat bygninga tror jeg ikke.* (Nor)  
*that Elvis has left the.building believe I not*

(Svenonius 1994, 1/56)

Errors: "forlat". Correct: "forlatt".

- (60) a. *De Leser {alltid / egentlig/desverre /ikke} avisa* (Nor)  
*they read always/actually/unfortunately/not the.newspaper*  
'They {always/actually/unfortunately/don't} read the newspaper'

- b. *De Leser desverre alltid avisa.*  
*they read unfortunately always the.newspaper*  
'They unfortunately always read the newspaper'

(Svenonius 1994, 3/35)

Errors: "desverre". Correct: "dessverre".

- [5'] *bok-a forsvan frå hylla*  
*livre-ART*

"Le livre a disparu du rayon"

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 220)

Error: "forsvan". Correct: "forsvann".

- [56] *det kamm ein student på grunn av sine karakterar*  
*vint un étudiant à cause de son/REFL note*

"Il est venu un étudiant au sujet de sa note"

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 236)

Error: "kamm". Correct: "kom".

- (29) a. *Mannen har drukket vinnen opp*  
*the.man has drunk wine PART*

- b. Mannen har drukket opp vinnen  
the.man has drunk PART wine  
'The man has drunk up the wine'  
(Norwegian; Svenonius 1996: 10)  
(Zeller 2001, 285)  
Errors: "vinnen". Correct: "vinen", which is spelled correctly in Svenonius 1996a, 11.
- (1) a. *Mannen har drukket opp vinnen*  
the.man has drunk up the.wine  
b. *Mannen har drukket vinnen opp*  
the.man has drunk the.wine up  
'The man has drunk up the wine'  
(Svenonius 1996a: 10)  
(Zeller 2002, 234)  
Errors: "vinnen". Correct: "vinen", which is spelled correctly in Svenonius 1996a, 11.
- (9) b. *John synes ham [ vaere en god venn]*  
(Hoekstra 1995, 121)  
Error: "synnes". Correct: "synes".
- (225) a. *A: Kommer Jens til festen for å see Marit?*  
comes Jens to the.party for to see Mary?  
(Craenenbroeck 2004, 113)  
Error: "see". Correct: "se". In a footnote at the very beginning of the subsection, Øystein Nilsen is thanked "for his help with the Eastern Norwegian data".
- (51) (---)  
c. *Det infannt seg en dame på kontoret.*  
it appeared REFL a lady on office-the  
'A lady appeared in the office.'  
(Bergeton 2004, 254)  
Error "infannt". Correct: "innfant". (Correct in Lødrup 1999, 367 - which is the source quoted.)
- (---), as for example in Norwegian *Hann sier/tror at hann kommer* 'He says/believes that he'll come.'  
(Kemmer 2002, 182)  
Errors: "Hann" and "hann". Correct: "Han" and "han".
- (13) (Norw. (Bokmål))  
(ia) *Det regner. (\*Regner. aber: Hann regner.) (Es regnet.)*  
(Lernerz 1985, 111)

Error: “Hann”. Correct: “Han”.<sup>34</sup>

[51] det vart kjøpt bøk-er  
fut acheté livre-PL  
“Il a été acheté des livres”

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 234)

Error: “kjøpt”. Correct: “kjøpt”.

(26) (---)

b. Det er den skitne boken, som laereren spurte hvem jeg sa hadde lagt (\*den)  
igjen på pullen.

(---)

‘This is the dirty book that the teacher asked who I said had left (it) behind  
on the desk.’

(Maling 1978a, 87)

Errors: “lagt” and “pullen”. Correct: “lagt” and “pulten”. “pullen” means ‘the  
crown (of a hat) (of PULL *m*)’.

(78)a. Jon<sub>i</sub> bad oss forsakte seg<sub>i</sub>  
asked us despise SEG  
Jon asked us to despise him

(Déchaine and Manfredi 1994, 245)

Error: “forsakte”. Correct: “forakte”.<sup>35</sup>

(108) Det vil alltid være dem som mener noe annet.  
it will always be those-ACC who think something different

(Hoekstra and Mulder 1990, 49)

Error: “alltid”. Correct: “alltid”.

(5) Det vil alltid være dem som sier noe annet  
it will always be those(ACC) who say something different

(Hoekstra 1990, 213)

Error: “altdid”. Correct: “alltid”.

(52) Det vil alltid være dem som mener noe annet.  
it(EXPL) will always be thoseACC who think something different  
(Askedal 1986)

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 327)

Error: “altdid”. Correct: “alltid”. Askedal 1986, 31 contains the correct sentence.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> In a footnote following the observation “Das Norwegische (Bokmål) und das Dänische vertreten dagegen das andere Extrem: Expletive Formen treten sowohl satzeinleitend wie in nicht-erster Position auf.”: “Von einigen “frozen forms” wie *hvis mulig er* u.a. abgesehen, (---).” Neither the *-t* suffix nor the word order is Norwegian. In the bibliography, by the way, the title of Svein Lie’s book is spelled *Innføring i norsk syntaks*. Correct: “Innføring”.

<sup>35</sup> Correct in Hellan 1988, 104, although his translation is different: “Jon asked us despise himself”.

- (29) Norwegian  
 a. John<sub>i</sub> liker [NP hans<sub>\*i/j</sub> kohne]  
     J likes his wife

(Pérez-Leroux and Roeper 1999, 937)

Error: "kohne". Correct: "kone".

- (68) Vi vet at noen snakket med Marit, men vi vit ikke hvem (\*som) [e].  
 'We know that someone talked with Mary, but we don't know who.'

(Lobeck 1995, 60)

Error: "vit". Correct: "vet" or "veit".

- (67) (---)  
 b. Vi vet [hvem (\*som) [Marit snakker met t]]  
     CP IP  
 'We know who that Mary talks with'

(Lobeck 1995, 59)

Error: "met". Correct: "med".

Lobeck makes a similar point based on the distribution of the complementizer *som* in Norwegian, which appears obligatorily in embedded questions with subject extraction, as in (89a) (modified slightly from Rizzi 1990: 57; see also Taraldsen 1986 and Vikner 1991; likewise for Danish *der* in spoken registers, if *der* is indeed in C<sup>15</sup>):

- (89) a Vi vet hvem \*(som) snakker met Marit. [Norwegian]  
 b Vi ved hvem ??(der) snakker med Marit. [Danish]  
*we know who C<sup>0</sup> talks with Marit*  
 'We know who is talking with Marit.'

(---)

- (90) a Noen snakker met Marit, men vi vet ikke  
 b En eller anden snakker med Marit, men vi ved ikke  
     *someone talks with Marit but we know not*  
     hvem (\*som). [Norwegian]  
     hvem (\*der). [Danish]  
     *who C<sup>0</sup>*

(Merchant 2001, 68)

Errors: "met". Correct: "med". (89) – including the error - appears to have Lobeck 1995 as its origin (Lobeck 1995, 60?). The corresponding sentence in Rizzi 1990, 57 is correct. Taraldsen 1986 does not contain these two sentences.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>36</sup> In their bibliography, Askedal's name is spelled incorrectly, "Jan" instead of "Jon".

<sup>37</sup> Remark the correspondence between Norwegian "Noen" and Danish "En eller anden" in (90). Danish "Nogen" seems more natural. It is also worthwhile noting that the Danish preposition is spelled correctly, "med".

Hestvik argues that (---) nongenerically interpreted personal pronouns in English do not permit restrictive modification as freely as is possible in Norwegian (Hestvik 1992: 570).

- i. \*he who she married
- ii han som hun giftet seg med  
he who she married REFL with

(Safir 2004, 269n)

Error: "giftet". Correct: "giftet". (Correct in Hestvik 1992: 570.)

- b. Ikkje gjær det!!  
not do-IMP it

(Platzack and Rosengren 1997, 218n)

Errors: "gjær". Correct: "gjør" or "gjer" are alternative imperative forms of Nynorsk GJØRE/GJERE. ("Ikkje" is an unambiguous indicator of Nynorsk.).<sup>38</sup>

- (41) Bordet<sub>j</sub> ble laft en duk på t<sub>j</sub>  
the-table was put a cloth on

(Hendrick 1995, 321)

Error: "laft". Correct: "lagt".

(23) (---)

- c. at brevet<sub>i</sub> ble klisteret frimerker på e<sub>i</sub>  
that letter-the was pasted stamps on  
'the letter was pasted stamps on'

(Norwegian: Taraldsen 1979)

(Afarli 1992: 18, 20)

- d. at frimerker<sub>i</sub> ble klisteret e<sub>i</sub> på brevet  
that stamps were pasted on the letter
- e. at det ble klisteret frimerker på brevet

(Haider 2000, 46)

Errors: "klisteret". Correct: "klistret".<sup>39</sup>

Anti-subject orientation (---) is also found in Danish *ham (selv)*, (---) Norwegian *ham (self)*, and Russian *ego*.

(Büding 2005, 60)

Error: "self". Correct: "selv".

- (26 a) Ola<sub>j</sub> kan jeg ikke skønne  
[hva<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> sier e<sub>j</sub>]

- (26 b) \*Ola<sub>j</sub> I don't understand

<sup>38</sup> "gjær" is present of GJÆRE 'ferment' or 'mitre'.

<sup>39</sup> In Taraldsen's similar (but not identical) sentence, "klistret" is spelled correctly. (*klisteret* is the definite form singular of KLISTER *n.*) By the way, no similar sentence can be found in Åfarli 1992, 18 and 20, only a sentence with similar syntax and different lexical items. Why "brevet" in d. is glossed as 'the letter' instead of "letter-the" in c. begs an explanation.

[what<sub>i</sub> e<sub>j</sub> says e<sub>j</sub>] (Engdahl 1988a, 15)  
 (Haider 1993, 643)  
 Error: “skønne”. Correct: “skjønne”. Engdahl 1988b, 15 contains the correct form “skjønne”.

28 c) Hvilke malerier<sub>j</sub> har ikke Petter noen  
 vegg<sub>j</sub> å henge topp e<sub>j</sub> på e<sub>j</sub>  
 which paintings has not Peter any wall  
 to hang up on  
 (Haider 1993, 643)  
 Error: “topp”. Correct: “opp”. Correct in Haider’s source: Engdahl 1988b, 19.

(5.34) (---)  
 b. jeg er på jakt etter [et bilde av seg selv]<sub>i</sub>  
 I am hunting for [a picture of itself]<sub>i</sub>  
 (Dalrymple 1993, 165)  
 Error: “jekt”. Correct: “jakt”.<sup>40</sup>

(71) a. Norwegian  
 Per / Maria si-t hus  
 Per / Maria RFL.POSS-N.SG house<sub>N</sub>  
 ‘Per’s/Maria’s house’  
 (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003, 669)  
 Error: “si-t”. Correct: “sitt”.

(169) a. Jeg lurer på hvem \* (som) [t ser mest suensk ut].  
 I wonder who that looks most Swedish out  
 (---)  
 (Taraldsen 1978:633-634)  
 (Ogawa 2001, 87)  
 Error: “suenk”. Correct: “svensk”.<sup>41</sup>

(21) a. Noen bjørne har angript sauen. [No]  
 Some bears have attacked the sheep  
 (Jonas 1996, 60)  
 Errors: “bjørne” and “angript”. Correct: “bjørner” or “angrepet” (past participle of ANGRİPE). “bjørne” may also be seen as the result of interference from Danish.

(ii) Jens har ?\*mange/ ingen bøkur<sub>i</sub> lese t<sub>i</sub>. [No]  
 Jens has many /no books read

<sup>40</sup> Similar to (39) d. of Hellan 1988a, 217: “Jeg er på jakt etter et bilde av **seg selv**.” The deeper meaning of “itself<sub>i</sub>” is not known by this author. JEKT *f* is an ancient small type of wooden cargo ship.

<sup>41</sup> (169) a is liable to be some sort of mixture of Taraldsen’s examples (46) and (47). (Taraldsen 1978b, 633.) However, Taraldsen’s paper contains only the correct form.

(Jonas 1996, 105)

Error: “bøkur”. Correct: “bøker”. Christensen and Taraldsen (1991, 72) is quoted as a source. However, their example contains no error.

(15) Det er politimannen som jeg lurar på hvilke piker dommeren vill vita hvilke droger {han/\*Ø} trodde {de/\*Ø} hadde solgt {Ø/\*den} till barne. (N)

‘This is the policeman<sub>i</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>j</sub> the judge will want to know which drugs<sub>k</sub> he<sub>i</sub> thought they<sub>j</sub> had sold \_\_\_\_<sub>k</sub> to the children.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 237)

Error: “barne”. Correct: “barnet” singular definite form or “barna” plural definite form.

Repeated later in the same article as:

(85) a. Det er politimannen som jeg lurar på hvilke piker dommeren vill vite hvilke droger {\*Ø/han} trodde {\*Ø/de} hadde solgt {\*den/Ø} til barne. (N)

‘This is the policeman<sub>1</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>2</sub> the judge will want to know which drugs<sub>3</sub> he<sub>1</sub> thought they<sub>2</sub> had sold \_\_\_\_<sub>3</sub> to the children.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 265)

Error: “barne”. Correct: “barnet” singular definite form or “barna” plural definite form.<sup>42</sup>

(62) Jag kjenner en melodie som ingen visste hvem skrev. (N)

‘I know a song that nobody remembers who wrote.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 257)

Error: “melodie”. Correct: “melodi”.

(51) a. (---)

b. Jeg liker ikke *han med langt haring*.

I like not him with long hair

‘I don’t like him with long hair.’<sup>39</sup>

c. \*Jeg like *han med langt haring ikke*.

I like him with long hair not

d. \*Jeg liker *han ikke med langt haring*.

i like him not with long hair

(Koopman 1999, 119)

---

<sup>42</sup> Curiosities: The entities within the brackets have swapped positions in the last example, and the indexation has changed from letters to numbers.

Error: “haring”. Correct: “hår” (neuter gender). (Cf. the correct concord “langt” adjective neuter.)

Koopman’s footnote 37 right above the quoted examples is interesting:

<sup>37</sup> Thanks to Arild Hestvik for the examples.

(Koopman 1999, 128n)

I take it for granted that Arild Hestvik has not seen the final proofs of the paper. One possible explanation for the errors would be the author’s misinterpretation of an instruction how to write ‘a overcircle’: “a ring”. The code *&Aring;* used in html format is equally a plausible candidate as the source of the confusion.

- (51) a. (---)  
b. Jeg liker ikke *han med langt haring*  
I like not him with long hair  
“\*I do not like him with long hair.”<sup>39</sup>

[105]

- c. \*Jeg liker *han med langt haring ikke*  
I like him with long hair not  
  
d. \*Jeg liker *han ikke med langt haring*  
i like him not with long hair

(Koopman 2000, 104f.)

Error: “haring”. Correct: “hår” (neuter gender). (Cf. the correct concord “langt” adjective neuter.)

- (i) ?Villet<sub>i</sub> hadde han nok ikke t<sub>i</sub> gidd opp.  
wanted has he probably not given up  
‘lit. wanted he has probably not to give up’

(Koopman and Szabolcsi: 2000, 230n)

Error: “gidd”. Correct: “gitt”.

- (84) kongen av Englands skokke  
the king of England’s beard

(Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, 147)

Error: “skokke”. The Norwegian word for English BEARD is SKJEGG, with hardly any resemblance at all to “skokke”. In fact, “skokke” has no meaning at all in Norwegian.<sup>43</sup>

(6.29)

- b. Røykeforbudet brøt en student vanligvis unansett.  
the smoking ban broke a student usually anyway  
‘A student usually violated the smoking ban anyway.’

---

<sup>43</sup> A conjecture would be that the original Norwegian sentence that Giorgi and Longobardi picked up somewhere, contains the word KOKKE ‘female cook’ or, less probable, SKOKK ‘group (pejorative sense)’.

(Engels 2004, 275)

Error: “unansett”. Correct: “uansett”. (Correct in Svenonius 2002a, 225 from where this example is quoted.)

<sup>12</sup> Other languages also mark this difference. In Norwegian, for instance, (8a) would translate as ‘Pavarotti tror at *sine* bokser brenner’ while (8b) would translate as ‘Pavarotti at *haus* bokser brenner’.

(Corazza 2004, 348n)

Errors: “bokser” (twice) and “haus”. Correct “bukser” and “hans”. In the last sentence, the finite verb, “tror” ‘believes’ is missing. “bokser” means ‘boxes’ (of BOKS *m*), HAUS *m* means ‘skull’.

(6) a. Det ble påstott å komme mange tilhørere  
it was claimed to come(ACC) many listeners

(---)

(7) a. Det ble påstott at det kommer så mange tilhørere  
b. Det var ikke let å få det til at det kommer så mange tilhørere

(---)

(8) a. Det ble påstott å ha repariert bilen  
it was claimed to have repaired the car”  
b. Det var ikke lett å få det til å repariere bilen  
it was not easy to get it to to repair the car

(Hoekstra 1990, 213)

Errors: “påstott”, “let”, “repariert”, and “repariere”. Correct: “alltid”, “påstått”, “lett”, “repareert”, and “reparere”. LET means ‘colour’. “repariert” and “repariere” are possibly due to interference from Dutch or German.

(33) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss hvem vi trodde hadde skrivet. (N)

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 245)

Error: “laererin “. Correct: “læreren”. -EN is the masculine definite postposed article, cf. a similar sentence represented in Maling 1978a, 87 (above).

Consider, for example, the following Norwegian example from Maling/Zaenen(1981):

(56) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss [hvem vi trodde hadde skrevet]  
These are the poems COMP teacher asked us who we thought had written  
‘These are the poems that the teacher asked us who we thought had written.’

(Borsley 1993, 578)

As for “Maling/Zaenen(1981)”, cf. above.

Error: “laererin”. Correct: “læreren”. Correct copy, incorrect morphology: -EN is the masculine definite postposed article.

(77b) *desse konstruksjonar trur jeg at er meir naturlege uttrykksmåta*  
*diese Konstruktionen denke ich daß sind mehr natürliche Ausdrucksmittel*

(Fanselow 1991, 338)

Error “uttrykksmåta”. Correct: “uttrykksmåtar”. An inexact copy of Engdahl 1988a, 81

### Interference?

The most conspicuous *cause* of errors appears to be interference, and, by far, the most important source of interference is Swedish, in some cases because the author in question actually *is* Swedish. In general, the reason seems to be that a certain knowledge of Swedish is more common among foreign linguists. Still, some of them may have serious problems determining what is Swedish and what is Norwegian:

(8) (---)  
Norwegian  
*Jeg leste dem ikke alla.*  
'I read them not all.'

(Deprez 1994, 105)

Error: “alla”. Correct: “alle”. (Swedish “alla”.) In Deprez’ article, there are a number of Scandinavian sentences - hardly any without one or more misspelled words.

(12) (---)  
c. *Vi leste ikke artikkeln.*  
d. \**Vi leste artikkeln ikke.*  
we read (the papers) not (the papers)

(Deprez 1994, 106)

Error: “artikkeln”. Correct: “artikkelen”. (Swedish “artikeln”.)

(2a) *i dag har \*(det) kommit mange lingvister hit* (Norw)

(Brandner 1993, 73)

Hardly a Norwegian, “(Norw)”, sentence. This is (mostly) Swedish. Errors: “kommit” and “mange”. Correct: “kommet” and “mange”. (Swedish: “kommit” and “många”.)

(45a) *i dag har det kommet mange lingvister hit*  
today have EXPL arrived many linguists here  
'there have arrived many linguists here today'

(Brandner 1993, 92)

Similar to (2a) of Brandner 1993, 73, but felt to be more Norwegian because of “kommet”. Error: “mange”. Correct: “mange”. (Swedish “många”.)

(71a) *fordi det har arbeidet en mann på kontoret*  
*hver aften* (Swe)  
because EXPL has worked a man in the office

- every night  
 ‘because a man has worked in the office every night’  
 (71b) därför att det har arbetat en mann i byrån (Norw)  
 varje afton  
 because that EXPL has worked a man in the office  
 every night  
 ‘because a man has worked in the office every night’  
 (Brandner 1993, 103)

Apparently, the difference between Norwegian and Swedish is a major problem for Brandner: (71a) is not Swedish as indicated by means of “(Swe)”. It is Norwegian. On the other hand, (71b) is not Norwegian as indicated, cf. “(Norw)”, but Swedish.<sup>44</sup> This is more than a misplaced language label, cf. Brandner 1993, 92 above. Of minor importance: “aften” may be the result of interference from Swedish AFTON, but may also simply be the slightly archaic Norwegian word AFTEN.

*Standard Norwegian (Koptjevskaja-Tamm forthc.)*

- Hatt-en till mann-en  
 hat- DEF to man- DEF  
 ‘the man’s hat’

(Heine and Kuteva 2002, 104)

Error: “till”. Correct: “til”. (Swedish “till”).<sup>45</sup>

- (15) Det er politimannen som jeg lurer på hvilke piker dommeren  
 vill vita hvilke droger {han/\*Ø} trodde {de/\*Ø} hadde solgt  
 {Ø/\*den} till barne. (N)  
 ‘This is the policeman<sub>i</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>j</sub> the judge will  
 want to know which drugs<sub>k</sub> he<sub>i</sub> thought they<sub>j</sub> had sold \_\_\_\_<sub>k</sub> to  
 the children.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 237)

Errors: “vill”, “vita”, “droger”, and “till”. Correct: “vil”, “vite”, “stoff”,<sup>46</sup> and “til”. (Swedish “vill”, “veta”, “droger”, and “till”). Repeated later in the same article as:

- (85) a. Det er politimannen som jeg lurer på hvilke piker dommeren  
 vill vite hvilke droger {\*Ø/han} trodde {\*Ø/de} hadde solgt  
 {\*den/Ø} til barne. (N)  
 ‘This is the policeman<sub>i</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>2</sub> the judge  
 will want to know which drugs<sub>3</sub> he<sub>i</sub> thought they<sub>2</sub> had  
 sold \_\_\_\_<sub>3</sub> to the children.’

<sup>44</sup> This is no coincidence or singular typing error, as may be seen from the next excerpt.

<sup>45</sup> "Koptjevskaja-Tamm forthc." must refer to Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003, where the word is spelled correctly (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003, 660).

<sup>46</sup> With the due changes in the rest of the sentence, e.g. "hva for/slags" instead of "hvilke", which a little peculiar anyway.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 265)

Errors: “vill” and “droger”. Correct: “vil” and “stoff”. Note that “hvilke [droger]” as well as “hvilke [droger]” in the example above, is unidiomatic. “hva for/slags stoff” (singular) would be better.<sup>47</sup>

(85) a. (---)

- b. Her er pusher som jeg lurer på hvilke piker dommeren vill vite hvilka stoffer folk hørte ham snakke med dem om Ø.  
'Here is the pusher<sub>1</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>2</sub> the judge will want to know which things<sub>3</sub> people heard him<sub>1</sub> talk with them<sub>2</sub> about Ø<sub>3</sub>.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 265)

Errors: “vill” and “hvilka”. Correct: “vil” and “hvilke”. (Swedish “vill” and “vilka”.)

Additionally, “stoffer” (indefinite plural) is translated as “things”. There is a slang reading of STOFF as ‘thing’. In the current case, however, the only possible meaning is ‘drugs’. But “hvilka stoffer” is unidiomatic.<sup>48</sup> The correct form is “hvilke stoff” or better: “hva for/slags stoff” (singular), cf. above.

(26) Montague kan jeg ikke huske om {\*han/Ø} døde i Kalifornia (N)

'Montague I can't remember if (\*he) died in California.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 239)

Error: “Kalifornia”. Correct: “California”. (Swedish “Kalifornien”.)

(62) Jag kjenner en melodie som ingen visste hvem skrev. (N)

'I know a song that nobody remembers who wrote.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 257)

Error: “Jag”. Correct: “Jeg”. (Swedish “jag”.)

(72) a. (---)

- b. Kalle, jeg liker inte den tullingen! (N)

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 261)

Error: “inte”. Correct: “ikke”. (Swedish “inte”.)

(33) a. (---)

- b. Slike foelsomme politiska fragor har jeg flere studenter som det ikke finnes noen som jeg tror ville våge å prata med om.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 242)

Errors: “politiska” and “fragor”. Correct: “politiske” and “spørsmål”. (Swedish “politiska frågor”.) Also, the equivalent of Norwegian VÅGE, VÅGA, is far more common in Swedish than in Norwegian, where it has a solemn ring.

---

<sup>47</sup> Note that the order of the constituents within the curly brackets have swapped.

<sup>48</sup> Even if one doesn't mind that "hvilka" is an error.

(34) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss hvem vi trodde  
hadde skrivet. (N)

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 245)

Error: "skrivet". Correct: "skrevet". (Swedish "skrivit".)

(105) a. Denne boken<sub>i</sub> er jag sikker på at \_{i} kom ut i Russland.  
this book I am sure that came out in Russia

(---)

[123]

(---)

d. Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> husker jeg ikke hva<sub>j</sub> \_{j}  
this author<sub>i</sub> I don't remember what  
har oversatt \_{j} til norsk.  
has translated to Norwegian

(Engdahl 1986, 122f.)

Errors: "Jag" and "forfatteren". Correct: "Jeg" and "forfatteren". (Swedish "jag" and "författaren".)<sup>49</sup>

(2.19) (---) [34]

e. Jag anser [ meg \*(å) ha rett]  
I think me have right

(Norwegian)

(---)

'I believe myself to be right.'

Platzack (1986, 218)

(Watanabe 1996, 33f)

Error: "Jag". Correct: "Jeg". (Swedish "jag".)<sup>50</sup>

(---); but in subordinate clauses: *vi ar redd for at bussen ikke kommer* "we fear the bus will not come", (---).

(Ramat 1987, 183)

Error: "ar". Correct: "er". (Swedish "är".)<sup>51</sup>

C.f. Dahl (1979: 95): (---) Norw. *Jeg vet ikke hvorfor jeg ar så trist* 'I don't know why I'm so sad' (---).

(Bernini and Ramat 1996, 223)

Error: "ar". Correct: "er". (Swedish "är".)<sup>52</sup>

(31) Norwegian  
Spikeren ligger på plankan.

<sup>49</sup> Note that "jag" occurs in (105) a. only. The correct form "jeg" is found in (105) d. I take it for granted that (105) d. is intended as Bokmål, given the markers "husker", "jeg", "ikke", "hva", "oversatt". ("forfatteren" is identical to the Nynorsk form corresponding to Bokmål "forfatteren".)

<sup>50</sup> Correct in Platzack 1986, 218.

<sup>51</sup> Ramat gives what appears to be a clear reference to Dahl, Östen: 1979, "Typology of sentence negation". *Linguistics* 17, 79-106. However, no explicit Norwegian example is given at the page indicated (95).

<sup>52</sup> Same as above.

nail the lie 3SG PRES on board the  
'The nail is on the board.'

(Kuteva 1999, 201)

Error: "plankan". Correct: "planken". (Swedish "plankan".)

(20) Det finns substantivforekomster vi ikke engang vet  
it exists noun occurrences we not even know  
[om e skall klassifiseres som mengdetermer eller ikke.]  
if shall classify-PASS as mass terms or not  
'There are noun occurrences that we don't even know if they  
should be classified as mass terms or not.'

(Engdahl 1985, 13)

Errors: "finns" and "skall". Correct: "fins"/"finnes" and "skal". (Swedish "finns" and "skall".)

f. Kva for sange vart det sunge den kvellen?  
*which songs was EX sung-N.SG that night*  
Which songs were sung that night? (Norwegian 2)

(Holmberg 2002, 108)

Error: "kvellen". Correct: "kvelden". (Swedish "kvällen".) This example contains another error as well: "sange". Correct: "songar". "sange" is Danish. There is also a possibility that it is a simple spelling error for "sanger". However, the sentence is in the written standard Nynorsk ("Norwegian 2" in Holmberg's notation), where "songar" is obligatory. "sanger" is Bokmål, the other written Norwegian standard.

(35) Det kan jeg ikke sie noe om [hvordan e må gjøres]  
it can I not say something about how ought do-PASS  
[uten å studere p nærmere.]  
without to study closer  
'That I can't say anything about how it should be done without  
studying it more closely.'

(Engdahl 1985, 17)

Error: "sie". Correct: "si". (Swedish "säga", Danish "sige".)

(14) a. Hun har hengt billedet opp på veggen. (Norwegian)  
she has hung picture-the up on wall-the  
b. Hun har hengt opp billedet på veggen. (Norwegian)  
she has hung up picture-the on wall-the

(Holmberg and Platzack 2005, 428)

Norwegian, "billedet" is uncontroversially an archaism and does not conform to official orthography. (Danish "billedet".)

(25) (---)

b. Dette er de dikte, som laereren spurte hvem vi trodde hadde skrevet (\*dem).

- (---)  
 ‘These are the poems that the teacher asked (us) who we thought wrote (them).’  
 (Maling 1978a, 87)  
 Error: “dikte”. Correct possibly “dikt” (indefinite plural) or, preferably, “diktene” or “dikta” (definite plural).<sup>53</sup> (Danish “digte”).<sup>54</sup>

- (135) (---)  
 b. Barna<sub>i</sub> ble overrakt [<sub>VP</sub> (t'<sub>i</sub>) [<sub>VP</sub> blomsterne [<sub>V</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]  
 the children<sub>nom</sub> PASS handed the flowers<sub>acc</sub>  
 (---)  
 d. Blomsterne<sub>i</sub> ble overrakt [<sub>VP</sub> barna<sub>j</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> [<sub>V</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]  
 the flowers<sub>nom</sub> PASS handed the children<sub>dat</sub>

(Müller 1995b, 243)  
 Errors: “blomsterne”. Correct: “blomstene”. (Danish “blomsterne”).<sup>55</sup>

- (38) (---)  
 b. Norwegian Min søster er like pen som dig.  
 c. Danish Min søster er lige så smuk som dig.  
 ‘My sister is as pretty as you.’

(Haspelmath and Buchholz 1998, 294)  
 Error: “dig”. Correct “deg”. (Danish “dig”).<sup>56</sup>  
 Also note “så” in the Danish c. sentence. This word might as well have appeared in the Norwegian sentence.

- (3) (---)  
 c. Det bli troet at Jon ikke var på kontoret  
 it was believed that John not was in the office

(Hoekstra 1990, 212)  
 Error: “troet”. Correct: “trodd”. (Danish “troet”).

- (i) a. Jeg har ingen/ (No)  
 I have no one/  
 \*henne<sub>i</sub> set t<sub>i</sub>.  
 \*her seen  
 “I haven’t seen anyone.”

(Thráinsson 2001, 197)  
 Error: “set”. Correct “sett”. (Danish “set”).

<sup>53</sup> In this particular phrase, where “double determination” is almost obligatory.

<sup>54</sup> The Danish hypothesis is supported by a corresponding Danish example found in Maling and Zaenen 1981:

(iii) Her er de digte, som laereren spurgte os, hvem vi troede, (der) havde skrevet dem.  
 Here are the poems that the teacher asked us who we thought had written them.

(Maling and Zaenen 1981, 276.)

<sup>55</sup> Corresponds to correctly spelled sentences in Christensen 1982 and e.g. Larson 1988, 356n.

<sup>56</sup> Theoretically, Swedish is another possible source, since “sig” is the correct Swedish form too. Still, the proximity of the Danish sentence makes it more probable that Danish is the source of the interference.

- (i) a. \*Etter dette slo Guri Per  
After this beat Guri Per  
altid I sjakk.  
always in chess

(---)

(Thráinsson 2001, 199)

Error: "altid". Correct "alltid". (Danish "altid").<sup>57</sup>

The term scrambling has since been used to describe phenomena as diverse as Object Shift found in Scandinavian languages such as Norwegian (2):

- (2) a. Igar læste han uden tviv ikke dem  
yesterday read he without doubt not them  
b. Igar læste han dem, uden tviv ikke t,  
yesterday read he them without doubt not  
'Yesterday, without a doubt, he didn't read them'

(Vikner 1994)

(---).

(van Gelderen 2003, 4)

This is not Norwegian. From a strictly *morphological* point of view, this is Danish.<sup>58</sup> Observe the numerous Danish errors: "Igar", "læste", "tviv". Correct Danish: "Igår", "læste", and "tvivl". The correct Danish sentence b. is given in Vikner's article, where no Norwegian examples can be found:

I går læste han [ I ° t ] [ VP dem [ VP uden tvivl [ VP ikke [ VP t t ] ] ] ]

(Vikner 1994, 487)

Vikner's article does not contain a direct source of the van Gelderen's a. sentence.)

- b. Disse konstruksjonar trur eg at t er meir naturlege uttryksmåtar.  
These constructions think I that are more natural expressions  
(from Engdahl 1984:12, (29))

(Vikner 1995, 60)

Error: "uttryksmåtar". Correct: "uttrykksmåtar". (Danish "udtryksmåder".)

(41)

(---)

- d. Hann spiste tørrfiskden/opp.

(Thráinsson 2001, 166)

Error: "Hann". Correct "Han". (Icelandic "hann").<sup>59</sup>

- (19) a. Han skar kjøttet up rått [Nor.]  
he cuts meat-the up raw

<sup>57</sup> As for the asterisk, see below.

<sup>58</sup> Which is why this example is not listed in the Norwegian characters' section.

<sup>59</sup> Possibly a misprint, since "Han" is spelled correctly in the previous example, (40).

- b. Han skar up kjøttet rått  
c. \*/??Han skar kjøttet rått up  
(---)”  
(Haider 1997, 11)  
Errors: “up”. Correct: “opp”. Theoretically, this could be the result of interference from archaic Nynorsk or modern Swedish “upp”. Yet, it seems more natural to track this error back to English.

- (14) *Cîinii latră.* *Hundene barker.*  
(Avram 1987, 209)  
Error: “barker”. Correct: “gjør”. The influence from English is obvious. (Norwegian “barker” of BARKE means ‘debark’; ‘tan’; ‘get to blows’.)

- (26) (---)  
b. Det er den skitne boken, som laereren spurte hvem jeg sa hadde legt (\*den) igjen på pullen.  
(---)  
‘This is the dirty book that the teacher asked who I said had left (it) behind on the desk.’  
(Maling 1978a, 87)  
Error: “skitne” of SKITTEN ‘dirty’ in a concrete sense, is likely to be an erroneous translation of “dirty” in the English “rendering”. DIRTY in its metaphoric sense, ‘obscene’, corresponds to Norwegian GROV, GRISETE etc. However, “den grisete boken” as a translation of “the dirty book” will be felt as slightly unidiomatic.

In Norwegian the counterpart to the English example in (101d) is also well formed:

- (iv) John wasket barna i ansiktet.  
John washed the children in the face  
But here Norwegian differs from English and French in another respect. In Norwegian *John wasket barna* ‘John washed the children’ may mean that only a specific part of the children’s body (for example, the hands) was washed.

- (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992, 640n)  
Errors: “wasket”. Correct “vasket”. Possibly the result of interference from another Germanic language, probably English, but Dutch or German is also possible.

- (19) a. (---)  
c. Jon wasket seg. (Hellan 1988:chap. 3, (22a))  
Jon washed SE  
(Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666)  
Error: “wasket”. Correct “vasket”. (Cf. Dutch “wassen”.) (The sentence is spelled correctly in Hellan 1988a, 108.)

(---) sentence [17b] is from Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 666):

- (17) (---)  
b. Jon<sub>i</sub> wasket seg<sub>i</sub>.  
'Jon washed (himself).'

(Smith 2004, 585)

Error: "wasket". Correct "vasket". A quotation from Reinhart and Reuland 1993. See above.

These cases involve lexical reflexivity, however, and are captured by Reinhart and Reuland's theory:

- (i) Max wast zich  
Max washes self  
'Max washes himself'  
(ii) Jon wasket seg  
Jon washed self  
'Jon washed himself'

(Lidz 1996, 122)

Error: "wasket". Correct "vasket". Presumably inherited from Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666.

- (211) a. (---)  
b. Jon wasket segselv bedre enn Per  
Jon washed himself better than Peter  
'Jon washed himself better than Peter washed himself'  
'Jon washed himself better than Peter washed him'

(Lidz 1996, 136)

Errors: "wasket". Correct "vasket". (Cf. Dutch "wassen".)

- (27) a. (---)  
d. en Mann som var fra India ...  
'a man that was from India ...'

(Pesetsky 1982, 307)

Errors (3 more tokens in the examples a. – c.): "Mann". Correct: "mann". German nouns have an initial capital character.

- (72) En man \*(som) var fra India kom inn  
A man that was from India came in

(---)

- (73) En man kom inn \*(som) var fra India

(Pesetsky 1982, 325)

Errors: "man". Correct: "mann". (English and Swedish: "man".)

Above, only examples of possible interference at word level have been given. Possible results of interference at phrase or sentence level will be listed at the end of the chapter on other anomalies at the same descriptive level.

### Phrase level errors

#### Correct morphological form used in an incorrect way

- (34) (---)  
c. Jeg har gitt John ei boka  
(Hoekstra 1995, 127)  
Error: “ei boka”. Correct: “ei bok”.<sup>60</sup>

- (35) (---)  
c. Jeg har kjøpt ham ei boka  
(Hoekstra 1995, 127)  
Error: “ei boka”. Correct: “ei bok”.

Or consider the Norwegian means of expressing the demonstrative *that*.

- (6) *Det stort huset*  
the large house-the  
*that large house*

[76]

Both *det* and the nominal suffix *-et* alone can be used to signal definiteness.

- (7) a. *Det stort hus*  
*the large house*  
b. *Huset*  
*the house*

In combination with one another, though, they mean *that*.

(Carlson 1983, 75f.)

Errors: “stort” in “Det stort huset” and “Det stort hus”. Correct: “store” (i.e. weak inflection): “Det store huset” and “Det store hus”.

- ii *Vi jaget Jon tilbake til huset sin/hans.*  
we chased Jon back to house SIN/his

(Safir 2004, 251n)

Error: “huset sin”. Correct: “huset sitt”. In a sympathetic reading, this “sin” may be explained as the lemma form of the word SIN. However, there is nothing else

---

<sup>60</sup> A Norwegian noun cannot be explicitly definite and indefinite at the same time ...

indicating that ii is not intended as a correct Norwegian sentence. SIN has to be written in its neuter form, *sitt*. *sin* is masculine.

(34a) Han med røtt hatt

(34b) ??He with the red hat

(Harbert 1995, 208)

Error: “røtt”. Correct: “rød”.

(34) [Norwegian] (Svenonius 1993: 207)

a. (---)

c. En kjempestore isbjørn a huge.c  
polar.bear

(Mallen 1997, 71)

Error: “kjempestore” in “en kjempestore isbjørn”. Correct: “kjempstor”, i.e. “en kjempstor isbjørn”. *kjempestore* is the weak inflection, wrong in this position. It is hardly probable that the author tries to represent the svaharabhakti vowel in Southwestern dialects – especially since Svenonius 1993 contains the correct form.

(35) [Norwegian] (Svenonius 1993: 212-3)

a. Steffens sine utslitte olabukser  
Steffen. his<sub>PL</sub> worn.out blue.jeans

(Mallen 1997, 71)

Error: “Steffens” in “Steffens sine”. Correct: “Steffen”, i.e. “Steffen sine”. Svenonius 1993 contains the correct form.

(19) at det ikke var skote noe fuglar  
that he not has shot any birds

(Hoekstra 1990, 217)

Taking the other Norwegian examples in the same paper into account, this must be intended as a Nynorsk sentence. Cf. also “skote” and “fuglar”. Now, “noe” belongs to the other written standard (Bokmål). The correct Nynorsk form is “nokre”. More about this and the *ikke/ikkje* indicator below. On the other hand, “noe” is incorrect under all circumstances, since it is neuter singular. Only pronounced slang will use “noe” (or Nynorsk “noko” for that matter) as some sort of mass term in a case such as “noe fuglar”, which is not probable in this case. The correct form in Bokmål would have been “noen” (plural). As for the past participle “skote”, agreement with DET is certainly the official Nynorsk norm. However, “skotne” (plural) will also be an option as long as one does not limit the inquiry to the written standards.

f. at det var kjøpt ein hund  
that it became bought a dog  
‘that a dog was bought’

(Haider 2000, 47)

“var” (of VÆRE ‘be’) indicating ‘state’) and not “vart” (of VERTE ‘become, get’ indicating ‘process’) is odd in itself – an impression supported by the translation (“became”).

(3) (---)

- b. Det var snakket om Jon  
 it was talked about John  
 c. Det bli troet at Jon ikke var på kontoret  
 it was believed that John not was in the office

(Hoekstra 1990, 212)

Errors: b. “var snakket om”. Correct: “ble snakket om”. (Another solution, however less probable to judge from the translation, is “var snakk om”). c. “bli” (infinitive). Correct: “blir” (present) or, taking the translation (“was”) into consideration, “ble” or “blei” (past).

(2.65) Han hente barna<sub>i</sub> og ba \*(dem<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> feie.  
 He call.PAST children.DEF.Pl<sub>i</sub> and order.PAST \*(them<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> sweep  
 ‘He called the children and ordered them (the children) to sweep.’

(2.66) Han hente barna<sub>i</sub> og ba \*(dem<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> om å feie.  
 He call.PAST children.DEF.Pl<sub>i</sub> and order.PAST \*(them<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> to sweep  
 ‘He called the children and ordered them (the children) to sweep.’

(Larson 2005, 30)

Error: “hente”. Correct past form is either “hentet” or “henta”. (“hente” is the infinitive. In some dialects of South-Eastern Norway, the infinitive and the past form of HENTE are homophones. This, however, does not seem to be what Larson intends to represent.)

(4) (---)

- b. Det starte en brann  
 it started a fire

(Hoekstra 1990, 212)

Error: “starte” (infinitive). Correct “startet” or “starta” (past form). It is hardly probable that a non-standard phonetic adaptation of the South-East Norwegian dialect past form is intended. (Cf. above.) Probably a quotation from Åfarli 1992, 103:

(4) (---)

- d. Det starta ein brann.  
 ‘There stared a fire.’

27Da) løbe [meget hurtigt]  
 run very fast

28N) løp [veldig fort]  
 run very fast

(Webelhuth 1992, 70)

Error: “løp” (imperative or past form). Correct: “løpe” (infinitive), cf. the Danish sentence right above. All the other examples in the same set are infinitives.

The infinitival PRO subject in (109b) corresponds to *det* in the finite counterpart in (109a). In both cases we find a postverbal correlate NP, *så mange tilhørere*. Assuming that no nominative NP can surface in a (non-ECM) infinitival complement, this postverbal NP can only be licenced by Accusative Case. (---).

(109) a. *det var ikke lett å få det til [at det komme så mange tilhørere]*  
it was not easy to arrange it at that it come so many listeners

(Hoekstra and Mulder 1990, 49)

Do the authors really think that (109a) is a Norwegian sentence? Phrases such as “finite counterpart” seem to indicate this. Error: “komme” (infinitive) is wrong (109a). Correct: “kom”, or preferably “skulle komme”.

(51) a. (---)

c. \**Jeg like han med langt haring ikke.*  
I like him with long hair not

(Koopman 1999, 119)

Error: “like” (infinitive). Correct: “liker” (present) or “likte” (past).<sup>61</sup>

59a) *Yeats lese seg selv på engelsk og så gjorde Hamsun det på norsk.*  
“Yeats read SIG-SELF in English and then Hamsun did in Norwegian.”

(Safir 2004, 132)

Error: “lese” (infinitive). Correct “leste” (past form).<sup>62</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Tests for bound variable status give different results in this case; many Norwegian speakers accept only the sloppy reading for (i) (Arild Hestvik, personal communication, Hellan 1988, 1991).

(i) *Jon respekterer seg selv, og det gjøre Bjørn også.*  
Jon respects self self and it does Bjorn also  
‘Jon respects himself, and so does Bjorn.’

(Richards 1997, 183)

Error: “gjøre” (infinitive). Correct: “gjør” (present).

73a) (---)

c) *Jon bad meg vasket seg/\*seg selv.*  
“Jon asked me to wash him.”

(Safir 2004, 99)

<sup>61</sup> The asterisk refers to one probable reading of the sentence only. Cf. below.

<sup>62</sup> Alleged origin: “My Norwegian informant for these examples, Arild Hestvik, also permits the pronoun *ham* in place of *seg* in (59b).” (Safir 2004, 257n).

Error “vasket” (past or past participle), correct “vaske” (infinitive).

(61) (---)

- b. Det hadde uheldigvis en student kanskje allerede brøt i går.  
That had unfortunately a student maybe already broken yesterday  
'A (specific) student unfortunately had maybe already violated it yesterday'

(Svenonius 2002a, 232)

Error: “brøt”. Correct “brutt” (past participle). “brøt” is the past form, while both the context, “hadde”, ‘had’ the perfect tense auxiliary, and the English gloss indicate that “brutt”, the perfect participle, is correct.

(iii) (---)

- b. Det hadde uheldigvis en student kanskje allerede brøt i går.  
(Svenonius 2002: 230)  
that had unfortunately a student maybe already broken yesterday  
'A student unfortunately had maybe already violated it yesterday.'

(Engels 2004, 146n)

Error: “brøt”. Correct “brutt” (past participle). “brøt” is the past form, while both the context, “hadde”, ‘had’ the perfect tense auxiliary, and the English gloss indicate that “brutt”, the perfect participle, is correct. A copy of Svenonius 2002a, 232 above. ”alreay” in the English gloss is a typo.

(26) *Zăresc o casă.* *Jeg får sikte av et hus.*

(Avram 1987, 211)

Error: “Jeg får sikte av et hus.” Correct: “Jeg får øye på et hus.”<sup>63</sup>

(5) *Pisicile sînt rare în acest ţinut.* *Kattene er sjeldsynte på dette landet.*

(Avram 1987, 208)

Error: “på dette landet”. Correct: “i dette landet”.<sup>64</sup>

At this descriptive level, there is also a lot of confusion brought about by the peculiar language situation in Norway.

---

<sup>63</sup> Probably, since this author’s Rumanian competence is inexistent.

<sup>64</sup> SJELDSYNT, usually associated with Norwegian Nynorsk, is extremely infrequent in Norwegian Bokmål, but cannot be considered to be incorrect.

## What kind of Norwegian?

### Written standards. The Bokmål/Nynorsk confusion

A special kind of phrasal incorrectness or straightforward error is connected with the special Norwegian variability, a complication brought about by spoken dialect versus written standard considerations with a strong historical dimension.<sup>65</sup> The relationship between Norwegian and written Danish is far from simple but very important in this respect.

- (2) a. i) *acist om*                      ii) *omul acesta*                                      (Rumanian)  
          this man                              man-the this  
      b. *denna man<sup>0</sup>(nen)*                                      (Mainland Scandinavian)  
          this man-(the)

(---) In Mainland Scandinavian (2b), (---), the [242] optionality of the article appears to be a matter of dialectal variation, represented by “<sup>0</sup>”.<sup>2</sup>

(Giusti 1994, 241f.)

2. With respect to this problem it seems quite difficult to distinguish clearly between the two variants in that the occurrence of the suffixed article is banned by the academy of certain national languages but used in the spoken languages. It can be roughly stated that Swedish allows it freely, including the formal language, Norwegian allows it in spoken varieties, while Danish does not display it at all.

(Giusti 1994, 242n)

As far as Norwegian is concerned, this is misleading. The suffixed article is generally recommended by the Norwegian Language Council, *Norsk språkråd*. Suffixed articles may be omitted only in the case of names of institutions: In written Norwegian – even in Bokmål, the standard closest to Danish – the lack of a suffixed definite article is quite marked, as long as there is no name involved. It definitely has an archaic ring. In spoken Norwegian, the lack of suffixed article is exceptional. An unofficial academy, with the objective to promote old, Dano-Norwegian normative rules, has a more open attitude to omitting suffixed articles also when no name of institution is involved, though.

Within the Scandinavian branch of Germanic, Norwegian (Nynorsk and informal Bokmål) and Faeroese permit re-articulation in the Swedish manner but are less eager to practice it.

(---)

And, (---), Danish and the formal Bokmål variety of Norwegian obligatorily shed the noun-article when an attributive adjective is added along with its adjective-article: [358]

---

<sup>65</sup> Vikør 2001, 53-57 and 98-104 describes the relationship between Bokmål and Nynorsk for those unfamiliar with the language situation in Norway.

(75) den ung-e                      mand(\*-en)  
the young-WEAK      man(\*-DEF)

(Plank 2003, 357f.)

The last contention is obviously not correct as far as Present-day Norwegian is concerned, cf. remarks made in relationship to other examples above.<sup>66</sup>

A noun phrase containing an adjectival modifier and a head noun may be lexicalized as a proper name, as in *the White House*. (---) In Scandinavian, we can see a tendency towards decreased definiteness marking. There is great variation in how this tendency is realized, however. Starting with ‘the White House’, the most common translations into the standard languages<sup>4</sup> are as follows:

Danish: *det hvide Hus* (P+W+S-)

Norwegian Bokmål: *det Hvite hus* (P+W+S-)

Norwegian Nynorsk: *det Kvite huset* (P+W+S+)

Swedish: *Vita huset* (P+W+S+)

(Dahl 2004, 155)

As for Norwegian, the definiteness marking has been increasing over time - also as far as names are concerned. It appears that Dahl has consulted normative grammars of a dubious - or archaic - character.

<sup>4</sup> An internet search reveals that the differences between the two varieties of Norwegian are not so clear-cut as normative grammars would have it, in this case. Thus, both *det Hvite huset* and *det Kvite hus* do occur. It appears that the pattern P+W+S- has its source in Danish-inspired written language and is not productive in spoken language.

(Dahl 2004, 179n)

The statement in Dahl’s footnote is true. Still, the influence from what was originally Danish officialese can be found in both Bokmål and Nynorsk, although to a lesser degree in the latter.

20. As mentioned, Danish doesn’t have Dx in construction with descriptive attributive adjectives and also does not do so in names: *Det Hvide Hus* ‘The White House’, *Det Døde Hav* ‘The Dead Sea’. Norwegian, for some reason, either behaves like Danish or employs a form of compounding: *Det Hvite Hus* but *Døde Havet*, the latter with compound intonation.

(Holmberg and Platzack 2005, 454n)

The statement “Norwegian, (---), either behaves like Danish or employs a form of compounding.” is incorrect. True, Norwegian (especially Bokmål) has a tendency to follow Danish in the case of names. In other cases, the so-called double definite form is both recommended and used in practice as stated above. The situation alluded to reflects (written) Dano-Norwegian more than one century ago.

---

<sup>66</sup> Interestingly enough, Plank makes a reference to Lundeby 1965 in passing and in the initial part of the chapter. (Lundeby’s monograph is the standard, descriptive linguistics study on the subject). However, Plank’s claim has no foundation in Lundeby 1965.

Error: “Døde Havet”. Correct: “Dødehavet”. This does not mean, however, that both constructions can be used freely. For instance, this author has never heard nor seen any instance of “Hvitehuset”, which would only be understood as a joke. Thus, the second part of Holmberg and Platzack’s contention is also a qualified truth.

Norwegian and Icelandic have retained the Old Scandinavian three-gender system with masculine, feminine and neuter.

(Platzack 2000, 301n)

The foreign reader may here get the impression that the three-gender system of Old Scandinavian has been retained completely in both modern languages. This is not the case, though. It is only fair to say that Norwegian Bokmål is characterised by a 2.5 gender system, as the feminine gender is lacking altogether in the dialect of the city of Bergen as well as in conservative Dano-Norwegian except for rudimentary forms. In general, the feminine gender leads a rather fluctuant existence in Bokmål representing some sort of latent category.

Norwegian non-restrictive relative clauses are structurally very similar to the Danish ones, except that *der* is used only in conservative Bokmål (Faarlund et al. 1997: 1056).

(Platzack 2002, 80)

DER in relative clause initial position was used by authors of the Riksmåal written standard, a precursor of today’s Bokmål. Today, a DER in this position will – without exception – be felt as a deliberate borrowing of a Danish construction (presumably in order to achieve a special stylistic effect). Which is, in fact, the case with the two examples given in Faarlund et al. 1997, 1056. Here, in the very last paragraph of 11.3.2.1.1 one reads the following:

“Etter dansk mønster kan ein i konservativt bokmål av og til finne der brukt som subjunksjon i relativsetningar med relativisert subjekt, særleg når ordet som står like føre korrelatet: Dette elementet defineres som et handlingselement der bringer undergang eller smerte (Børtnes 1980). Somme tider kjente vi oss som de der visste minst av alle (Dagbladet 1995).” (Faarlund et al. 1997: 1056)

However, the examples of Faarlund et al. are either a curiosity or an intended archaism. As a matter of fact, this use of DER became extinct several generations ago. So, Platzack’s contention “is used only in conservative Bokmål” is true only under a special interpretation, ‘at least once or twice’ - and he has not construed the relevant paragraph of Faarlund et al. 1997 correctly.

In the possessor-doubling construction (13a) from Norwegian (Nynorsk dialect),<sup>6</sup> the doubling element *sin* is a reflexive, hence anaphoric (it is opposed to pronominal *hans*; see Delsing 1998, Fiva 1984). We correctly predict that the Norwegian possessor-doubling construction is compatible with a reciprocal possessor (13b).

(13) a. Per sin bil

- Per his car  
'Per's car'  
b. *kvarandre sin bil*  
each-other his car  
'each other's car'

(Haegeman 2004, 705)

Nynorsk is not a dialect. It is one of the two written standards of Norwegian. The SIN genitive, on the other hand, is a dialectal phenomenon, and its users are found in both the Nynorsk and the Bokmål camp. This implies that numerous Nynorsk users will never say or write (13) a. or b.

Notice also that the inherently reflexive verb par excellence (i.e. the example most often mentioned in the literature, (---)), viz. *skamme sig* 'be ashamed' has two variants in Norwegian dialects, see (141).

- (141) a. *skamme seg* (Bokmål Norwegian)  
shame REFL  
'be ashamed'  
b. *skjemme-s* (Ny-norsk Norwegian)<sup>50</sup>  
shame-S  
'be ashamed'

(Bergeton 2004, 300)

SKAMME SEG and SKJEMMES are normal in both written standards. Note that "Ny-norsk" (with a hard hyphen) is incorrect in English as well as in Norwegian. Correct Norwegian form: "nynorsk". (Bergeton's footnote 50 contains a reference to Faarlund, Lie and Vannebo 1999 [1997], which is totally irrelevant.)

More examples will be given in the section on strange assertions below. But first, a quotation from a linguist exhibiting a limited knowledge of Norwegian dialectology and of the actual use of the written standard Nynorsk today:

The oldest type of a repertoire in Europe in which standard and dialects are structurally and genetically closely related was similar<sup>18</sup> to what we find today in (---) Norway (---) in areas where *Nynorsk* is used instead of *Bokmål* as the standard variety (i.e. with the exception of the eastern region around Oslo).<sup>19</sup>

(Auer 2005, 15)

If the content of the parentheses is intended as an explication, i.e. of "in the areas were (sic!) Nynorsk is used instead of Bokmål as the standard variety", the author is wrong.

19. The majority of Norwegians use Bokmål as their standard variety which is structurally very similar to the urban dialect of Oslo.

(Auer 2005, 34n)

Yes, rather similar. But equally to all urban dialects with the possible exception of the one of Stavanger. One could also add the South-Eastern interior region, parts of Trøndelag and the entire North, with the exception of a few small and isolated areas. And this is not an entirely new situation.

In Norway, the Danish written standard became norwegeianised (---) by active and conscious Norwegianisation of the whole language, modelled on the Oslo dialect, to form one of the two modern standard varieties, i.e. what is known today as *Bokmål* (Widmark, in press).

(Auer 2005, 17)

This author suspects that e.g. speakers of the Bergen dialect will object to this description. For linguistic reasons already mentioned, and because Bergen was by far the most important city in Norway during the critical phase of modifying the Dano-Norwegian orthography in the 19th century. The Bergen dialect, by the way, was also the national theatre norm until the end of the 19th century, i.e. even in Oslo. As for the reference, "Widmark, in press" is Widmark 2005,<sup>67</sup> which gives slightly different yet equally inexact description of this particular phase of the normalisation of Norwegian (Widmark 2005, 1504)<sup>68</sup>. "norwegeianised" in Auer's chapter is a misprint.

Auer returns to the idea of Bokmål based on the (south)eastern dialects several times: Auer 2005, 20 and 24.

### Awareness of written standard

NORWEGIAN (Faarlund 1981:48)

(4.23) a. Eg vil i alle fall ikkje stole på han  
I will in any case not rely on him

(Siewierska 1988, 157)

This is a correct Nynorsk sentence. It is a matter of debate whether the written standard of Norwegian should always be indicated or not.

(33) en nynorsk  
sykkelen har Marie kjøpt  
<bicyclette a Marie achetée> c'est-à-dire <la bicyclette, c'est Marie  
qui l'a achetée>

(Perrot 1998, 621)

The information "en nynorsk" is redundant/misleading, since this is a perfect Bokmål sentence as well.

---

<sup>67</sup> And not "Widmark, Gün" as in Auer's bibliography, but "Widmark, Gun".

<sup>68</sup> Inexact since, among other things, "The Norwegian created by Knud Knudsen, Riksmål/Bokmål, was based on educated colloquial speech. In this context, the speech of Oslo provided the norm, (---)" (Widmark 2005, 1504) can be easily interpreted as if Knudsen created Riksmål and that he wanted the "speech of Oslo" to be the norm. He did not.

(---) dans tous ces énoncés, un indice actanciel *il* dont le correspondant se retrouve dans d'autres langues: (---), *det* en norvégien etc.; exemple en norvégien:

- (146) *det forvann ei jente*  
<il a disparu une fille>.  
c'est-à-dire <la bicyclette, c'est Marie qui l'a achetée>

(Perrot 1998, 641)

In this example drawn from the same article, no information about written standard is given. The sentence is labelled “norvégien” only, which is misleading, since it is a clear Nynorsk sentence. Which, in turn points to the fact that the information “nynorsk” in the case of Perrot’s example (33) shown above is superfluous.<sup>69</sup>

- (19) *Desse konstruksjonar trur eg at t er meir naturlege*  
these constructions think I that are more natural  
*uttrykksmåtar.*  
expressions  
‘These constructions, I think that they are more natural expressions.’

- (20) *Det finns substantivforekomster vi ikke engang vet*  
it exists noun occurrences we not even know  
[om e skall klassifiseres som mengdetermer eller ikke.]  
if shall classify-PASS as mass terms or not  
‘There are noun occurrences that we don’t even know if they should be classified as mass terms or not.’

(Engdahl 1985, 13)

(19) is Nynorsk, while (20) is Bokmål. In this case this confusion is probably of no importance. However, one might imagine cases where the difference between the written standards is of crucial importance.

So far, examples of a general lack of awareness as to the written standard of entire sentences have been given. One special case is the inconsistency within a given sentence as far as written standard is concerned.

### Inconsistency as to written standard

- (77b) *desse konstruksjonar trur jeg at er meir naturlege uttrykksmåta*  
*diese Konstruktionen denke ich daß sind mehr natürliche Ausdrucksmittel*

(Fanselow 1991, 338)

Error: “jeg”. Correct Nynorsk: “eg”. (“jeg” is Bokmål.) An inexact copy of Engdahl 1988a, 81.

---

<sup>69</sup> This fact is, however, without any importance/relevance for the linguistic issue at hand.

Thus the contrast between Norwegian (22) and Icelandic (23) is predicted by our analysis (cf. Vangsnes 1995).

(22) *Norwegian*

a. Det har vore en katt i kjøkenet.

(---)

‘There has been a cat in the kitchen.’

(Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, 55)

Error: “en” (Bokmål) in a straightforward Nynorsk sentence. Correct: “ein”. A deliberate mixture of dialect/written forms is excluded, given the authors’ earlier comment:

<sup>9</sup> We consider in this paper only the standard dialects of these languages.

(Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, 46)

(It seems natural to interpret “standard dialects” as ‘written standards’ as far as Norwegian is concerned.) In other similar examples, the correct form “ein” is used. “ein” is also the form found in Vangsnes 1995, 91.<sup>70</sup>

The embedded clause variant of (1a) is given in (17). (17) immediately shows that *ingen fuglar* cannot be in the SPEC of the complement of *vaere*. (---).

(17) at det ingen fuglar var skotne  
that it no birds were shot+AGR3pl

(18) at det NP<sub>i</sub> vaere [<sub>AGR</sub> t<sub>i</sub> AGR [<sub>VP</sub> skotne t<sub>i</sub>]]

(Hoekstra 1990, 216)

The gloss (18) contains “vaere” as the supposed infinitive form of “var” in the Nynorsk sentence (17). Although a variant with “vart” (infinitive “verte”) seems natural, cf. above, this sentence is correct.<sup>71</sup> However, the infinitive of “var” in Nynorsk is “vere/vera”, not “være” which probably is the form intended by “vaere”.

(19) at det ikke var skote noe fuglar  
that he not has shot any birds

(Hoekstra 1990, 217)

As remarked above, “ikke” and “noe” are Bokmål word forms. (“noe” is neuter singular and incorrect at this position in the phrase anyway.) Correct forms in Nynorsk: “ikkje” and “nokre” (plural).

(3.74) (---)

<sup>70</sup> Which, by the way, has not been included in Bobaljik and Thráinsson’s bibliography.

<sup>71</sup> This sentence has all the appearance of being intended as a copy of (70) of Christensen (1989, 377). Christensen’s example, though, contains “vart” (of VERTE ‘get/become’). In Hoekstra’s bibliography, by the way, the title of Christensen’s paper is spelled incorrectly: “Partisipkongruens (---)” instead of “Partisippkongruens”.

- (b) Harald<sub>1</sub> fortalde Jon<sub>2</sub> om  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} *ham_1/*ham\ selv_1/*seg_1/seg\ selv_1 \\ *ham_2/ham\ selv_2/*seg_2/*seg\ selv_2 \end{array} \right\}$   
*Harald told John about*  
 (Norwegian)

(Büring 2005, 76)

Error: “fortalde”. Correct: “fortalte”. “fortalde is the correct Nynorsk form, while the sentence is distinctively a Bokmål sentence., cf. “ham” ‘him’ and “selv” ‘self’.<sup>72</sup>

This inconsistency may even prevail in a conspicuous manner when it comes to morphological variants of what is basically the very same written standard:

- (13) a. det blir kjøpt ei bok/\*boken  
 it is bought a book/book-the  
 b. det blir snakket om boken  
 it is talked about book-the  
 c. der blir gitt Jon ei bok/boken  
 it is given John a book/book-the  
 d. \*der blir gitt en mann boken  
 it was given a man book-the

(Hoekstra 1995, 123)

Both standards of Norwegian are characterised by extensive variability, i.e. the possibility of choosing between several elements within one set of equivalent morphological forms. E.g. the indefinite article feminine singular {en, ei} and post posed definite article feminine singular {-en, -a}. This does not imply, however, that any element may be combined with anyone else in the same (part of a) text. E.g. “ei bok” and “boken” is clearly an anomaly.

By the way, in (13a) - (13c), “blir” is glossed as “is”, while “blir” in (13d), is “was”. As “blir” has the same tense in all the four sentences, “was” is incorrect.

Foreigners usually have a very unclear idea about the inherent variability of Norwegian and about the entire Bokmål/Nynorsk distinction, often conceiving it as a matter of dialect differences only. True, there is a relationship between the two different written standards, their internal variability, and the dialects. Yet, they are not dialects.

A related phenomenon is the use of regional features of Norwegian as arguments in discussions aiming at Norwegian as a whole or characterising the dialects of other regions.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Since Büring also commits “accidental errors”, cf. Büring 2005, 60, it seems a likely possibility to analyse the present error as such. Note that the English gloss ends in “about”, apparently by some sort of convention, since this type of abbreviation also characterise other glosses of other examples.

<sup>73</sup> Despite wise caveats such as: “To talk about Swedish, Norwegian and Icelandic as monolithic entities with no variation among the speakers of each language is of course an oversimplification. As will become clear, the variation among Norwegian speakers is so important that even for an overview like this one, it is not possible to maintain the fiction of one grammar.” (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 277n)

## What is Norwegian after all?

### Regional variants

- (14) (---)  
b. Jeg har ingen bok kjøpt  
c. Jeg har ingen bok gitt henne  
d. \*Jeg har ingen mann gitt boken/ei bok

(Hoekstra 1995, 123)

Both b. and c. have a definite dialectal and/or archaic flair. Perhaps a handful of Norwegian speakers of the Southern coast variant will accept them? However, they are felt to be wrong by the Norwegian language user in general today. To the extent that this author does not find (14d) less grammatical than the two preceding sentences

- (i) a. Jeg har ingen/ (No)  
I have no one/  
\*henne<sub>i</sub> set t<sub>i</sub>.  
\*her seen  
“I haven’t seen anyone.”

(Thráinsson 2001, 197)

A certain dialectal and archaic flair. Still, less acceptable than the two sentences above.

The examples above are clearly linked to restricted dialect areas. Still, they are used as arguments in analyses of general phenomena or features of different dialects of Norwegian. The same problem is illustrated by the following examples:

(---) the so-called verb-particle alternation which is attested in Norwegian and English and illustrated in (28) and (29):

- (28) a. John drank his beer up  
b. John drank up his beer  
(29) a. Mannen har drukket vinnen opp  
the.man has drunk wine PART  
b. Mannen har drukket opp vinnen  
the.man has drunk PART wine  
‘The man has drunk up the wine’  
(Norwegian; Svenonius 1996: 10)

(Zeller 2001, 285)

Disregarding the spelling error, (29 a) is only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>74</sup> “[Zeller’s] 2001 book is a valuable source of information about the grammatical behavior and status of particle verbs in German (and, to a lesser degree, in other Germanic languages).” Benji Wald, in *Language* 79(4), 2003. Which is correct, although in a sense different from the one intended.

- (1) a. *Mannen har drukket opp vinnen*  
the.man has drunk up the.wine  
b. *Mannen har drukket vinnen opp*  
the.man has drunk the.wine up  
‘The man has drunk up the wine’  
(Svenonius 1996a: 10)

(Zeller 2002, 234)

Zeller repeats these odd examples although in a different sequence, in a chapter published one year later - with a somewhat different gloss... (1 b) is only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast.

One of these is the fact that the Mainland Scandinavian languages exhibit a three-way contrast (cf. Taraldsen 1983); in Danish, the particle must follow the postverbal DP, as shown in (18a); Norwegian is like English in that both orders are acceptable, as in (18b); and in Swedish, the particle must precede the postverbal DP, as in (18c).

- (18) a. Vi slapp {\*ud} hunden {ud} (Dan)  
b. Vi slapp {ut} hunden {ut} (Nor)  
c. Vi släpte {ut} hunden {\*ut} (Swe)  
*we let out the.dog out*  
‘We let the dog out’

(Svenonius 1994, 3/8)

The “Vi slapp hunden ut” variant is, in general, only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast. On the other hand, they would probably not use “Vi slapp ut hunden”.<sup>75</sup>

The first relevant observation is that (standard) Swedish is alone among the Scandinavian languages in requiring the object to follow the particle. In Danish, Icelandic, and Norwegian, the object may (or must in Danish) precede the particle.

- (53) a. Vi slapp {\*ud} hunden {ud} (Danish)  
b. Við hentum {út} hundinum {út} (Icelandic)  
c. Vi slapp {ut} hunden {ut} (Norwegian)  
d. Vi släpte {ut} hunden {\*ut} (standard Swedish)  
*we let out the.dog out*  
We let the dog out. (Svenonius 1994, p. 169, 1996b, p. 10)

(Bobaljik 2002, 236)

The “Vi slapp hunden ut” variant is, in general, only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast.

- (2.11) Vi slapp (ut) hunden (ut).  
we let (out) dog.the (out)

<sup>75</sup> Note that the Swedish sentence contains one error: "släpte". Correct: "släppte". See also Bobaljik 2002, 236 below.

‘We let the dog out.’ [Norwegian; Svenonius 1994]

(Toivonen 2003, 20)

The “Vi slapp hunden ut” variant is, in general, only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast.

(24) (---)

(b) slå lyset av (Norwegian)  
turn light-the off

(Hróarsdóttir 2000, 316)

Slightly awkward to all speakers of Norwegian except those talking a dialect from the South coast. Still, this sentence is less odd than the preceding ones. One explanation is that it gives sense to think of a special stress/accents on the adverb “av”, since it may contrast with “på” (SLÅ PÅ ‘turn on’) It doesn’t give sense to contrast e.g. “drikke opp” (Zeller 2001, 285 and Zeller 2002, 234) with “drikke ned” (NED ‘down’).

(3) (---)

b. Jeg skrev (nummeret/det) opp (nummeret/\*det). (Norwegian)

(---)

I wrote (the-number/it) up (the-number/it)

‘I wrote the number/it down.’

(Holmberg 1999, 2)

Only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast.

(41)

(---)

d. Hann spiste tørrfisken/den opp.

(Thráinsson 2001, 166)

The variant with the noun “tørrfisken” is only acceptable to speakers of a dialect from the South coast.

Pronominal OS in Danish and Norwegian works the same way, but the Swedish facts are different, as shown by Holmberg (1986), due to special properties of the particle construction in Swedish (see also Svenonius 1996):

(i) a. Hún skrifaði það upp/\*upp

það. (Ic)

b. Hon skrev \*det upp/upp

det.(Sw)

c. Hun skrev det op/\*op det

(Da)

she wrote it up/up it

(Thráinsson 2001, 198n)

Yes and no. In general, Norwegian follows the Danish example, (i c). On the other hand, there are dialects where the speakers talk according to the Swedish pattern as exemplified in (i a)

Norwegian and Icelandic have both possibilities, as shown by the following examples from Svenonius (1996):

- (11) a. Han spiste tørrfisken *opp*. (Norwegian)  
He ate dry.fish-the up
- b. Han spiste *opp* tørrfisken.  
he ate up dry.fish-the  
'He ate up the dried fish.'
- (12) a. Ég gerði nokkra bíla *upp*. (Icelandic)  
I fixed some cars up
- b. Ég gerði *upp* nokkra bíla.  
I fixed up some cars  
'I fixed up some cars.'

When the object is a weak pronoun, it is placed before the particle in Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic; in Swedish, it still tends to follow the particle.<sup>6</sup> Evidently, the optionality of particle shift of DPs in Norwegian and Icelandic is similar to that found in English:

- (13) a. Hun har hengt det *opp*. (Norwegian)  
she has hung it up
- b. Hon har hängt *upp* det. (Swedish)  
she has hung up it

(Holmberg and Platzack 2005, 427)

(11) a. is only acceptable to speakers of a Norwegian dialect from the South coast. Unelicited, no non-linguist Norwegian will use or recognize both variants. However, sentences such as (11) a. are presented here and elsewhere as Norwegian tout court, with the value as an argument for Norwegian in general. Thus, it is of interest to make a comparison to the Icelandic and Swedish sentences: While Norwegian language users cannot choose freely between (11a) and (11b), Icelanders may choose (12a) or (12b), which represent a stylistic option for all language users. (Kjartan Ottóson, p.c.) Thus, presenting the situation in Norwegian and in Icelandic as equal is misleading. For the sake of consistency, one should also have to accept as Norwegian a sentence similar to the Swedish (13b), as this sentence type is equally acceptable to the speakers of Norwegian dialects along the Swedish border (in the county of Hedmark).

- (22) a. *mannen sitt hus* (Norw.)

man-the his-REFL house

(Delsing 1998, 94)

(48) a *han Per* (N.Norw.)  
*he Per*

(Delsing 1998, 102)

There is no doubt as to the correctness of the two phrases (22a) and (48a). Still, (22a) is above all a phenomenon characterising the Western dialects of Norwegian. Despite this, it is labelled here as “(Norw.)” i.e. ‘Norwegian’.. (48a), on the other hand, is marked as “(N.Norw.)” i.e. ‘Northern Norwegian’, while, in fact, this construction is used in the spoken language in most parts of Norway.

The requirement that reanalysis must preserve the linear order pre-determined by structural adjacency seems to be less restrictive in Norwegian. As illustrated in (82), some Norwegian dialects prefer the order particle-verb when the particle verb is used in the participle form: [289]

(39) a. *Trea vart nedhogne*  
*the.trees were PART-chopped*  
b. ??*Trea vart hogne ned*  
*the.trees were chopped PART*  
*‘The trees were chopped down’*  
(Western Norwegian; Svenonius 1996: 19)

As noted in Svenonius (1996), the sentence with the particle on the left of the verb favors a stative interpretation of the participle, whereas the particle on the right favors an eventive reading. This suggests that (39a) is an adjectival passive, while (39b) seems to be a verbal passive.

(Zeller 2001, 288f.)

The correct reference is Svenonius 1996a, 20 and 22.

In the two above cases, one very special dialect feature is exposed in order to serve as an argument. In the following case, a very precise dialect determination of one particular phenomenon is produced. However, the phenomenon in question is known from all Norwegian dialects. I.e. the “precision” relating this phenomenon to one particular dialect area is misleading.

Consider the Swedish pseudo-coordination<sup>36</sup> example in (25), from Josefsson (1991), and the parallel examples from the Trøndelag dialect of Norwegian (data from Tor Åfarli, personal communication, 1996) in (26).

(25) *I köket står det en kwinna och lagar middag*  
*In the-kitchen stands there a woman and cooks dinner*  
*‘In the kitchen, there stands a woman and cooks dinner.’*

- (26) (a) Det kom en mann og reparerte bilen min  
‘There came a man and repaired my car.’  
(b) Det satt et menneske og leste avisen  
‘There sat a person and read the newspaper.’

(Cormack 1999, 60)

These are perfectly normal Norwegian phrases, no matter the dialect. To specify that the data are drawn from the Trøndelag dialect of Norwegian equals saying that the “I’m hungry.” is taken from the New York dialect (Walter Rosenbaum, personal communication, 1986).<sup>76</sup>

Another aspect of the dialect-for-language argumentation consists in using as arguments dialect forms not accepted by official orthography:

In colloquial Scandinavian varieties, including at least Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish, demonstratives may be reinforced with adverbial-like elements. The following Swedish and Norwegian examples are representative of the phenomenon (Norwegian examples due to Vangsnes).<sup>2,3</sup>

- (9) (a) den här mannen (Swedish)  
the here man-the  
‘this man’  
(b) den där bilen  
the there car-the  
‘that car’
- (10) (a) den herre klokka (Norwegian)  
the here watch-the  
‘this watch’  
(b) det derre huset  
the there house-the  
‘that house’

(Bernstein 1997, 90)

and in a note:

<sup>2</sup> Øystein Vangsnes (personal communication) points out that the Norwegian equivalent is much more colloquial than the Swedish one, and is never found in the written language.(---)  
(Bernstein 1997, 90n)

Note that both “herre” and “derre” are forms unknown to any official orthography.

As examples, Bernstein cites such diverse languages as (---) and colloquial varieties of Swedish and Norwegian (one of her Norwegian examples is given in (56b)).

---

<sup>76</sup> Note that “kwinna” is an error. Correct Swedish: “kvinna”. (Correct in Josefsson 1991.)

(56) (---)

[539]

- b. den herre klokka  
the here watch-the  
'this watch'

(Cheng and Sybesma 1999, 538f.)

Note that "herre" is a form unknown to any official orthography, cf. the above example.

(27) (---)

- c. denne herre (flotte) bilen (Norwegian)  
this here (nice) car-the

(Brugè 2002, 26)

Note that "herre" is a form unknown to any official orthography, cf. the above example.

Finally, one special case of this use of dialect forms can be subsumed under the designation *The Hallingdalen Syndrome*.

Similarly, the Norwegian dialect of Hallingdalen discussed in Trosterud (1989) has plural forms (in the present tense) that are identical to the infinitive and lacks V-to-Agr: (---) It appears, then, that Hallingdalen is in relevant respects like Faroese. Putting together Faroese, Hallingdalen and Ålvdalsmålet, it appears that it is plural agreement which is related to V-to-Agr movement.

(Roberts 1993, 265)

English finite verbs have either tense morphology (past tense) or agreement morphology (present tense), but never both (---), and the same goes for for finite verbs in Hallingmålet.  
(Vikner 1997, 190)

Furthermore, as has been pointed out by Vikner (1995a), all these approaches face a problem on the ground that there are languages like Late Old Swedish (Falk 1993: 172f.) or Faroese (Vikner 1995a) in which V-to-I movement is optional. For instance, Late Old Swedish, and the Norwegian dialect of Hallingdalen make number distinctions, but may lack V-movement as illustrated in the following examples.

[227]

(---)

- (22) Hallingdalen  
sg. kasta 'throw'  
pl. kastæ

- (23) at me ikkje kjøpæ bokje  
that we not buy book-the

(Alexiadou and Fanselow 2002, 226f)

Cf. Rohrbacher 1999, 117f.

As already mentioned in passing, there is a certain correspondence between some distinctively regional phenomena and the development of Norwegian. Dialects may contain linguistic atavisms. Another way of exploring atypical data in linguistic discussions involves archaic features no matter their geographical distributions.

### Archaisms

- (99) a. Jag fick boken {skriven/\*skrivet} (Swe)  
*I got the.book written.M/written.N*
- b. Jeg fikk boka skrevet (Nor)  
*I got the.book written*
- c. Jeg fik skrevet bogen (Dan)  
*I got written the.book*  
'I got the book written'

(Svenonius 1994, 3/51)

(99) b. is acceptable, although an archaism. In fact, the syntax of its Danish parallel has more appeal to a native user of Norwegian as the unmarked case.<sup>77</sup>

(10) (---)

d. Jeg setter ham en hatt på hodet

(Hoekstra 1995, 122)

Awkward sentence with a distinct archaic flair. Nobody will write a sentence such as this one today under "normal" circumstances, the sole exception being idiomatic expressions, e.g. "skytte ham ett skudd for baugen" 'fire a shot across his bow'. Is Hoekstra's sentence the result of interference from French or German?

(37) (---)

c. Jeg har satt ham en hat på hodet

(Hoekstra 1995, 127)

Just as awkward as the sentence right above.

(85N) [Til *hvem*] skriver du  
to whom write you

(Webelhuth 1992, 124)

Only acceptable under special circumstances (extraordinary accentuation/stress).

---

<sup>77</sup> If we are to believe Diderichsen 1968, 135, b. is as Danish as c.: "Han fik Bøgerne indbundet/indbundne Bøgerne". Note that "boken" in the Swedish sentence, a., is an error. Correct: "boken". (Swedish BOCK means 'ram', "boken" definite singular. This error must be due to confusion with the plural form, "böcker" (indefinite plural).

Still more dubious in a discussion of Present-day Norwegian are arguments based on geographically and otherwise extremely limited slang and more or less idiosyncratic child language.

### Atypical language use

By “atypical Norwegian” is meant children’s language, slang etc.

Furthermore, it turns out that even the pronominal forms aren’t always identical, as shown in the forms in (42) drawn from various dialects (the especially widespread type represented in (42a) is discussed in Fretheim 1976).

- (42) a. min jakke jakka mi (Oslo dialect)  
*my jacket jacket.DEF my*  
b. våres bok boka vårs (Harstad dialect)  
*our book book.DEF our*  
c. min bror brorsan (Sarpsborg dialect)  
*my brother brother-my*

(Svenonius 1993, 215)

(42a) is a reminder of the charm of Norwegian variation. Dependent on context, style level/register, sociolect, and sub-dialect, the two parts, “min jakke” and “jakka mi” may be used by the same native speaker. Yet, “mi jakke” and “jakken min” are also possible. (This author is a native of Oslo). (42b)? Maybe. If you are from Harstad. (42c) Nonsense! With few exceptions (e.g. the dialect of Bergen), “min bror” is the rigid, written language inspired “high” form, just like “min jakke”. “brorsan” is slang. I.e. a Swedish slang word used by some Norwegians. Perhaps more used around Sarpsborg (close to the Swedish border) than elsewhere, still a different word at a different level. C. is liable to correspond to the following pair in English: “my father - daddy” or maybe its constituents are further apart still.

Remarkably, for many speakers, *-s* can be stranded as well, cliticizing to the element preceding it. Here, of course, an analysis as an affix is out of the question:

- (33) Hvem er det’s (bil)  
Who is it+s (car)  
‘Whose (car) is that?’

(Newmeyer 1998, 267)

This sentence is wrong. The only native speakers of Norwegian that can utter such a sentence seriously are small children. Before they are acknowledged as regular user of Norwegian. The sentence in question is idiosyncratic, in the sense that not all Norwegian children of any dialect necessarily pass through a phase of language learning involving such sentences. From a normative point of view, the sentence contains a clear error. This is what is implied in Fiva 1984,

Newmeyer's source: "-s can marginally occur suffixed onto a noun that is not the head of the possessor chain, but outside of the matrix NP in which -s belongs." (Fiva 1984, 41) In her article, the sentence is marked with an interrogation mark. Also, the apostrophe is non-standard.

### What was the name of this language again ... ?

(71a) fordi det har arbeidet en mann på kontoret hver aften (Swe)  
because EXPL has worked a man in the office every night  
'because a man has worked in the office every night

(71b) därför att det har arbetat en mann i byrån varje aften  
(Norw)  
because that EXPL has worked a man in the office every night  
'because a man has worked in the office every night

(Brandner 1993, 103)

(71a) is not Swedish as indicated by means of "(Swe)". It is Norwegian. On the other hand, (71b) is not Norwegian as indicated, cf. "(Norw)", but Swedish.

- (2) a. Eng Peter was talking with someone, but I don't know (with) who.  
b. Nor Peter har talat med naagon; jag vet inte (med) vem.  
c. Swe Per har snakket med noen, men jeg vet ikke (med) hvem.

(Merchant 2000, 1)

b. is not Norwegian. It is Swedish. c., on the other hand, is not Swedish. It is Norwegian. Additionally, "naagon" is also incorrect Swedish for "någon".

In some cases, the lack of linguistic competence is even reflected in the use of an incorrect language name:

Of these three patterns, (60a) is that of main clauses in the North Germanic languages Danish, Norse, Icelandic, and Swedish, (60c) is found in Dutch, German, and Frisian, (---).

(Dik 1980, 172)

"Norse"? "Norwegian" is probably the word intended. Result of interference from Dutch? (NOORS 'Norwegian'.)

For example, one may compare typological shapes of modern Norse and modern Icelandic, English and German, Russian and English, etc., and relate these results with empirical data on rates of their core dictionary survival in time.

(Polikarpov 1997)

## Syntactic errors

As an implication of what was stated in the introduction, there is a gradual transition from error to oddity – and a corresponding lack of rigour as to what examples will be catered for in this section and the next one.

Although it is possible to recognize what syntactic subsystem the grammarian is aiming at, it is usually difficult to explain exactly why a sentence is ungrammatical. So, I shall refrain from explanations in most of the below cases.

(6.60) (---)

- b. De ga Marit ikke blomstene. (Nor)  
they gave Marit not the-flowers

(Holmberg and Platzack 1995, 172)

Adverb in the wrong place.

(7.8) *Norwegian* (Holmberg and Platzack 1995: 172)

- De ga Marit ikke blomstene.  
they gave Marit not the-flowers  
'They did not give Marit the followers.'

(Ura 2000, 236)

Adverb in the wrong place. ("followers" is a common misprint.)

Icelandic is unique among the Scandinavian languages, insofar as in the other Scandinavian languages object shift is restricted to pronouns. Holmberg and Platzack (1995, pp. 172f.), however, report that to a limited extent non-pronominal arguments may shift: in Norwegian varieties of Swedish and Faroese, a non-pronominal DP of a double object construction may be shifted, again without change of the relative order. (---)

- (45) a. De ga Marit ikke/gjerne blomstene (Norwegian) H&P, p. 172  
*they gave Marit not/gladly flowers-the*  
b. Vi ger barnen alltid/inte vad de vil han (Swedish) H&P, p. 172  
*we gave children-the always/not what they want have*

(Haider 2005, 35)

Adverb in the wrong place. Only the "ikke" sentence can be found in Holmberg and Platzack 1995, where there is a different "gjerne" sentence. As for "in Norwegian varieties of Swedish and Faroese", hopefully, just a comma is missing

...

- (i) Han så uten tvil den. (Norwegian)  
he saw without doubt it

(Holmberg 1999, 28)

---

<sup>78</sup> Note that the Swedish example contains several errors: "altid", correct: "alltid". Error: "vil", correct: "vill". Error: "han", correct: "ha". The sentence is spelled correctly in Holberg and Platzack. Additionally, Swedish "ger", 'give(s)' (present form) is translated as 'gave' (past form).

Preposition phrase in the wrong place. Felt to be incorrect without an expansion of the object NP, e.g. “den mannen som gikk langs vejen” ‘the man who was walking by the roadside’.

- (1) a. *Knut leverte sannsynligvis oppgaven inn.* (Nor)  
Knut handed probably the.assignment in  
‘Knut probably handed the assignment in.’

(Svenonius 2000, 256)

Adverb in the wrong place.

- (2) a. ... *hvis Knut sannsynligvis leverte den inn.* (Nor)  
if Knut probably handed it in

(Svenonius 2000, 256)

Adverb in the wrong place. Inconsistency HVIS / SANNSYNLIGVIS.

- (27) a. (---)  
b. Norwegian  
*Jeg tror at Jon sannsynligvis ikke leste den.*  
I think that Jon probably not read it  
‘I think that Jon probably did not read it.’

(Holmberg and Rijkhoff 1998, 84)

This sentence contains several oddities: From a syntactic point of view, “sannsynligvis ikke” is hardly grammatical. From a semantic point of view, the past form “leste” is a little weird. To this author, present perfect or past perfect would be better, with the proper rearrangements of the syntax. Finally, the word “sannsynligvis” seems odd in a clause of TRU ‘believe’. True, we are talking of small margins and fine nuances here. Still, the instance of SANNSYNLIGVIS represents a break with the last of the two main rules for the sequence of modalities of Norwegian sentences: Either the modal elements (modals, semi-modals, adverbs etc.) “add up” to create the basis of the interpretation as ‘uncertain’, or there is a certain aspect of compositionality, where only certain sequences of modal elements are possible. It is hard to predict what principle applies, and this is, in general, a rather poorly understood part of Norwegian. TRU(SANNSYNLIGVIS) can neither be analysed nor used according to the first principle, nor is it felt to be correct according to the second. What all this boils down to, though, is that we are discussing very complicated aspects of the language that even linguist native language users may have hesitations about. For a foreigner, the risk of getting lost is obvious ...

In Holmberg (1993 b) I argue that the thematic subjects is in specTP also in constructions such as (21) and (ii), common in Swedish and Norwegian.

- (ii) *Jag tror att möjligen Johan har läst den boken.* (Swedish)  
I think that possibly Johan has read this book

(Holmberg 1998, 591)

This author has problems imagining a direct Norwegian equivalent. Possibly “Jeg trur at muligens/kanskje Johan har lest den boka”. Only acceptable with an extraordinary emphasis on “Johan”.

- (60) a. at *dessverre* Jon ikke har lest boka *Norwegian*  
*that unfortunately J. not has read the-book*  
 b. Denne boka har *dessverre* Jon ikke lest  
*This book has unfortunately J. not read*  
 c. at *tross alt* Jon ikke vil lese disse bøkene  
*that despite everything J. not will read these books*  
 d. Disse bøkene vil *tross alt* Jon ikke lese  
*These books will despite everything J. not read*

However, there seems to be considerable variation with respect to the acceptability of the sentences shown in (60). Among the eight speakers of Norwegian consulted, we can roughly find the following patterns of grammaticality judgements.<sup>36</sup>

(61)	A (4 speakers <sup>37</sup> )	B (2 speakers)	C (2 speakers)
a.	√ or ?	?? or *	*
b.	√	√	??
c.	√ or ?	?? or *	*
d.	√	√	??

(Haeberli 2002, 244)

(60) a. and c. are completely ungrammatical (also as parts of complete sentences). How any native language user could have accepted any of them is hard to imagine.

<sup>37</sup> Some variation in this group concerns the type of adjunct chosen. One speaker finds (60c) less good than the other examples. Another speaker seems to have more problems with (60a) than with the other cases. Finally, one speaker accepts all examples in (60) but rejects the embedded equivalent to (12i), i.e. a sentence with a temporal adverb between C and the subject in an embedded clause. However, this ban on temporal adverbs is not shared by all the speakers in this group.

It would of course be tempting to relate at least some of the variation in (61) to the relatively complex sociolinguistic situation in Norway. At first sight, it is not clear whether such a correlation is possible however.

(Haeberli 2002, 244n)

This has nothing to do with the sociolinguistic situation of Norway. (In fact, nobody with the slightest knowledge of the situation would ever suggest such a relationship.)

Holmberg (1997, p.c.) observes that in Mainland Scandinavian, a participial main verb can appear in clause-initial position, acting as the

[124]

‘first constituent’ for ‘verb-second’ (V2).

- (12) (?) *Lest har hun den sikkert, men har hun skjønnt noe av den?*  
read has she it surely but has she understood anything of it  
“She has surely READ it, but has she understood any of it?”  
(Norwegian)”

(Toyoshima 2001, 123f.)

Ungrammatical, not just “(?)”. In order to make it “(?)” the word “den” has to be moved to the position right behind *Lest*: “*Lest den*”.

“Øystein Nilsen (personal communication) informs us that the following types of examples are relatively acceptable in Norwegian with participles or infinitives:

- (i) ?*Villet<sub>i</sub> hadde han nok ikke t<sub>i</sub> gidd opp.*  
wanted has he probably not given up  
‘lit. wanted he has probably not to give up’
- (ii) ?*Begynne<sub>i</sub> vil han nok ikke t<sub>i</sub> a jobbe*  
begin will he probably not to work  
‘lit. begin de will probably not to work’

(Koopman and Szabolcsi: 2000, 230n)

Hardly. The “lit.” rendering is not what this author thinks must be the intended sense of this impossible Norwegian sentence. Which emphasizes the problem at hand.

- (1) (--)  
b. *Släppt in har jag den inte (men jag har satt ut mat åt den).*  
let in have I it not but I have put out food for it  
‘I haven’t let it in (but I have put out food for it).’

(---)[149]

But in that case they also predict that Norwegian should contrast with Swedish with respect to (1b), since the linear order of verb, object, and particle prior to movement in Norwegian should be *sluppet<den<inn*.

- (3) a. *Jeg har ikke sluppet den inn/\*sluppet*  
I have not let it in / let  
inn den. (Norwegian)  
in it
- b. *Sluppet inn har jeg den ikke.*  
let in have I it not

The prediction is false. V-topicalization/Remnant VP fronting is a marginal phenomenon in Norwegian as in Swedish, but among those Norwegians who accept it, there are those who accept (3b), just as in the case of Swedes and (1b).

(Holmberg 2005a, 148f.)

To this author, (3b) is ungrammatical. This also holds for his informal panel of non-linguist native speakers of Norwegian.

- (226) [context: two people standing next to the body of a girl who has just killed herself by jumping off a high building; person A shakes his head in disbelief and says to person B:]
- a. Hvorfor (#det)?  
why that<sub>DEM</sub>  
'Why?'
- b. Hvorfor er det at hun har gjort det?  
why is that<sub>DEM</sub> that<sub>C°</sub> she has done that<sub>DEM</sub>  
'Why is it that she has done that?' [Eastern Norwegian]
- (Craenenbroeck 2004, 113)
- b. is ungrammatical for two reasons: The DET construction and the use of perfect, "har gjort" instead of past, "gjorde". Especially in Eastern Norwegian.
- (228) Hvorfor det at Jens har kjøpt ny bil?  
why that<sub>DEM</sub> that<sub>C°</sub> Jens has bought new car.  
'Why has Jens bought a new car?' [Eastern Norwegian]
- (Craenenbroeck 2004, 114)
- Ungrammatical. What does this sentence mean?
- (11) a. (---)  
b. Dette er en type oppgave som Kalle hevder at om Pelle greidde a løse {den/\*Ø} vil vise om han er intelligent. (N)
- [236]
- 'This is the kind of problem that Kalle says that whether Pelle succeeds in solving it will show if he is intelligent.'
- (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 235f.)
- Note that this and several of the following examples relating to the question of gaps show signs of interference from Swedish.
- (48) *dette er en type oppgave som<sub>i</sub> Kalle hevder at om Pelle greide a*  
*dies ist ein Typ Aufgabe die Kalle sagt daß ob Pelle Erfolg-hat im*  
*løse den/\*t<sub>i</sub> vil vise om han er intelligent*  
*lösen sie wird zeigen ob er ist intelligent*
- (Fanselow 1991, 270)
- Cf. Maling and Zaenen 1982, 235f. above
- (101) Jeg vet om jobber som du bruker mer tid på bilen enn vil ta å utfore \_\_\_\_\_. (N)  
'I know of a-job<sub>i</sub> that you spend more time on the-car than will take to finish Ø<sub>i</sub>'.
- (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 270)
- Apart from the nonsensical meaning of this ungrammatical sentence: "jobber" (indefinite plural) is translated as "a-job".

- (12) a. (---)  
b. De snakket om den prøven som Pelle lurte på om det at Kalle allerede hadde lest {den/\*Ø} ville ha noen innvirkning på resultatet. (N)  
'They talked about the exam that Pelle wondered whether (it) that Kalle had already read it would make no difference in the result.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 236)

Nonsensical. Ungrammatical even without a "den". Anacoluthon.

In cases with triple (crossing) extractions, however, a resumptive pronoun is obligatory even in Norwegian.

- (13) a. (---)  
b. Denne gaven her vil du ikke gjette hvem jeg fikk (den) fra \_\_\_\_ (N)  
'This gift can you not guess who I got (it) from \_\_\_\_.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 236)

Not only is "den" impossible in this position of a grammatical sentence. "fra" is not idiomatic. AV is the correct preposition in this case (indicating person and not origin, which is the case of FRA).

- (14a) *denne gaven her<sub>i</sub> vil du ikke gjette hvem<sub>j</sub> jeg fikk t<sub>i</sub> fra t<sub>j</sub>*  
*dieses Gabe hier wirst du nicht raten wem ich bekam von*

(Fanselow 1991, 326)

Not only is "denne gaven her" impossible in this position of a grammatical sentence. "fra" is not idiomatic. AV is the correct preposition in this case (indicating person and not origin, which is the case of FRA). Cf. Maling and Zaenen 1982, 236 above.

- (15) Det er politimannen som jeg lurer på hvilke piker dommeren vill vite hvilke droger {han/\*Ø} trodde {de/\*Ø} hadde solgt {Ø/\*den} til barne. (N)  
'This is the policeman<sub>i</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>j</sub> the judge will want to know which drugs<sub>k</sub> he<sub>i</sub> thought they<sub>j</sub> had sold \_\_\_\_<sub>k</sub> to the children.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 237)

Repeated later as:

- (85) a. Det er politimannen som jeg lurer på hvilke piker dommeren vill vite hvilke droger {\*/Ø/han} trodde {\*/Ø/de} hadde solgt {\*/den/Ø} til barne. (N)  
'This is the policeman<sub>1</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>2</sub> the judge will want to know which drugs<sub>3</sub> he<sub>1</sub> thought they<sub>2</sub> had sold \_\_\_\_<sub>3</sub> to the children.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 265)<sup>79</sup>

Nonsensical. Complicated beyond comprehension. Anacoluthon?

(29) Dette er filmen som jeg ikke vet om noen husker hvem (som) har spilt i (den). (N)

‘This is the film<sub>i</sub> that I don’t know if anyone remembers who played in (it<sub>i</sub>).’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 239 and 266)

Interference from Swedish?

(85) a. (---)

b. Her er pusher som jeg lurer på hvilke piker dommeren vill vite hvilke stoffer folk hørte ham snakke med dem om Ø.  
‘Here is the pusher<sub>1</sub> that I wonder which girls<sub>2</sub> the judge will want to know which things<sub>3</sub> people heard him<sub>1</sub> talk with them<sub>2</sub> about Ø<sub>3</sub>.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 265)

Ungrammatical. Even if the sentence in general had been grammatical, it contains numerous errors at phrase or lexical level, each one sufficient to make the sentence as a whole ungrammatical: Incorrect in this context: “pusher” (indefinite singular). Correct: “den pusheren”. Additionally, “hørte ham snakke” is an error. “snakke” is present. One should have expected an infinitive, “snakke” or past “snakket”.

(77) Dette er den eksamenen som Per sa at hvor godt Lars gjorde det på *den* ville bestemme om han kommer inn på medisin og som Lars faktisk greide \_\_\_ bra. (N).

‘That’s the exam that Peter said that how well Lars does on *it* would determine whether he gets into med school, and that Lars indeed aced \_\_\_.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 263)

Ungrammatical. Anacoluthon.

Although the extraposition analysis does not account for the extraction phenomena, it remains to be explained why sentences like (40a) are better than (40b).<sup>15</sup>

(40) a. Per slipper jeg ikke noen inn som liker  
Peter let I not anybody in who likes

b. ???Per slipper jeg ikke noen som liker inn.  
Peter let I not anybody who likes in.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 246)

Both sentences are ungrammatical.

---

<sup>79</sup> Observe that the elements within the brackets have changed positions and that the indices are numeric, not alphabetic as in (15).

<sup>15</sup> The following version is also accepted, and in fact, preferred, by my informant:

- (i) Per slipper jeg ikke inn noen som liker.  
Peter let I not in anyone who likes

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 278n)

Quite right. It is somewhat odd although grammatical, in contrast to both (40) a. and (40) b.

The following example from Allwood (1976) was accepted by all our Norwegian informants but by none of the Icelandic ones:

- (4) a. De blommorna känner jag en man som säljer. (S)  
b. De blomstene kjenner jeg en mann som selger. (N)  
c. (---)

these flowers know I a man who sells  
'These flowers, I know a man who sells.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 232)

According to the authors, the native informants consulted were Per Kristian Halvorsen, Lars Hellan og Svein Lie - all well-known linguists. Still, (4) b. is definitely strange, liable to be acceptable only in a context where somebody is shown a picture of a flower, exclaiming in recognition. Consulting a group of Norwegian non-linguists, the response was totally negative.

- (38) Det er Chomsky (som) jeg ikke kjenner noen som lurer på om  
Marit burde ta et kurs hos.  
'It is Chomsky (that) I don't know anybody who wonders  
whether Marit should take a course with.'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 245)

Incorrect.

- (33) a. (---)  
b. Slike foelsomme politiska fragor har jeg flere studenter som  
det ikke finnes noen som jeg tror ville våge å prata med om.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 242)

Ungrammatical

- (63) Norwegian (Øystein Vangsnes, p.c.)

a. ?Hvilken oppdagelsesreisende spurte laereren deg hvilket kontinent \_ oppdaget \_?

(Richards 2001, 77)

Incorrect.

Legate (to appear) points out that vPs headed by passive verbs show the same effects. I illustrate with a pair of sentences from Norwegian.<sup>2</sup>

- (8) a. Hvilken av oppgavene som han skrev for Frøken Olsen har

which of the assignments as he<sub>1</sub> wrote for Miss Olsen<sub>2</sub> has  
hver elev blitt bedt av henne om å skrive om? (Norwegian)

every student<sub>1</sub> become asked of her<sub>2</sub> about to write over  
'Which of the assignments that he wrote for Ms. Olsen has every  
student been asked by her to write over?'

[p 264]

- (8) b. Hvilken av oppgavene som han skrev for Frøken Olsen har  
which of the assignments as he<sub>1</sub> wrote for Miss Olsen<sub>2</sub> has  
hver elev syntes henne å være fornøyd med?  
every student<sub>1</sub> seemed her<sub>2</sub> to be satisfied with  
'Which of the assignments that he wrote for Ms. Olsen has every student seemed  
to her to be satisfied with?'

(Svenonius 2004, 263f)

<sup>2</sup> See Holmberg 2002; Svenonius 2001a for discussion of whether passive v in  
Scandinavian is a phase head.

(Svenonius 2004, 263n)

Incorrect. Neither Legate (2003) nor Holmberg (2002) contain Norwegian  
examples. Additionally, none of the above examples can be found in Svenonius  
2001.

- (4) a. Eng Peter went to the movies, but I don't know who with.  
Nor Per har gaatt paa kino, men jeg vet ikke hvem med.

(Merchant 2000, 1)

"hvem med" instead of "med hvem" is definitely odd or worse.

14 Space prevents a full discussion of this phenomenon here, but I note that it is also  
found in some of the Scandinavian languages (thanks to P. Svenonius for the Norwegian  
and L. Mikkelsen for the Danish):

- (i) Per har gått på kino, men jeg vet ikke hvem med [Norwegian]  
Per er gået i biografen, men jeg ved ikke hvem med. [Danish]  
*Per has/is gone to cinema but I know not who with*  
'Per went to the movies but I don't know who with.'

(Merchant 2001, 64n)

"hvem med" instead of "med hvem" is definitely odd or worse.

- (20) a. (---) [296]  
b. %Per gikk på kino, men jeg veit ikke hvem med. Norwegian  
Per went to cinema but I know not who with  
'Per went to the movies but I don't know who with.'

(Merchant 2002, 296)

The “%” seems to indicate a uncertainty on the part of the grammarian. However, “hvem med” instead of “med hvem” is definitely odd if not worse.<sup>80</sup>

- (8 c) Norwegian:  
Bordet, tok han en bok fra  
table-the take.Past he a book from  
hylla og [la på t].  
shelf-the and put.Past on  
'The table, he took a book from the shelf  
and put [it] on'

(Déchaine 1993, 801)

As her sources, Déchaine invokes “(---) for Norwegian (Creider 1986; Åfarli Creider 1987; Johnsen 1988; den Dikken 1991).” This author has been unable to find this sentence in Åfarli and Creider 1987 and Johnsen 1988.

- (74) (ex. (28) from Åfarli 1994, p. 89)

(---)

- b. *som*-relative  
Det av husa som Jon bor  
that of houses-the SOM Jon lives  
'the house where Jon lives'

(Bhatt 2002, 82)

The preposition, “i”, is missing in final position.<sup>81</sup> (Correct in Åfarli 1994, 89.)<sup>82</sup>

- (2) a. (---)  
b. Hvilke bøker spurte Jon hvem (som) hadde skrevet? (N)  
c. (---)  
what books asked John who (that) (had) written  
'What books did the teacher ask who had written?'

- (3) a. (---)  
b. Hvem vet du ikke om Jon sa på kino? (N)  
c. (---)  
who do-you-not-know whether John saw at movies  
'Who don't you know whether John saw at the movies?'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 232)

Strange sentences. Difficult to decide whether they are ungrammatical or unacceptable both according to Chomskyan definitions or in a traditional sense. (2) b. may be correct in a situation where a deaf asks somebody the third time about what books.

<sup>80</sup> The change to (an equally correct “veit” is immaterial to the question of grammaticality.

<sup>81</sup> Repeated e.g. in Bhatt's handout “Three theories of relative clauses” at the LOT summer school 2005, Universiteit Leiden. Cf. below.

<sup>82</sup> 28 a. *Det av husa som Jon bor i, er ganske falleferdig.*

(34b) *hvilke bøker spurte Jon hvem (som) hadde skrevet?*

(Fanselow 1991, 223)

Strange sentence. Copy of Maling and Zaenen's (2) b (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 231).

The infinitival PRO subject in (109b) corresponds to *det* in the finite counterpart in (109a). In both cases we find a postverbal correlate NP, *så mange tilhørere*. Assuming that no nominative NP can surface in a (non-ECM) infinitival complement, this postverbal NP can only be licenced by Accusative Case. (---).

(109) a. *det var ikke lett å få det til [at det komme så mange tilhørere]*  
it was not easy to arrange it at that it come so many listeners

[50]

b. *det var ikke lett å få det til [å PRO komme så mange tilhørere]*  
it was not easy to arrange it at to come so many listeners

(Hoekstra and Mulder 1990, 49f.)

Error: The second “det” of (109a) and (109b) – in “få det til” – renders the sentences ungrammatical. (Admitting for a finite verb form instead of the infinitive “komme”, cf. above.)

A more striking piece of evidence is found in sentences such as those in (6), which are mentioned in Askedal (1986). (---)

(6) a. *Det ble påstott å komme mange tilhørere*  
it was claimed to come(ACC) many listeners

(---)

(Hoekstra 1990, 213)

Ungrammatical. As mentioned above, Askedal 1986 does not contain an identical sentence.

(8) a. *Det ble påstott å ha repariert bilen*  
it was claimed to have repaired the car”

b. *Det var ikke lett å få det til å repariere bilen*  
it was not easy to get it to to repair the car

(Hoekstra 1990, 213)

Ungrammatical.

(71) a. (---)

c. *Han hadde foresatt seg aldri å slå hunden.*  
*he had decided himself never to beat the dog*

(Norwegian)

He had decided never to beat the dog.

(Platzack 1986, 215)

FORESATT SEG may be construed as a form of the separable verb SETTE SEG FORE.<sup>83</sup> As such, it is hardly grammatical - at any rate extremely infrequent.<sup>84</sup> This may be why this sentence looks odd to this author as well as to other native users.

Platzack (1986), following Kayne (1981), observes that the same pattern holds in Scandinavian languages. Consider the control complements in (2.18) and the ECM complements in (2.19).

(2.18) (---)

- c. Han hadde foresatt seg [ aldri å slå hunden]  
he had decided himself never beat the dog (Norwegian)  
'He had decided never to beat the dog.' Platzack (1986, 215)

(---)

(2.19) (---) [34]

- e. Jag anser [ meg \*(å) ha rett]  
I think me have right (Norwegian)

(---)

'I believe myself to be right.' Platzack (1986, 218)

(Watanabe 1996, 33f)

Odd. Cf Platzack 1986, 215 and 218.

(9) b. John synnes ham [vaere en god venn]

(Hoekstra 1995, 121)

The infinitival marker, Å, is missing.

(32) a. *Det gi-s løsning på problem-et.*  
it gives-PASS solution to problem-the  
'There is a solution to the problem.' (Norwegian)

(Newman 1996, 166)

"gis" is understandable, although not idiomatically correct. "fins" or "finnes" (of FINNES 'exist') is the correct lexical item. At a syntactical level, "en" (indefinite article) is missing. One corresponding correct sentence would be: "Det fins en løsning på problemet."

(72) a. (---)

- b. Kalle, jeg liker inte den tullingen! (N)

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 261)

Hardly grammatical as one sentence.

---

<sup>83</sup> There is no corresponding inseparable verb FORESETTE SEG.

<sup>84</sup> A quick search (21 March 2006) gave as its result 16 unique tokens on the entire internet (including both HAR FORESATT SEG and HADDE FORSATT SEG) of which only 8 had an infinitive with an infinitival marker Å as their complement.

12 Exceptional in this regard are vocative constructions, such as *dumme idioten* ‘stupid idiot’, in which the definite suffix does appear despite the lack of a determiner (as pointed out to me by Arild Hestvik). (---)

(Svenonius 1993, 208n)

Error: A definite article “den” is missing. Correct: “den dumme idioten!”.

Svenonius (1993: 208), (---), provides the following example from Norwegian:

(i) *dumme idioten!*

Stupid idiot-the

(Kester 1996, 146n)

Repeating Svenonius’ error, cf. above.

(33) Norwegian

a. *John hadde ingen venn*

John had no:UTR friend

b. *Der var intet brød*

there was no:NEUT bread

(Bernini and Ramat 1996, 194)

a. is a rather strange sentence, only acceptable in special contexts. To judge by the other sentences in Bernini and Ramat 1996, it is the result of bad translation. Its Swedish counterpart is “John hadde ing-a venner”. (I.e. ‘(---) no friends’ (plural). Correct Swedish is “hade” and “vänner”.

b. is identical to the corresponding Danish example. Such sentences are felt to be archaic in present-day written Norwegian - more or less ungrammatical.

(---) in Swedish and Norwegian it appears that possessivization of the object is generally well tolerated with ‘description’:

(ii) *Johans beskrivning*

Johan’s description

In (ii) in fact, *Johans* is ambiguous between the agent and theme reading.

(Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, 251n)

The sentence is in Swedish. In a Norwegian translation, “Johans beskrivelse”, only what Giorgi and Langobardi call a “agent reading” is possible although somewhat weird. Less so if we put it in the right context, e.g. “Johans beskrivelse av raneren stemte helt med det konstruerte bildet.” ‘Johan’s description of the robber agreed completely with the robot portrait.’ A “theme reading” is not grammatical in Modern Norwegian.

(56) a. *?Ødeleggelsen av skipet for å heve forsikringen er uhørt*

The destruction of the ship to collect the insurance is outrageous

b. *\*Skipets ødeleggelse for å heve forsikringen er uhørt*

The ship’s destruction...

(Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, 136)

The two sentences are equally ungrammatical. “Ødeleggelsen av skipet” in isolation is a little odd yet grammatical in certain contexts in Present-Day Norwegian, e.g. as a title.

As already stated, there is a gradual transition between what is felt to be more or less correct and what is odd whatever the reason.

### Odd sentences

- (35) a. (---)  
b. Den egentlige meg ville ikke.  
The actual me-ACC would not  
‘The actual me would not.’

(Schütze 2001, 227)

“Den egentlige meg”?

- (97) a. Hunden är {bunden/\*bundna}. (Swe)  
b. Hunden er {bundet/\*bundne} (Nor)  
c. Hunden er {bundet/\*bundne} (Dan)  
*the.dog is tied.SG/tied.PL*

- (98) a. Hundarna är {\*bunden/bundna}. (Swe)  
b. Hundene er {bundet/\*bundne} (Nor)  
c. Hundene er {bundet/\*bundne} (Dan)  
*the.dogs are tied.PL/tied.*

(Svenonius 1994, 3/51)

Apart from the graphic oddity of representing singular/plural as options: “Hunden er bunden” is a normal alternative to (97) b., while “Hundene er bundne” perhaps is to be preferred to (98) b. Agreement is one of many sub-systems of Norwegian where native speakers’ intuition is notoriously vague in most part of the country.

- Norvégien: God kaffi, dette! <bon café ceci = Ça, c’est du bon café!>

(Feuillet 1998, 679)

A linguistic curiosity. This author can’t imagine any native speaker saying such a sentence. The example gives the impression of some stylistic error. It may have appeared in a literary text one century ago as mannerism, probably as a calque of a similar expression in another language.

- (3) (---)  
c. Det bli troet at Jon ikke var på kontoret  
it was believed that John not was in the office

(Hoekstra 1990, 212)

Odd in any conceivable correct form (cf. above), e.g. “Det ble trodd at Jon ikke var på kontoret.” Because of the impersonal DET construction. No native, non-

linguist user of Norwegian would ever say or write such a sentence, although everybody will understand what is intended.

- (ii) Jeg leter etter noen å gi blomster.  
I look for somebody to give flowers

(den Dikken 1995, 185n)

A preposition, “til”, is not obligatory, still it is felt to be missing as the final constituent of the sentence.

- (18) en mann som vi forespeilet *t* at *p* ikke ville  
bli arrestert  
a man that we held-out-the-prospect-to that not would  
become arrested

‘a man that we promised *t* that (he) wouldn’t be arrested’

(Engdahl 1985, 12)

Odd. At the outset, a full NP (and not just a personal pronoun) as indirect object is special. The effect of extracting the NP indirect object and the form of the direct object (a that-clause) does not reinforce the grammaticality of the sentence. Additionally, it appears that the verb FORESPEILE is more acceptable in the passive in present-day Norwegian.

- (71) a. På gulvet satte han *ned* katten *t*.  
on the-ground put he down the-cat

(den Dikken 1995, 65)

Odd. More acceptable with a long, “heavy” object NP because of the preposed PP. However, a certain “solemn” content would also be required to fit the syntax. Just “katten” makes the sentence a slightly nonsensical.

- (19) (---)  
c. \*/??Han skar kjøttet rått up

(Haider 1997, 11)

No doubt about it: This sentence is simply unacceptable.

- (32) a. at han skar<sub>i</sub> kjøttet [e<sub>i</sub> i biter] [Nor.]  
that he cuts meat-the to pieces  
b. at han [skar i biter]<sub>i</sub> kjøttet e<sub>i</sub>

(Haider 1997, 18)

b. is odd. To the present author, the clause would have been quite acceptable with the phrase “i stykker” both in a. and b. However, with “biter”, only a. is fully acceptable.

- (8) a. Jeg tror at på brevet ble klistret frimerker.  
I believe that on the-letter be pasted stamps

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 307)

Odd. A formal subject DET missing. Furthermore, there is a certain disproportion between the position of the NP “på brevet”, giving the sentence a “solemn” if not a straightforward archaic flair, and the trivial content of the sentence.

- (13) (---)
- a. På denne veggen lot jeg bli hengt opp et bilde av grunnleggeren vår.  
 on this wall let/make I be hung up a portrait of the-founder our
- b. ?Nedover denne bakken har jeg aldri sett komme trillende en barnevogn.  
 down this hill have I never seen come rolling a baby carriage

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 309)

Odd. A formal subject DET missing in both sentences. A certain disproportion between the syntactic order of b. and its trivial yet too specific (“diger”) content.

- (14) (---)
- b. (Jeg tror at) på bordet ble plassert bøker.  
 I believe that on the-table be put books
- c. (Jeg tror at) nedover bakken kom trillende en digerbarnevogn.  
 I believe that down the-hill come rolling a huge baby carriage

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 309)

Odd. A formal subject DET missing in both sentences. A certain disproportion between the syntactic order of both sentences and their trivial (and in the case of c.: too specific) content. It is also difficult to imagine a world where the use of TRO ‘believe’ does not confer a certain anomaly to the sentence at a modal level.

- (15) a. Jeg tror at Jon (plutselig) leste (plutselig) boken.  
 I believe that Jon suddenly read suddenly the-book
- b. Jeg tror at boken (\*plutselig) leste Jon (plutselig).  
 I believe that the-book suddenly read Jon suddenly
- c. Jeg tror at nedover bakken (\*plutselig) kom (plutselig) trillende en diger barnevogn.  
 rolling a huge baby carriage

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 310)

Odd. In a., “leste plutselig boken” is definitely odd, and so is b. In c., a DET is missing, and the position of “nedover bakken” is awkward. It is also difficult to imagine a world where the use of TRO ‘believe’ does not confer a certain anomaly to the sentence at a modal level.

- (23) Hun<sup>m</sup>Henne ble klistret en tøybit på.  
 she(NOM)/her(NON-NOM) be pasted a patch of fabric onto

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 314)

Odd. Basically because of a DET missing, but also because of our knowledge of the world. This sentence is certainly not true in a world central to most native users.

(24) (---)

b. *Hvordan tror du at brevet ble klistret frimerker på?*  
how believe you that the-letter be pasted stamps on

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 315)

Odd. Basically because of our knowledge of the world. However, a corresponding sentence such as “Hvordan tror du at barnet ble skiftet bleier på?” is only marginally acceptable

(28) a. *?Hvilket land tror du at brevet ble klistret [frimerker fra t] på?*  
which country believe you that the-letter be pasted stamps from on

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 317)

Odd. Very much a linguist’s sentence. Any native speaker would have expressed the same content in a different – and simpler – way.

(35) a. *?Aksjonærene ble sendt ut møteprogrammet til.*  
the-stockholders be sent out the-schedule to

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 319)

Odd.

(40) a. *Jeg tror at i banken ble hevet penger.*  
I believe that in the-bank be cashed money  
b. *Jeg tror at i badet ble sunget en sang.*  
I believe that in the-bathroom be sung a song

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 321)

Odd. One formal subject DET missing. Strange content. In the sense that no native speaker would ever express such a “trivial” content in such an officialese way. Only as a joke.

(i) *Jeg tror at denne pennen ble skrevet et brev med.*  
I believe that this pen be written a letter with

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 321n)

Odd. One formal subject DET missing. Strange content.

(i) a. *Denne idrettsplassen er ikke blitt spilt golf på.* (---)

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 325n)

Odd. One formal subject DET missing. Strange content.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Literally: ‘This arena/stadium has not been played golf on’.

- (53) *Jeg spurte om det på brevet ble klistret frimerker.*  
I wondered whether it(EXPL) on the-letter be pasted stamps

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 327)

Odd. There is a certain disproportion between the position of the NP “på brevet”, giving the sentence an archaic flair, and the trivial content of the sentence.

- (55) a. *Jeg tror at det på brevet ble klistret frimerker.*  
I believe that it(EXPL) on the-letter be pasted stamps  
b. *Jeg tror at det i banken ble hevet penger.*  
I believe that it(EXPL) in the-bank be cashed money  
c. *Jeg tror at det i badet ble sunget en sang.*  
I believe that it(EXPL) in the-bath be sung a song

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 329)

Odd. Basically for “lexical” reason and because of our knowledge of the world: Nobody would ever say nor write such sentences about such situations.

- (56) a. *Hvor mange barnevogner tror du at det nedover*  
how many baby carriages believe you that it(EXPL) down  
*bakken kom trillende.*  
hill come rolling  
b. *Hvordan tror du at det nedover bakken kom trillende*  
how believe you that it(EXPL) down the-hill come rolling  
*en diger barnevogn?*  
a huge baby carriage

(den Dikken and Næss 1993, 329)

Odd. a.: A certain disproportion between the syntactic order of the sentence and its trivial content Sounds like a nursery rhyme. b. Really odd. Same as a. but worse. Officialese and a content that it will not be appropriate to express in any conceivable situation.

- (19) *Bare Jon respekterer seg selv.*  
only Jon Respects self self  
‘Only Jon respects himself...’

(Richards 1997, 183)

This sentence gives no sense to a non-linguist native speaker. It seems to be a quotation from a Norwegian grammarian, though.

- (26) *Montague kan jeg ikke huske om {\*han/Ø} døde i Kalifornia (N)*  
‘Montague I can’t remember if (\*he) died in California.’

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 239)

Odd.

- (24) (---)  
b. *Det er den teorien, som ingen vet nøyaktig, hva Bohr syntes om.*

- (---)  
'This is the theory, that no one knows exactly what Bohr thought of (it).'
- (Maling 1978a, 87)  
Odd.
- (26) (---)  
b. Det er den skitne boken, som laereren spurte hvem jeg sa hadde legt (\*den) igjen på pullen.
- (---)  
'This is the dirty book that the teacher asked who I said had left (it) behind on the desk.'
- (Maling 1978a, 87)  
Odd. Anacoluthon?
- (22) (---)  
b. Det er det skuespillet, som ingen vet, hvem først oppdaget, at Ibsen hadde skrevet.
- (---)  
'This is the play, that no one knows who first discovered that Ibsen wrote.'
- (Maling 1978a, 86)  
Odd. "først" adds to the peculiarity.
- (32) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss hvem vi trodde hadde skrevet. (N)  
'These are the poems that the teacher asked us who we thought had written.'
- (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 241)  
Repeated later as:
- (101) Dette er de diktene som laererin spurte oss hvem vi trodde hadde skrivet. (N)
- (Maling and Zaenen 1982, 245)  
Odd.
- (45) a. Hvilken foreleser syntes alle at \_ burde innbys?  
Which speaker did all think that \_ ought to be invited?  
b. Hvem syntes at hvilken foreleser burde innbys?  
Who thought that which speaker ought to be invited?
- (Engdahl 1988a, 81)  
This sentence is acceptable on very specific conditions only: extraordinary intonation and accentuation of "Hvilken" as a third attempt to dispel confusion as to what a crowd actually means when everybody has been shouting all at once. I.e. a particular metalinguistic use of the words and phrases in question.
- (14) a. Mannen som jeg møtte i går som  
The man that I met yesterday that  
jeg fortalte deg om er en berømt fysiker.

I told you about is a famous physicist.

(Maling 1978b, 722)

Hardly acceptable. The second relative clause, “som jeg fortalte deg om” is not felt to be a regular embedded clause, but an inserted element, not planned for at the outset of the sentence. This is no linear complex sentence, as the second relative sentence has to be construed as a correction on behalf of the speaker. (In writing, such an unplanned sentence construction is inconceivable - and definitely not acceptable.) Thus, any adequate analysis of this sentence cannot be exploited in an argumentation presupposing linearity.

- (20) Det finns substantivforekomster vi ikke engang vet  
it exists noun occurrences we not even know  
[om e skall klassifiseres som mengdetermer eller ikke.]  
if shall classify-PASS as mass terms or not  
'There are noun occurrences that we don't even know if they  
should be classified as mass terms or not.'

(Engdahl 1985, 13)

Odd. Also rather peculiar from a lexical point of view.

- (22) Men det<sub>i</sub> har jeg ikke sagt noe om hvordan<sub>j</sub> e<sub>i</sub> gjøres e<sub>j</sub>.  
but it have I not said anything about how do-PASS  
'But that I haven't said anything about how it is done.'

(Engdahl 1985, 13)

Odd. Something wrong as far as the sequence of modalities is concerned. “skal gjøres” seems more appropriate.

- (35) Det kan jeg ikke si noe om [hvordan e må gjøres]  
it can I not say something about how ought do-PASS  
[uten å studere p nærmere.]  
without to study closer  
'That I can't say anything about how it should be done without  
studying it more closely.'

(Engdahl 1985, 17)

Odd.

- (17) (---)  
b. Det er melodien, som ingen visste, hvem skrev \_\_\_\_.  
(---)  
'This is the song that no one knew who wrote.'

(Maling 1978a, 84)

Odd. “den” missing: “den melodien”. Instead of “skrev” (past form of SKRIVE ‘write’), one should have expected “hadde skrevet” (past perfect). This fact seems to be related to the movement, as “Hvem (var det som) skreiv denne melodien?” is a correct sentence. In fact, this example shows the very fine limit

between the acceptable and unacceptable - and how difficult it is to explain why in a foreign language...

- (19) (---)  
b. Det er melodien, som Jan spurte, hvem skrev \_\_\_\_.  
(---)  
'This is the song, that John asked who wrote \_\_\_\_.'

(Maling 1978a, 84)

Odd. As for missing "den" and "skrev" instead of "hadde skrevet", cf. above.

- (24) Hvem tror du at skulle vinne? (N)  
'Who do you think that will win?'

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249)

Odd.

- (51a) *hvem tror du at skulle vinne?*  
*wer denkst du daß soll gewinnen*

(Fanselow 1991, 333)

Odd. Copied from Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249. Additionally, this example contains a certain anomaly as far as the sequence of modalities is concerned: An extensive correct interpretation will be 'Who do you think that should have won according to a certain plan or decision of a not specified person.' This author has problems construing a situation where such a sentence will be correctly used.

- (19) *Desse konstruksjonar trur eg at t er meir naturlege uttrykksmåtar.*  
*these constructions think I that are more natural expressions*  
'These constructions, I think that they are more natural expressions.'

(Engdahl 1985, 13)

Double determination missing. Particularly awkward since the written standard of Nynorsk is adapted, double determination with postposed possessive adjective is semi-compulsory: "Desse konstruksjonane".

- (43) Norw. *Desse konstruksjonar trur eg at \_ er meir naturlege uttrykksmåtar.*  
*These constructions think I that \_ are more natural expressions.*

(Engdahl 1988a, 81)

Double determination missing. Particularly awkward since the written standard of Nynorsk is adapted, double determination with postposed possessive adjective is semi-compulsory: "Desse konstruksjonane".

- (77b) *desse konstruksjonar trur jeg at er meir naturlege uttrykksmåta*  
*diese Konstruktionen denke ich daß sind mehr natürliche Ausdrucksmittel*

(Fanselow 1991, 338)

Odd. Also from a lexical point of view. An inexact copy of Engdahl 1988a, 81

- b. *Desse konstruksjonar trur eg at t er meir naturlege uttrykksmåtar.*

These constructions think I that are more natural expressions  
(from Engdahl 1984:12, (29))

(Vikner 1995, 60)

Cf. Engdahl 1985, 13.

(73) En man kom inn \*(som) var fra India

(Pesetsky 1982, 325)

Odd.

(89) Noen så ikke en del ting.  
somebody saw NEG a part thing

(Bernini and Ramat 1996, 145)

The syntactic positions represented by an indefinite pronoun and a generalized, vague expression.

(105) (---)

d. Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> husker jeg ikke hva<sub>j</sub> \_  
this author<sub>i</sub> I don't remember what  
har oversatt \_ til norsk.  
has translated to Norwegian

(Engdahl 1986, 123)

The lexical item “forfatteren” is most unfortunate. This author was unable to accept this sentence before he had substituted “forfatteren” for a different noun, as “forfatteren”, ‘author.the’, is normally associated with the author of what has been translated, not the translator ...

(72) bøkene om syntaks til den gutten som står der borte  
the books of syntax of the boy who is there

(Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, 202)

The semantic content of the sentence is not consistent with our knowledge of the world: Only “professoren” ‘the professor’ instead of “gutten” ‘the ladd’ will render this sentence fully acceptable.

<sup>37</sup> In Norwegian the class of verbs that trigger reanalysis is somewhat different from that in French. In Norwegian there is a class of verbs that allow the short form of the reflexive (the clitic *seg*). As in Dutch, these verbs can be characterized as the verbs that take an “affected” object (see Zubizarreta (1987)). It is this class of verbs that allow for a definite inalienable phrase in direct object position (we owe this observation to L. Johnsen):

- (i) De vasket seg/ansiktet.  
They washed self/the face
- (ii) De barberte seg/skjeget.  
They shaved self/the beard
- (iii) De reiste seg/hodet.  
They raised self/the head

Compare these examples with (iv)-(v).

(iv) Han stolte på seg selv/\*seg.  
He trusted himself/\*self

(v) Han stolte på sitt hode/\*hodet.  
He trusted his head/\*the head

(Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992, 622n)

“De barberte skjegget.” is a slightly odd sentence to most Norwegians. Contrary to its English equivalent, the object of Norwegian BARBERE ‘shave’ refers typically to the part of the body that is being treated, not what is being disposed of: “Han barberte haka.” ‘He shaved his chin’.

On the other hand, this author finds “Han stolte på hodet.” just as (ab)normal as “Han stolte på sitt hode.” Only acceptable in very specific contexts.

(119) norvégien (Vergnaud & Zubizarreta 1992: 622)

a. De vasket ansiktet. / De barberte skjegget.  
Eux lavèrent le:visage eux rasèrent la:barbe  
<Ils se lavèrent le visage.> <Ils se rasèrent la barbe.>

b. Han stolte på sitt hode. (\*Han stolte på hodet.).  
lui fit.confiance à sa tête  
<Il faisait confiance à sa tête.>

(König and Haspelmath 1998, 576)

Cf. Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992, 622n above.

[56] det kom ein student på grunn av sine karakterar  
vint un étudiant à cause de son/REFL note  
<Il est venu un étudiant au sujet de sa note>

[57] eg såg ein student på grunn av hans karakterar  
je vis son  
<J’ai vu un étudiant au sujet de sa note>

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 236)

Double determination missing. Particularly awkward since the written standard of Nynorsk is adapted, double determination with postposed possessive adjective is semi-compulsory: “karakterane sine” and “karakterane hans”. Odd for lexical reasons as well: A similar sentence “Det kom en student på grunn av depresjonen sin.” seems more natural for a physician summing up a day’s work. In other words, a very specific context is needed to render even this sentence acceptable.

[57] eg såg ein student på grunn av hans karakterar  
je vis son  
<J’ai vu un étudiant au sujet de sa note>

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 236)

Odd. If the meaning is ‘I saw a student (with my own eyes/literally) because of his notes’, i.e. ‘I didn’t recognise him in the crowd before I knew that he was the one with extraordinary notes etc.’, the sentence is grammatical – although hardly

acceptable in any normal context. On the other hand “au sujet de” seems to indicate that another interpretation is intended: ‘I met him in order to talk with him about his notes’. In that case, the sentence is unacceptable. “såg” (past form of SJÅ ‘see’ in Nynorsk) cannot be used this way. The sentence is probably a result of interference from English.<sup>86</sup>

- (1) a. Han så [<sub>VP</sub> (aldri) t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> analysen løse oppgaven]  
(\*aldri)]  
He saw never the.analysis solve the assignment  
never  
‘He (never) saw the analysis solve the assignment’  
b. Han så [<sub>VP</sub> (\*aldri) t<sub>v</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> den løse oppgaven] (\*aldri)]  
he saw never it solve the.assignment never  
‘He saw (\*never) it solve the assignment’

(Svenonius 2005a, 217)

(1a) is definitely a strange sentence. Something about the lexical combination is wrong ...

*Norwegian* (Haga 1976). Norwegian, an SVO language, has a minor movement rule Haga names Light-Pronoun Shift. (---)

- (116) Winston utbedret visst skaden ved dugnad  
Winston repaired “I think” the damage through  
volunteer work  
Winston repaired the damage through volunteer  
work  
(117) Winston utbedret den visst ved dugnad  
Winston repaired it I think through volunteer  
work.  
Winston repaired it I think through volunteer  
work.

(Tomlin 1986, 65)

One feature adding to the oddity of these two sentences is the preposition phrase “ved dugnad”. Idiomatically incorrect. “ved å holde dugnad”, “på siste dugnad” etc. will produce a correct sentence.

Although pure existentials usually become degraded when temporally modified, there are examples where spatio-temporal anchoring is fine:

- (38) (---)  
No b. Nettopp nå fins det ikke dinosaurer, men det fantes dinosaurer før.  
*just now find-MP this not dinosaurs, but this found-MP dinosaurs before*

---

<sup>86</sup> A reference to Faarlund seems to indicate that these Norwegian sentences are drawn (in identical form?) from unpublished material produced for the project *Typologie des langues en Europe* where both Lazard and Faarlund participated. (Jan Terje Faarlund p.c.)

“Just now there are no dinosaurs, but earlier there used to be dinosaurs.

(Czinglar 2001, 103)

Odd. Something missing. A specific indication of the location? “Nettopp nå” creates the impression of the dinosaurs being temporarily away.

(68) No a. *“Det fins også noe gratis, gjør det ikke?  
this find-MP also something for free, does it not*

(Czinglar 2001, 122)

Slightly odd. Still, more acceptable than another sentence of hers, qualified by means of a similar “??”: The result of interference from German? (Cf. Czinglar 2001, 123)

(74) No *“I går fantes det varm vin foran universitetet.  
in yesterday found-MP this warm wine in-front-of university-DEF*

(Czinglar 2001, 123)

Odd. No native user would have used a form of FINNES ‘exist’ in such a sentence. What is intended must be “kunne en få kjøpt” ‘one could buy’, “solgte en” ‘was for sale’ or the like. The sentence is liable to be the result of interference, probably from German: “Gestern gab es Glühwein vor der Universität.”

(12) Norwegian  
a. *Vi leste ikke dem.*  
b. *Vi leste dem ikke.*  
we read (them) not (them)

(Deprez 1994, 106)

Adverb in the wrong place. a. is definitely odd without an exceptional stress or an extraordinary written context.

(60) a. *De leser {alltid / egentlig/desverre /ikke} avisa (Nor)*  
*they read always/actually/unfortunately/not the.newspaper*  
*‘They {always/actually/unfortunately/don’t} read the newspaper’*  
b. *De leser desverre alltid avisa.*  
*they read unfortunately always the.newspaper*  
*‘They unfortunately always read the newspaper’*

(Svenonius 1994, 3/35)

a. is a little odd with “desverre”,<sup>87</sup> and incomprehensible with “egentlig”. In order to make them acceptable, an explicit context is required: “De leser desverre avisa [med et fordumsfullt sinn]. ‘(---) with a biased mind’. “De leser egentlig avisa [bare på lørdager].” ‘(---) on Saturdays only’.

b. is odd. Only acceptable with a “heavy” continuation, e.g. “De leser desverre alltid avisa [som ligger på matta til naboen før han står opp og får tatt den inn om morgenen].” ‘(---) lying on the mat before our neighbour manages to awake and fetch it every morning’.

<sup>87</sup> “desverre” is misspelled, cf. above.

I.e. in order to make this sentence acceptable, a few “heavy” phrases must be added. As they are, both sentences above are in defiance with the “weight principle” of Norwegian syntax.

- (109) [CP I går tok<sub>j</sub> [IP grisen<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> [VP]O [VP t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> en dusj ]]] (Nor)  
*yesterday took the.pig indeed a shower*  
 ‘Yesterday, the pig did take a shower’

(Svenonius 1994, 2/62)

In order to make this sentence acceptable, a few “heavy” phrases must be added, e.g. “som ingen her på gården noensinne har sett maken til ...” As it is, the sentence is in defiance with the “weight principle” of Norwegian syntax. (Only a metaphorical reading is possible, due to our knowledge of the world.)

- (25) (---)

- b. Han er redd nok  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} * \emptyset \\ \text{for} \end{array} \right\}$  ulver.

*He is afraid enough of wolves.*

(Maling 1983, 264)

Unacceptable in isolation. Only correct Norwegian in a context of the type “(Han er redd nok for ulver), om du ikke skulle slippe inn en bjørn eller to også.” ‘(---), so letting in a bear or two will give him a terrible shock’.

- (8.132)a. Så provoserer Salomes mannshunger fortsatt dagens publikum.  
*so provokes Salome’s man-hunger still the-day’s audience*  
 ‘Then Salome’s hunger for men still provokes today’s audiences.’  
 b. Så provoserer fortsatt Salomes mannshunger dagens publikum.  
*so provokes still Salome’s man-hunger the-day’s audience*  
 ‘Then Salome’s hunger for men still provokes today’s audiences.’

(Ernst 2002, 434)

According to Ernst, these examples are drawn from Svenonius 2000, which turns out to be Svenonius 2002a, 221, where almost identical sentences are given.<sup>88</sup>

- (39) a. Så provoserer Salomes mannshunger fortsatt dagens publikum.  
*so provokes Salome’s man.hunger still the.day’s audience*  
 ‘Then Salome’s hunger for men still provokes today’s audiences.’  
 b. Så provoserer fortsatt Salomes mannshunger dagens publikum.  
*so provokes still Salome’s man.hunger the.day’s audience*

(Svenonius 2002a, 221)

These sentences bear all the signs of being literary quotations from old-fashioned Dano-Norwegian sources at least one century ago. (No precise reference is given.) As such, they are hard to understand for any contemporary

<sup>88</sup> In Svenonius 2002a, 221, there is no English translation of the b. sentence.

native speaker of Norwegian - as they are for the grammarian himself, cf. the English translation.

- (33) (---)  
b. Jon sa Marit at hun ga en presang.  
John said Marit that she gave a present  
'John, Mary said that she gave a present.'

(Larson 1988, 356)

Nonsensical. Something seems to be missing since "present" is some sort of "default" thing to give. Most important, though, this author and his informants all have problems recognising such a sentence as Norwegian, given that "Jon" is to be construed as the indirect object of "gave". According to Larson, the source is Arild Hestvik (person communication).

Also, A-bar movement of shifted IOs is permitted in Norwegian (Larson (1988:356)):

- (119) (---)  
b. Jon<sub>i</sub> sa Marit t'<sub>i</sub> at hun ga [<sub>VP</sub> t'<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> en presang [<sub>V</sub> t<sub>i</sub> ]]]  
Jon<sub>dat</sub> said Marit that she<sub>nom</sub> gave a present<sub>acc</sub>

(Müller 1995b, 234)

Nonsensical. Something seems to be missing. Yet, no known part of a possible original sentence or context has been omitted.

### Absurdities

- (iii) ??De<sub>i</sub> undredes hvorfor bildet av hverandre<sub>i</sub> var solgt  
They wonder why the picture of each other was sold

(Everaert 1986, 253n)

No doubt about it. This is an incomprehensible and thus completely unacceptable sentence. Apart from that, the past form "undredes", a marked archaic form, is translated as 'wonder' (present).

(169)

- (---)  
c. Jeg lurer på hvem (\* som) du synes [t ser mest].  
I wonder who that you think looks most

(Taraldsen 1978:633-634)

(Ogawa 2001, 87)

Nonsensical. Thus, it is difficult to decide whether the sentence is grammatical or not. Now, according to the author, (169) is an adoption of Taraldsen 1978b, 634. Given that the sentence is based on Taraldsens sentence (52): "\*Jeg lurer på hvem som du synes ser mest svensk ut." the essential final part, "svensk ut", is missing. Not by chance, though, to judge from the English rendering.

In the periphrastic construction, e.g. Norwegian *lysene blir lyset* ‘the lights are lit’, the event referred to is a specific one. With the corresponding MM construction, on the other hand, *lysene lyses* ‘the lights are lit’, the implication of a recurrent state of affairs, which can be made explicit with the addition of a habitual temporal modifier such as *hver kveld* ‘every evening’.

(Kemmer 2002, 149)

Both “lysene blir lyset” and “lysene lyses” are ungrammatical. Correct translations of the English renderings back to Norwegian will be “lysene blir tent” and “lysene tennes” respectively. The verb LYSE in the sense ‘light, shine’ is intransitive. There exists a homonymous transitive verb with a remotely related meaning, though: ‘make known, publish’. However, under no circumstances can the verb be inflected “lyset”. The past participle of LYSE is *lyst*.

### Incorrect interpretation

(19) at det ikke var skote noe fuglar  
that he not has shot any birds

(Hoekstra 1990, 217)

The Norwegian sentence is in the passive. The English gloss is in the active, and introduces a subject “he”, which has no counterpart in the Norwegian sentence.

One particular manifestation of lack of understanding is erroneous indexing.

(26 a) Ola<sub>i</sub> kan jeg ikke skønne  
[hva<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> sier e<sub>j</sub>]

(26 b) \*Ola<sub>i</sub> I don’t understand  
[what<sub>j</sub> e<sub>j</sub> says e<sub>j</sub>] (Engdahl 1988a, 15)

(Haider 1993, 643)

The indexation is wrong, as both “Ola” and “hva” as well as their corresponding empty positions all have the same index.<sup>89</sup>

28 c) Hvilke malerier<sub>j</sub> har ikke Petter noen  
vegg<sub>j</sub> å henge topp e<sub>j</sub> på e<sub>j</sub>  
which paintings has not Peter any wall  
to hang up on

(Haider 1993, 643)

Incomprehensible indexation. Both “malerier” and “vegg” have the same index, *j*, as the traces “e” and “e”. In both the above cases, poor proofreading is also a possibility, although the overall standard of the examples seems to indicate a lack of linguistic competence on behalf of the author – and his source. Cf. Engdahl 1988b, 19.

---

<sup>89</sup> Engdahl (1988b, 15) contains the correct indexation: “Ola<sub>i</sub> kan jeg ikke skønne hva<sub>j</sub> e<sub>i</sub> sier e<sub>j</sub>” and “\*Ola<sub>i</sub> I don’t understand what<sub>j</sub> e<sub>i</sub> says e<sub>j</sub>”.

Other misunderstandings are subtler:

Holmberg (1986) notes (but does not [119] explain) the fact that pronouns that are modified by PPs cannot undergo object shift. The following paradigm shows this for Norwegian<sup>37,38</sup>

- (51) a. Jeg liker *ham* ikke.  
I like him not
- b. Jeg liker ikke *han med langt haring*.  
I like not him with long hair  
'I don't like him with long hair.'<sup>39</sup>
- c. \*Jeg like *han med langt haring* ikke.  
I like him with long hair not
- d. \*Jeg liker *han* ikke *med langt haring*.  
i like him not with long hair

(Koopman 1999, 118f)

<sup>39</sup> The star stands for the interpretation 'I don't like the person with long hair', not for a small clause construal 'I don't like him when he has long hair'.

(Koopman 1999, 129)

Apart from the fact that "like" in c. has been corrected to "liker" and that the full stops are missing, these examples are rendered in the same way in the reprinted version Koopman 2000 (104f).

Whatever these sentences are supposed to mean (and reading "like" as "liker" in c., cf. above, and "haring" as "hår" in all the sentences): c. is wrong no matter the semantic interpretation. d., on the contrary, is correct in Koopman's second interpretation, just as she contends.

On the other hand, incorrect interpretations may be more concrete:

- (2.65) Han hente barna<sub>i</sub> og ba \*(dem<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> feie.  
He call.PAST children.DEF.PI<sub>i</sub> and order.PAST \*(them<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> sweep  
'He called the children and ordered them (the children) to sweep.'
- (2.66) Han hente barna<sub>i</sub> og ba \*(dem<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> om å feie.  
He call.PAST children.DEF.PI<sub>i</sub> and order.PAST \*(them<sub>i</sub>) PRO<sub>i</sub> to sweep  
'He called the children and ordered them (the children) to sweep.'

(Larson 2005, 30)

Error: "ordered" is not the equivalent of "ba" (of BE). The correct translation will be 'asked them to' or 'told them to'.

- [56] det kom ein student på grunn av sine karakterar  
vint un étudiant à cause de son/REFL note  
'Il est venu un étudiant au sujet de sa note'

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 236)

Error: “karakterar” (indefinite plural) translated as “note”, i.e. singular..

(12) (---)

- c. *Vi leste ikke artikkeln.*  
d. *\*Vi leste artikkeln ikke.*  
we read (the papers) not (the papers)

(Deprez 1994, 106)

Despite the error, “artikkeln” is easily recognised as definite form plural. I.e. “the paper” in English.

(9) Det har ingen lingvist/\*en lingvist kjøpt boken.  
there has no linguist/\*a linguist bought a book

(10) Jon har ingen böker/\* en bok kjøpt.  
John has no book/ a book bought

(Ingham 2000, 15f.)

Errors: “boken” is definite form singular, ‘the book’ (cf (10)). “böker” (bøker) is indefinite plural, ‘books’. Correct in Christensen 1991, 149.

sometimes very concrete even:

(70) a. Han satte katten *ned* på gulvet.  
He put the-cat down on the-ground

(---)

(71) a. På gulvet satte han *ned* katten *t*.  
On the-ground put he down the-cat

(den Dikken 1995, 65)

Errors: “gulvet” ‘does not mean ‘the-ground’. The correct rendering is ‘the-floor’.

or more like a typing error:

(88Da) [erobringen *af byen*]  
the conquest of the city

(88N) [ødeleggelsen *av byen*]  
destruction of the city

(Webelhuth 1992, 76)

The definite article is missing in the English rendering. Cf. the corresponding Danish sentence. -EN is the postposed definite article in both Danish and Norwegian.

or both:

(15) (---)  
Norwegian INGEN så noe.

Swedish INGEN så någonting.

(Bernini and Ramat 1996, 186)

The Norwegian sentence is not an equivalent of the Swedish one, as a variant “Ingen så noen ting.” is also possible.<sup>90</sup>

- (19) a. Han skar kjøttet up rått [Nor.]  
 He cuts meat-the up raw  
 b. Han skar up kjøttet rått  
 c. \*/?/?Han skar kjøttet rått up  
 (---)”

(Haider 1997, 11)

Errors: “skar” is translated as ‘cuts’. *skar* is the past form of SKJÆRE/SKJERE ‘cut’, not present.

- (32) a. at han skar<sub>i</sub> kjøttet [e<sub>i</sub> i biter] [Nor.]  
 that he cuts meat-the to pieces  
 b. at han [skar i biter]<sub>i</sub> kjøttet e<sub>i</sub>

(Haider 1997, 18)

Errors: “skar” is translated as ‘cuts’. *skar* is the past form of SKJÆRE/SKJERE ‘cut’, not present. Cf. Haider 1997, 11.

(4) B: Norwegian topicalization (Taraldsen 1981; McCreight 1988)

- a. Per<sub>i</sub> hadde de trodd [t<sub>i</sub>[t<sub>i</sub> ville komme forsent]]  
 Peter had they thought would arrive too late  
 ‘Peter had thought they would come too late.’  
 b. {\*jeg, \*du, \*vi}<sub>i</sub> hadde de trodd [t<sub>i</sub>[t<sub>i</sub> ville  
 {\*I, \*you.sg.NOM, \*we} had they thought would  
 komme forsent]]  
 arrive too late  
 c. {\*meg, \*deg, \*oss}<sub>i</sub> hadde de trodd [t<sub>i</sub>[t<sub>i</sub>  
 {\*me, \*you.sg.ACC, \*us} had they thought  
 ville komme forsent]]  
 would arrive too late  
 d. dere<sub>i</sub> hadde de trodd [t<sub>i</sub>[t<sub>i</sub> ville komme  
 you.pl.NOM/ACC had they thought would arrive  
 forsent]]  
 too late  
 ‘You had thought they would arrive too late.’

(Bejar and Massam 1999, 67)

Two of the translations are wrong:

a. is correct and is quoted from Taraldsen 1981, 378. This is also the case with the literal rendering in English. The English translation in single quotes, however, is wrong.

<sup>90</sup> By the way, correct Swedish is "såg" not "så".

- b. is a correct quotation of Taraldsen's example. Not all native speakers of Norwegian have a clear opinion about all the alternatives, and this author will accept "du" as a subject, although with a certain reservation.
- c. on the other hand, is felt to be grammatical, "meg", "deg", or "oss". These sentence alternatives do not appear in Taraldsen's paper, but are constructed on the basis of what Taraldsen maintains (Taraldsen 1981, 379).
- In the case of d., what is supposed to be the English translation is wrong. "McCreight 1988" refers to Young 1988. Young 1988, 30f. quotes Taraldsen's sentences correctly, adding no faulty translation.

### Incorrect asterisks

- (23) \* Jeg spurte om det var [AGRP mange fuglar skote/skotne]  
I asked whether it was many birds shot

(Hoekstra 1990, 217)

"Jeg spurte om det var mange fuglar skotne" is certainly a little odd (a mixture of Bokmål and Nynorsk, "var" instead of "vart", and the position of "skotne"). Still, the sentence(variant) is not more ungrammatical than the usual Norwegian sentence found in international grammar literature. (Cf remark to Hoekstra 1990, 217 as far as agreement and the past participle are concerned.)

### It's six of one and half a dozen of the other

It seems to be crucial that the agreement be case agreement. In Norwegian, predicate adjectives agree in number, but there is no morphological case marking. Despite the existence of number agreement on adjectives, goal objects cannot host depictive predicates. If the object is a theme, then the host of the depictive adjective can be either the subject or the object; if the object is a goal, then only the subject-host reading is available. The grammaticality judgements can be made sharper by ensuring that subject and object disagree in number. The adjective *naken* is singular (m/f), whereas *nakne* is plural.

- (89) a. De så ham naken/#nakne  
they saw him naked  
b. De reddet ham nakne/naken  
they rescued him naked-pl./sg  
c. De besøkte ham nakne/\*naken  
they visited him naked-pl./\*sg  
d. De hjalp ham nakne/\*naken  
they helped him naked-pl./\*sg

I conclude that it is the presence of agreeing morphological case on adjectives which serves to license secondary predicates in Icelandic even when c-command does not hold.

(Maling 2001, 458)

As far as Norwegian is concerned, this author has problems making any clear judgments of the listed alternatives. This is an attitude shared by all non-linguist native speakers of Norwegian asked on the subject. This may be related to the fact that the meanings of the respective sentences and their variants are rather farfetched. It is difficult to have a clear opinion about a sentence with a meaning in the borderline area of nonsense, cf. above. Additionally, this author has his doubts as to the roles attributed to REDDE and HJELPE. Since the world may look identical in a case where a person is “reddet” or “hjulpet”, the question of the semantic roles of the two verbs in question is less clear-cut than it might appear. Unless one wishes to confirm a preconceived truth.

### Interference at a phrase or sentence level

- (61) (---)  
b. Ta inte DU den boken! (Swedish)  
*take not you that book*  
c. Ta ikke DU den boken! (Norwegian)  
*take not you that book*

(Platzack and Rosengren 1997, 218)

“DU” is unacceptable in this sentence. Whether some kind of extension of the sentence, “, av alle...” ‘of all (possible persons)’. Since the authors are Swedish and accept b. as Swedish, c. is liable to be the result of interference from Swedish.

- (14) a. Mannen som jeg møtte i går som  
The man that I met yesterday that  
jeg fortalte deg om er en berømt fysiker.  
I told you about is a famous physicist.

(Maling 1978b, 722)

“Mannen som” is felt to be slightly Swedish in contrast to Norwegian “Den mannen som” (with double determination).

- (23) (---)  
b. Det er vennen, som jeg ikke vet, hva jeg skal gi til jul.  
‘This is the friend, that I don’t know what I shall give for Christmas.’

(Maling 1978a, 86)

“Det er vennen, som” has a definite Swedish flavour - without the demonstrative “den”. “Det er den vennen som” will be the correct Norwegian clause.

- (78) a. Jag anser mig ha rätt. (Swedish)  
*I think me have right*

(---)

- (79) a. Jeg anser meg å ha rett. (Norwegian)  
*I think me to have right*

I believe myself to be right.

(Platzack 1986, 218)

Odd. Probably a result of interference from Swedish. (Swedish “Jag anser mig ha rätt”.) In Norwegian, the construction ANSE SEG Å is marginally acceptable when followed by an instance of VÆRE ‘be’ in a predicative construction. Preferably, the sentence must contain a FOR, e.g. “Jeg anser meg for å være fullt kompetent til stillinga.” ‘I consider myself fully competent for the position’.

(2.19) (---) [34]

e. Jag anser [ meg \*(å) ha rett]  
I think me have right (Norwegian)

(---)

‘I believe myself to be right.’ Platzack (1986, 218)

(Watanabe 1996, 33f)

Odd. Cf. above.

(34) Læreren sa at den smarteste studenten, altså meg/jeg,  
the-teacher said that the smartest student, thus me-ACC/I-NOM,  
skulle gi en tale.  
should give a speech  
‘The teacher said that the smartest student, namely me, should give a  
speech.’

(Schütze 2001, 227)

Error: “gi en tale”. Correct “holde en tale”. (English “give a speech”.)

(57) a. Da han kom tilbake ut hadde plutselig hunden forsvunnet.  
when he came back out had suddenly the.dog disappeared  
b. Da han kom tilbake ut hadde hunden plutselig forsvunnet.  
when he came back out had the.dog suddenly disappeared

(Svenonius 2002a, 227)

Error: “kom tilbake ut”. Correct “kom ut igjen”. (English “came back out”.)

### Strange assertions

- (i) a. \*Etter dette slo Guri Per alltid i sjakk.  
after this beat Guri Per always in chess  
b. Etter dette slo Guri Per ærlig talt heldigvis ikke lenger alltid i sjakk.  
after this beat Guri Per honestly spoken fortunately not any-longer always in chess

Although OS of full NPs across a single sentential adverb is standardly bad in Norwegian, as in (ia), sentences like (ib), where the object precedes a long string of adverbs, are markedly better.

(Thráinsson 2001, 199)

The contrary is the case. (i) a. is acceptable, (i) b. not. The asterisk of (i) a. appears to be the result of a misinterpretation of Nilsen 1997:19f. (referred to by Thráinsson as “Nielsen 1997”). The acceptability of (i) b. is controversial at least. Again, this is related to language use rather than the language as a linear system. The only possible interpretation rendering it acceptable is as a sentence containing a series of alternative adverbial phrases as some sort of correction(s) inserted in the linear sentence. It can also be seen as a contamination of two or more sentences. The fact that Thráinsson has borrowed this example from a Norwegian linguist (Nilsen 1997, 19) does not alter this situation. A normal analysis of this sentence (and argumentation based on it) equals a linear syntactic analysis of a stuttered utterance ...<sup>91</sup>

(19)    Desse konstruksjonar trur eg at t er meir naturlege  
           these constructions think I that are more natural  
           uttrykksmátar.  
           expressions  
           ‘These constructions, I think that they are more natural expressions.’

(---)  
 (20)    Det finns substantivforekomster vi ikke engang vet  
           it exists noun occurrences we not even know  
           [om e skall klassifiseres som mengdetermer eller ikke.]  
           if shall classify-PASS as mass terms or not  
           ‘There are noun occurrences that we don’t even know if they  
           should be classified as mass terms or not.’

(---)  
 (22)    Men det<sub>i</sub> har jeg ikke sagt noe om hvordan<sub>j</sub> e<sub>i</sub> gjøres e<sub>j</sub>.  
           but it have I not said anything about how do-PASS  
           ‘But that I haven’t said anything about how it is done.’

(---)  
 Although there is some dialectal variation in Norwegian, in particular with respect to examples involving the sometimes optional complementizer *at* ‘that’, the range of constructions illustrated in (19)-(22) and the fact that they are not infrequent show that the subject position can be empty in modern Norwegian.

(Engdahl 1985, 13)

As indicated above, a theoretical conclusion based on a selection of rather odd Norwegian sentences.

Im Schwedischen und den Dialekten des Norwegischen, in denen Subjekte nicht aus Sätzen mit Konjunktionen extrahiert werden dürfen, tritt ein resumptives Pronomen in die Subjektposition ein, cf. (49) aus dem Schwedischen:

(49) *vem<sub>i</sub> undrade alla om han<sub>i</sub>/\*t<sub>i</sub> skulle komma i tid?*

<sup>91</sup> The problem of native language user linguists providing wrong examples, has to be addressed elsewhere, as it is loaded with severe problems for the entire foundation of linguistics.

wer fragte-sich jeder ob er würde kommen in Zeit  
(Fanselow 1991, 271)

This is Swedish. Which is, in fact, what is stated in what seems to be Fanselow's source for this example, Maling and Zaenen 1982, 238. One source of the confusion may be an erroneous contention in Maling and Zaenen 1982, 236. Cf. above.

Further evidence is provided by *wh*-movement. Norwegian has two possessive constructions, (30a) and (30b), the former with cliticized *-s* and the latter with *sin*, the usual possessive reflexive:

- (30) a. Pers bil  
Peter's car  
b. Per sin bil  
Peter his (refl) car  
'Peter's car'

(Newmeyer 1998, 266)

Norwegian has more than two possessive constructions. Much more important than SIN possessive is the TIL construction: "Bilen til Per". The SIN possessive, on the other hand, is a regional phenomenon, whose centre is on the West coast. Most Norwegians never use the SIN possessive. So, there is no free choice between the a. and b. type of possessives.

Consider first the data set in (27) that illustrates the Saxon genitive construction. Notice that in Norwegian, only pronominal possessors are allowed to bear the 's affix:

[p 761]

- (27) a. Peter's book (English)  
b. bok-en hans (Norwegian, from Taraldsen, 1990)  
book-the his  
'his book'  
c. Fyrirlestur Peturs (Icelandic, from Sigurðsson, 1993)  
lecture Peter's  
'Peter's lecture'  
d. Johans bok-en (N. Swedish, from Svenonius, 1993)  
Johan's book-the  
'Johan's book'  
e. Jans auto (Dutch, from Corver, 1990)  
'Jan's car'  
f. Peters Hunde (German, from Webelhuth, 1992)  
'Peter's dogs'

(Gavrusseva 2000, 760f.)

Not only pronominal possessors. A Norwegian sentence “Pers bok” is perfectly grammatical. Of course, “boken hans” is spelled correctly in Taraldsen 1990, 419.

Jespersen (1960: 305), for example, [216] observes that possessive dative constructions are “extremely common in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish dialects”. Likewise, Koptjevskaja-Tamm (forthcoming) shows that Modern Norwegian does have a construction comparable to the English *his*-genitive, i.e. a reflexive pronoun bound to the possessor, as in:

- (92) *Jan og Maria si-ne barn*  
Jan and Maria refl.poss-pl children  
'Jan and Maria's children'

Maybe the fact that these constructions do occur in dialects or spoken language has so far been overlooked, and therefore their presence and influence on the process of turning a genitive inflection into a clitic in the Scandinavian languages has not been acknowledged yet and may well need to be rethought (---).

(Rosenbach 2002, 215f.)

The final remarks reveal an extraordinary lack of familiarity with Norwegian grammatical literature and her final hypothesis is correspondingly unmotivated.

In (6) there is a selection of postnominal possessive constructions found among Norwegian and NSw dialects:

[101]

- (6) a. *bilen hans*  
car.D his “his car”  
b. *bilen hans n Jon*  
car.D his ART Jon ”Jon's car”  
c. *bilen n Jons*  
car.D ART Jon's ”Jon's car”  
d. *bilen läraren*  
car.D teacher.D ”the teacher's car”  
e. *bilen åt läraren*  
car.D to the.teacher ”the teacher's car”

(Holmberg and Sandström 1996, 100f)

Only a. is a perfect Norwegian phrase. e. is also correct if the necessary alterations from Swedish orthography and morphology are made: ”bilen til läreren. The other phrases are impossible in Norwegian, even b. and c. where the Norwegian and Swedish orthography and morphology coincide.

Norwegian presents a more complex case as it may be treated as a two- or three-gender system, depending on dialectal, structural and stylistic considerations. In Norwegian Bokmål, feminine [236] gender enjoys an unstable position, which is demonstrated by the small number of nouns with obligatory feminine forms and a weak status of feminine agreement.<sup>4</sup>

(Kilarski and Krynicki 2005, 235f.)

- 4 (---) The two insular languages, Icelandic and Faroese, together with Norwegian Nynorsk, possess the traditional Old Norse three-gender systems. The following discussion will be based however on Danish, Swedish and Norwegian Bokmål due to the comparable size of the collected data.

(Kilarski and Krynicki 2005, 246n.)

It is true that Norwegian Bokmål does not have a complete three-gender system such as the one of Icelandic and Faeroese, even the one of Norwegian Nynorsk. It is equally true that feminine enjoys an unstable position in Bokmål. But the number of obligatory feminine nouns in the official orthography is not a proof. What ought to be an interesting part of Bokmål and of numerous spoken dialects is the fact that, in principle, feminine is often optional, thus leaving the ground for an extensive variation - even within the speech of one single person. As for the spoken language, there are native users that never use feminine forms (traditionally only in the dialect of Bergen, but the last half of a century, this lack of active feminine may also be found elsewhere, for instance among persons adhering to particular political ideologies and, in general, belonging to certain social layers.) Still, the very same native language users will have a passive competence of feminine. This means that feminine still exists in general in all Norwegian dialects/sociolects, however in an unexpected way. I.e. different from what one should have expected comparing with other Western European languages.<sup>92</sup>

Martin Haspelmath (p.c.) points out that, in spoken Norwegian, the word *og* 'and' has [147] come to be used as an infinitival complementiser.

(Lefebvre 2004, 146f.)

This is an oversimplification. OG 'and' has not all of a sudden been used instead of the infinitival marker. The point is that the infinitival marker Å 'to' and OG has become homonymous, as /o/, in a number of dialects with the inevitable consequence that many native speakers find it difficult to spell the infinitival marker correctly. Which in turn has resulted in singular interpretations, however infrequent, of all instances of /o/, i.e. also the infinitival marker as OG – pronounced /og/.

The Scandinavian languages fall into two divisions with regard to the position of the infinitive marker roughly corresponding to English *to*: in Icelandic and Swedish it precedes S-adv, while in Danish and Norwegian it follows S-adv.

- (46) a. (---)  
d. Han lovet (ikke å lese boken) (Norwegian)  
*not to read the book*

---

<sup>92</sup> There are examples even of Norwegians excluding feminine from linguistic expositions, e.g. works as different as Lødrup 1989 and Nilson 1994. This, however, is politically motivated and, inevitably, implies that the linguistic description at hand is deficient.

(Holmberg 1986, 154)

The sentence “Han lovte å ikke lese boka.” is grammatical. On the other hand, it has only one reading ‘promised that not p’, while the sentence represented in d. may have the same reading (as indicated by the parentheses) and a ‘didn’t promise that p’ reading. (I.e. if one disregards the parentheses.)

As a further evidence in favor of the existence of quasi-indicators we can quote the behavior of the Italian reflexive ‘proprio’ [self]. In an ascription like (the example comes from Chierchia 1989: 24):

- (8) a. Pavarotti crede che i *propri* pantaloni siano in fiamme.  
[Pavarotti believes *self* pants are on fire]

‘proprio’ forces the *de se* reading. If, instead of the reflexive ‘proprio’ we had the non-reflexive pronoun ‘suoi’ [his], we could have both the *de re* and the *de se* interpretation:

- (8) b. Pavarotti crede che i suoi pantaloni siano in fiamme.<sup>12</sup>  
[Pavarotti believes that his pants are on fire]

(Corazza 2004, 348)

<sup>12</sup> Other languages also mark this difference. In Norwegian, for instance, (8a) would translate as ‘Pavarotti tror at *sine* bokser brenner’ while (8b) would translate as ‘Pavarotti at *haus* bokser brenner’.

(Corazza 2004, 348n)

The way Corazza states it, there is no correspondence between Italian and Norwegian in this case, since the Norwegian sentence is ungrammatical: Neither the Norwegian sentence “Pavarotti tror at sine bukser brenner.” nor a variant. “Pavarotti tror at buksene sine brenner.” are grammatical, since “sine” (plural of SIN) cannot refer to the subject of the main clause, ‘Pavarotti’.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The prescriptive rule in English imposing nominative case on predicate NPs (*it is I* in contrast to the ‘colloquial’ *it’s me*) evaporates for virtually all speakers as soon as one extends the data beyond this one learned example, (---). No such prescriptive rule exists for Danish and Norwegian.

(Maling and Sprouse 1995, 182n)

The Danes will speak for themselves. As far as Norwegian is concerned, however, Maling and Sprouse’s final contention is not correct. One example: In a recent normative grammar, both possibilities are accepted, “Det er meg.”, “Det er jeg.” However, with a preference for “jeg”, the subject form (Gundersen, Engh and Fjeld 2001, 79). Cf. also Norsk språkråd 1999, 157.

---

<sup>93</sup> In fact, native Italian speakers object to (8) a. for a similar reason: The clause has no explicit subject, and the main clause should either have an impersonal subject or the “proprio” should be changed for a “suoi” in order for the sentence to be grammatical. Yet, these sentences are widely quoted in linguistics literature, the last instance seems to be Huang and Liu 2001, 155. (Thanks to Maria Grazia Martens and her friends for helping me with the Italian examples.)

Most varieties of Norwegian, including the *bokmål* standard, lack participle agreement.

(Holmberg 2002, 101)

A conditioned truth. Norwegian Nynorsk has participle agreement as have the corresponding dialects. Bokmål has a reminiscent participle agreement system. Holmberg's contention is correct, though, if it is delimited to past participles of intransitive transitional verbs, e.g. KOMME 'come, as in "\*De er komne." Correct "De er kommet" (conservative Bokmål/Dano-Norwegian Riksmål). Which is the context of the article at hand.

(35) *Det blev tre bilder målade*

Construction (35) also occurs in Norwegian dialects (cf. Christensen & Taraldsen 1989: 72).

(van Gelderen 1997, 191)

This Swedish sentence<sup>94</sup> is correct. However, the corresponding Norwegian sentence will have no agreement when MALE/MÅLE is inflected according to a paradigm that contains overt plural inflexion. (There is no Norwegian sentence parallel to the Swedish one in Christensen and Taraldsen 1989, 72.)

The complex passive is productive in Danish and most varieties of Norwegian. It is disallowed in Swedish, English, Icelandic, and some varieties of Norwegian.

(Holmberg 2002, 87)

This is inexact as far as Norwegian is concerned. See below.

I have argued that PrtP is a phase in Swedish and English but not in Norwegian or Danish while Prt has an EPP-feature in all of them. Does this parameter have any effects other than the ones that have been discussed above, mainly the absence of the NP-Prt-passive in Danish and Norwegian 1? The following is a candidate:

Norwegian 1 and Danish have so called complex passives:

[119]

(67) a. Bilen ble forsøkt reparert. (Norwegian 1)

b. Bilen blev forsøgt repareret. (Danish)

*the-car was tried repaired*

There was an attempt to repair the car.

(68) a. Et nytt prosjekt ble lovet iverksatt. (Norwegian 1)

b. Et nyt projekt ble lovet iverksat. (Danish)

*a new project was promised launched*

They promised to launch a new project.

See Engh (1984), Hellan (1984), Christensen (1991). The counterparts of (67) and (68) in Swedish, Norwegian 2, or English are clearly ill formed.

---

<sup>94</sup> Literally 'there became three pictures paintedPLUR', i.e. There were painted three pictures.

- (69) (---)  
b. \*Bilen vart prøvd reparert. (Norwegian 2)  
(---)
- (70) (---)  
b. \*Eit nytt prosjekt vart lova iverksatt. (Norwegian 2)

(Holmberg 2002, 118f.)

Holmberg (Holmberg 2002, 100f.) sketches a typology distinguishing between ‘Norwegian 1’, ‘2’, and ‘3’ based on the criteria perfect participle agreement of KOM(M)E ‘come’ and DET/DER as formal subject. Nynorsk pertains to ‘Norwegian 2’ and ‘3’. Bokmål corresponds roughly to Holmberg’s ‘Norwegian 1’. The sentences (69) b. and (70) b. are both spelled according to Nynorsk orthography. Now, contrary to what Holmberg contends, both (69) b. and (70) b. are as grammatical as (67) a. and (68) a. True, there is less tolerance for complex passive in Nynorsk than in Bokmål. Still, Nynorsk complex passives are abundant. I.e. complex passive is clearly a phenomenon of the *written* language, tied to certain special contexts and genres. It is also considered a construction close to an error by normative grammarians of both written standards. This has been painstakingly documented in Engh 1994.

However, alongside (57a), Swedish also has the following impersonal double object construction (the same holds true of Norwegian 2):

- (59) a. Det blev tre generaler tilldelade en medalj var.  
*EX was three generals assigned-PL a medal each*  
b. Det blev inte många barn givna presenter den julen.  
*Ex was not many children given-PL gifts that Christmas*

(Holmberg 2002, 114)

The same does not hold true for Norwegian unless one strains the limits of acceptability to a radical (archaic?) degree – and forgets about the past participle agreement.

### 3.2 Pure existentials in Scandinavian

(---) Mainland Scandinavian has a construction involving the s-passive of the verb “find”. In Danish it combines with the locative adverbial *der* “there” and in Swedish and Norwegian with the 3rd person neuter d-pronoun *det* “this”. [96] Hopper (1998: 154) characterizes the Scandinavian s-passive as a morphological medio-passive (MP), where the reflexive pronoun *sik* became part of the verbal morphology. This medio-passive form is no longer productive, for regular passive formation a periphrastic passive form involving *blive* “become” is used. But it has survived in certain relics, including the existential construction.

(Cztinglar 2001, 95f)

At least, only a qualified truth ... True, there is a division of labour between the medio-passive form and the periphrastic passive form in modern Scandinavian. Yet, it is not the case that the “medio-passive form is no longer productive”.



The inspiration of Ludlow 1999 and Hyams 2002.

Yet another example is the “perfect of evidentiality” (PE) in languages such as Turkish, Bulgarian and Norwegian, discussed in Izvorski (1997) (---). (Hyams 2002, 261)

Incorrect. The start of a hoax. Izvorski > Hyams

Izvorski (1997) has argued that the present perfect in many languages (ranging from Turkish to Norwegian to Bulgarian) in fact expresses what she calls the “perfect of evidentiality.” For example, the examples in (12) all express a meaning akin to “I apparently/evidently arrived.”

(12)

*Turkish*

gel -miş -im  
come PERF 1SG

*Bulgarian*

Az sâm došâl  
I be-1sg,PRES come-P.PART

*Norwegian*

Jeg har kommet  
I have-1SG,PRES come-P.PART

‘I have come.’ (PRESENT PERFECT) and/or  
‘I apparently came.’ (PE)

(Ludlow 1999, 162)

The perils of borrowing arguments from a neighbouring discipline (Philosophy of time/linguistics). The start of a hoax. Izvorski > Ludlow

Ludlow suggests that there is no irreducible past tense and that what we call ‘past tense’ is an evidential, a semantic category discussed in the linguistics literature. The so-called past tense in fact serves to tell us about the kind of evidence we currently<sup>96</sup> have for our claims. For example, one morpheme might indicate that we have first-hand evidence, another morpheme that we have second-hand evidence (e.g., testimony of others) and the like. The root evidentials indicate whether the source [387] of evidence is experience or testimony, and there are more abstract evidentials that include aspectual markers (the so-called progressive, culminative, etc., aspectual markers). Thus, the Norwegian sentence ‘Jeg har kommet’ has the English meaning ‘I apparently/evidently arrived’.  
(Smith 2003, 386f.)

---

common in various Indo-European languages, from Sanskrit down to modern languages such as Persian, Armenian, English and Scandinavian. Generally, however, the indirective semantics is unstable and elusive, suggested by categories that have rather different central meanings. Thus, the indirective capacities of Scandinavian perfects are far more modest than sometimes stated in the literature (e.g. Haugen 1972)."

<sup>96</sup> Also observe “Gel -mis -im” instead of “Gel -miş -im”.

The perils of borrowing arguments from a neighbouring discipline (Philosophy of time/linguistics). The continuation of a hoax. Izvorski > Ludlow > Smith

It may seem odd that an element of the temporal/aspectual lexicon, the perfect, should have a modal aspect to its meaning. It turns out, however, that it is not uncommon for present perfects to have a kind of epistemic modal interpretation (Izvorski 1997). Examples are given in (25).

- (25) a. Gel -mis -im. Turkish  
b. Az sẫm dořâl. Bulgarian  
[7]  
c. Jeg har kommet. Norwegian  
“I have come” OR “I apparently came”  
(Katz 2003, 6f.)  
Incorrect. Cf. Izvorski 1997 above.

Izvorski (1997) observes that the present perfect in Turkish, Bulgarian and Norwegian expresses the evidential category of indirect evidence. She terms this phenomenon the perfect of evidentiality (PE).

- (66) a. Gel -miř -im. (Turkish)  
come PERF 1SG  
b. Azsẫm dořâl. (Bulgarian)  
I be-1SG.PRES come-P.PART  
c. Jeg har kommet (Norwegian)  
I have-1SG.PRES come-P.PART  
‘I have come/I apparently came’  
(Rooryck 2001, 166)  
Incorrect. Cf. Izvorski 1997 above.<sup>97</sup>

Inexact observations on Norwegian are not limited to syntax and semantics. In the introduction to their three volume work *Gender across languages*, Hellinger and Bussmann, for instance, mention a Turkish proverb, which they render as ‘Let the one who bears a son be proud, let the one who bears a daughter beat herself.’ continuing: “This is the message of numerous idiomatic expressions and proverbs from many languages of “Gender across languages”: Arabic, Chinese, Danish, Finnish, Italian, Norwegian, Russian, and Turkish.” (Hellinger and Bussmann 2001, 17.) As far as Norwegian is concerned, this is nonsense. No expert of Norwegian folklore (Reimund Kvideland, Brynjulf Alver, and Ann Helen Bolstad Skjelbred) nor linguistics (e.g. Tove Bull and Toril Swan, the Norwegian contributors to Hellinger and Bussmann’s work), has ever heard about anything remotely similar.

Of a less controversial nature are the numerous uncritical references to code-switching in Hennesberget, following Blom and Gumperz’ article from 1972 (Blom and Gumperz

---

<sup>97</sup> Bulgarian error: ” Azsẫm”. Correct: “Az sẫm”.

1972), e.g. Heller (1988, 6), Romaine (1994, 60f.), and Hudson (1996, 53) to mention a few, and Thiam (1997, 34), Swann (2000, 164), Milroy and Gordon (2003, 198), and Coulmas (2005, 110) to mention titles more recent than Mæhlum 1996. In the Norwegian linguistics' community, the latter is generally considered to represent the final words about the linguistic facts from Hemnesberget and their (mis)interpretation.

A sign of general confusion is found in

Type (5), the *s*-genitive, is found in English, Swedish, Danish and some other varieties of Norwegian.

(Norde 1998, 214)

“some other varieties of Norwegian”? Is Danish a variety of Norwegian? And what about Swedish and English?. If ‘and in some varieties of Norwegian’ is what the grammarian meant this is a conditioned truth: The Nynorsk written standard *norm* is negative, while *s*-genitive still is part of the repertoire of many Nynorsk users. With few exceptions, *s*-genitive can be found in all spoken dialects.

Finally, it is symptomatic that Nicol in his article on verb-particle constructions (Nicol 2002) includes a paragraph “Contrasts between English and the Scandinavian languages” where only examples from Swedish are analysed. Nothing is said about the complexity of this phenomenon in Scandinavian.

## Spurious references

### Informants

In the possessor-doubling construction (13a) from Norwegian (Nynorsk dialect),<sup>6</sup> the doubling element *sin* is a reflexive, hence anaphoric (it is opposed to pronominal *hans*; see Delsing 1998, Fiva 1984). We correctly predict that the Norwegian possessor-doubling construction is compatible with a reciprocal possessor (13b).

- (13) a. Per sin bil  
Per his car  
‘Per’s car’  
b. kvarandre sin bil  
each-other his car  
‘each other’s car’

(Haegeman 2004, 705)

<sup>6</sup> Thanks to Anna Britta Stenström for the judgment on Norwegian.

(Haegeman 2004, 705n)

The author is ill informed, cf. above. The reason is, apparently, that the author has relied on information provided by a Swedish professor of English living in

Norway. There exists an extensive literature on the subject that should have been consulted. Cf. Rosenbach 2002, 215f. below.

Martin Haspelmath (p.c.) points out that, in spoken Norwegian, the word *og* ‘and’ has [147] come to be used as an infinitival complementiser.

(Lefebvre 2004, 146f.)

Martin Haspelmath is hardly the optimal source/documentation of another much discussed phenomenon of Norwegian grammar.

14 Space prevents a full discussion of this phenomenon here, but I note that it is also found in some of the Scandinavian languages (thanks to P. Svenonius for the Norwegian and L. Mikkelsen for the Danish):

- (i) Per har gått på kino, men jeg vet ikke hvem med [Norwegian]  
Per er gået i biografen, men jeg ved ikke hvem med. [Danish]  
Per has/is gone to cinema but I know not who with  
‘Per went to the movies but I don’t know who with.’

(Merchant 2001, 64n)

Svenonius is not a native speaker of Norwegian - and an important contributor to the current inventory.

As pointed out in Sung (1990), the Mainland Scandinavian languages exhibit agreement in predicate adjective constructions:<sup>18</sup>

[xxxvii]

(46) Predicate Adjective Agreement

- a. *Gutten er stor.*  
the boy is big  
‘The boy is big.’  
b. *Huset er stort.*  
the house is big  
‘The house is big.’  
c. *Husene/Guttene er store.*  
‘The houses/boys are big.’

(Cole, Hermon, and Huang 2001, xxxvi-xxxvii)

<sup>18</sup>Example (77), from Norwegian, was provided to Li-May Sung by Arild Hestvik (personal communication).

(Cole, Hermon, and Huang 2001, xlv)

These examples are correct. The somewhat alarming part of this piece of documentation, however, is the strange detour made by the authors in order to state a very simple, basic, and well documented fact about Norwegian: A reference to Sung (1990), who reportedly was informed about the phenomenon by a linguist native speaker.<sup>98</sup> It has been impossible to get access to a copy of Sung 1990. (I

---

<sup>98</sup> Which takes one back to one of the classic jokes of generative semantics: “??? informs me that German has three genders.”

take it “Example (77)” does indeed refer to (46), given its position in the text and the fact that the paper does not contain any example (77).)

## Bibliographical references

### Correct references

(---) as shown in the Norwegian examples (22) and (23) based on Giusti (1994:252-3):

(22) [DP *mitt* [D e] [AgrP *store* [Agr e][NP *hus*]]]  
my big house  
“my big house”

(23) [DP [D *det*] [AgrP *store* [Agr *huset<sub>i</sub>*] [NP *mitt* [N *t<sub>i</sub>]]]]]  
the big house-THE my  
“my big house”*

(Willim 1999, 192)

Giusti (1994, 252f.) is hardly the best reference in order to document a simple, basic, and otherwise well documented fact about Norwegian, disregarding the formalities of notation.

However, there is frequently a snag of one sort or the other:

(---) I want to point out that incorporation structures are attested in Northern dialects of Norwegian and Swedish, as pointed out in Delsing (1993: 91) and Sandström & Holmberg (1994), from which the following examples have been taken, respectively.

(88) stor-en NO.SW.  
big-the  
‘the big one’

(89) nybiln NO.SW  
new-car-the  
‘the new car’

(Kester 1996, 154)

“NO.SW.” means ‘Northern Swedish’. On the other hand, Kester clearly states that the phenomenon in question is found in Norwegian as well, one implication being that both (88) and (89) correspond to rather similar Norwegian words. Taking a closer look, her interpretation of Delsing is distorted: “(---) most Norwegian and Swedish dialects have independently used adjectives with the definite suffix, exactly as in (59) [which corresponds to Kester’s (88).]” (Delsing 1993, 91.) Which does not mean that a Norwegian word “storen” is what Delsing has in mind.

Still, this footnote phenomenon of Norwegian is described in traditional Norwegian dialectology literature, e.g. Beito 1986, 223.

As far as the regional distribution is concerned, Kester’s statement is a conditioned truth and so is Delsing’s contention. The only dialect area where this

construction has any general use is the one of Trøndelag, i.e. of central Norway. Elsewhere, it is limited to certain niches, e.g. names of inhabitants and horses.

Jespersen (1960: 305), for example, [216] observes that possessive dative constructions are “extremely common in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish dialects”. Likewise, Koptjevskaja-Tamm (forthcoming) shows that Modern Norwegian does have a construction comparable to the English *his*-genitive, i.e. a reflexive pronoun bound to the possessor, as in:

- (92) Jan og Maria si-ne barn  
Jan and Maria refl.poss-pl children  
'Jan and Maria's children'

Maybe the fact that these constructions do occur in dialects or spoken language has so far been overlooked, and therefore their presence and influence on the process of turning a genitive inflection into a clitic in the Scandinavian languages has not been acknowledged yet and may well need to be rethought (---).

(Rosenbach 2002, 215f.)

Especially the reference to Koptjevskaja-Tamm is utterly strange, since the construction in question is a well documented and, in fact, much discussed topic in Norwegian linguistics literature. The final remarks display a remarkable lack of familiarity with the literature on Norwegian grammar - and a correspondingly misguided hypothesis.

(---) as shown by (181) for Norwegian (---) (Holmberg and Platzack 1995: 217-218):

- (181) a. *Jon ble gitt en bok*  
John was given a book  
'John was given a book'  
b. *En bok ble gitt Jon*  
A book was given John  
?\* 'A book was given John'

(Anagnostopoulou 2003, 124)

The examples are correct but peculiar (a content relating to everyday life expressed in officialese). One Finnish and one Swedish linguist are mentioned as informants.<sup>99</sup> The same example can also be found in Müller 1995b, 243. His source appears to be Larson 1988. However, (181) a. and b. are almost identical to (8) a. and b. of Hellan 1988b, 10.<sup>100</sup>

Bokmål Norwegian: *Jeg så ham ikke* 'I haven't seen him'; *Det er folk som ikke vil arbeide* 'There are people who do not want to work' (see Sommerfelt-Marm 1981:53ff.).

(Ramat 1987, 173)

---

<sup>99</sup> Norwegian linguists may be the origin of similar sentences, though. E.g. Åfarli (1992).

<sup>100</sup> Which, in fact, contains a reference to Larson 1988.

The second sentence is somewhat weird. “fins”/”finnes” would be better than “er”. (In fact, this seems to be what Sommerfelt and Marm communicate, at least in the 1967 impression of the book, which is the closest copy this author has managed to get hold of:

“Det er (fins) folk som ikke vil arbeide. There are people who will not work.”  
(Marm and Sommerfelt 1967, 55)

Ramat refers to a correct Norwegian sentence. In order to demonstrate the trustworthiness of this correct sentence, however, the author refers to Sommerfelt-Marm 1981. Now, this is the inexact reference in the first place, as we are talking about two individuals. “Sommerfelt-Marm” should be spelled out as ‘Sommerfelt and Marm’.<sup>101</sup> In the second place, it is a reference to a reprint of the otherwise *more or less* correct normative grammar of the *Teach yourself* series: Marm and Sommerfelt 1943. Hardly an appropriate source in a scientific context.<sup>102</sup>

Ramat is not the only linguist using Marm and Sommerfelt to document Norwegian, however. E.g. Harris and Campbell (Harris and Campbell 1995, 206f.) who refer to Marm and Sommerfelt 1967.

(---) the more or less colloquial varieties of Norwegian as well (“[...] the expression: *ikke noen*, [...] often replaces *ingen*, especially in colloquial speech”, Marm-Sommerfelt (1981: 131)).

(Bernini and Ramat 1996, 233n)

This is only a qualified truth. It probably even was a qualified truth more than 60 years ago, when Marm and Sommerfelt was first published (in exile). Cf. above.

*Norwegian* (Haga 1976). Norwegian, an SVO language, has a minor movement rule Haga names Light-Pronoun Shift. (---)

- (116) Winston utbedret visst skaden ved dognad  
Winston repaired “I think” the damage through volunteer work  
Winston repaired the damage through volunteer work
- (117) Winston utbedret den visst ved dognad  
Winston repaired it I think through volunteer work.  
Winston repaired it I think through volunteer work.

(Tomlin 1986, 65)

In this case, a common feature of Norwegian syntax – and indeed of every descriptive syntax of Norwegian – is “documented” by means of a reference to a peripheral American paper: Haga 1976. As for an additional idiomatic anomaly, cf. above.

---

<sup>101</sup> Wrong sequence, see below.

<sup>102</sup> Despite the fact that Sommerfelt, in particular, was a linguist of high esteem.. The book at hand is a popular handbook, first conceived during the World War, probably for world war use. Also, the kind of Norwegian reflected in it seems fairly antiquated to modern language users, an impression that persist even in its newer versions.

<sup>11</sup> Unless noted otherwise, the data and generalizations in this section and the next are taken from (---); Dalrymple (1993) (Marathi, Norwegian); (---).

(Büring 2005, 59n)

Not a particularly reliable source, given the quality of the Norwegian data, cf. Dalrymple 1993, 28/30/164f./165 etc.<sup>103</sup>

Falk (Falk 2001, 183) also refers to Dalrymple 1993. No example is given. Finally, Müller (Müller 1995a, 204 and Müller 1995b, 234) refers to Larson (Larson 1988, 356) as his source for Norwegian:

Similarly, IOs which have first undergone dative movement may then undergo A-bar movement in Danish (---), or in Norwegian (cf. Larson (1988: 356), (---).

(Müller 1995a, 204)

Also, A-bar movement of shifted IOs is permitted in Norwegian (Larson (1988:356)):

(Müller 1995b, 234)

Cf. one odd sentence and its accompanying translation from Larson (Larson 1988, 356) reproduced above. Linguistic and editorial sloppiness walks hand in hand when Müller (1995b, 337) writes:

Similar restrictions on embedded topicalization hold in most Germanic languages, such as Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian (cf., e.g., Platzack (1986), den Besten (1989) and Vikner (1990)).

(Müller 1995b, 337)

It is debatable whether these linguists have the proper insight to make them the natural sources for assertions on Norwegian. Vikner (1990) is, by the way, an unpublished doctoral thesis, not available at any Norwegian library. Vikner 1995 is based on Vikner 1990.

The same seems to hold in the more restrictive variant of Norwegian which normally prohibits A-movement of the DO in dative movement constructions (cf. Hestvik (1986), Fanselow (1991)):

(Müller 1995b, 417n)

Fanselow 1991 is hardly a primary source.

(---) there are Norwegian dialects which also use logophoric reflexives, though lacking a distinction between indicative and subjunctive mood in the verbal morphology (Aass 1979 (cited by Maling 1984), Moshagen and Trosterud 1990).

(Bresnan 2000, 264n)

In this case, one master's thesis (Aass 1979) is referred to as a matter of form, since its content is only known to the author via Maling 1984. This is a perfectly

---

<sup>103</sup> What about the Marathi examples?

honest way to declare one's sources - although a far from perfect editorial practice.

On the other hand, Tanaka's reference to Jonas 1996 as his source for Norwegian data (Tanaka 2000, 474) is justifiable, as Tanaka primarily intends to give an overview of recent research in the area. Less justifiable is Rizzi's reference to Engdahl 1985:

4. The necessity of a complete dissociation between subject and adjunct extraction is clearly indicated by the asymmetric behavior of extraction from a *wh* island in Norwegian, as was pointed out by Elisabet Engdahl.  
(Rizzi 1990, 125)

given that Engdahl is widely represented in the present inventory.

### Erroneous references

(---); but in subordinate clauses: *vi ar redd for at bussen ikke kommer* "we fear the bus will not come", (---).  
(Ramat 1987, 183)

A correct sentence per se (disregarding the spelling error). The informant is a native speaker of Swedish, Östen Dahl (Dahl 1979, 95).<sup>104</sup>

(8 c) Norwegian:  
Bordet<sub>i</sub> tok han en bok fra  
table-the take.Past he a book  
from  
hylla og [la på t<sub>i</sub>].  
shelf-the and put.Past on  
'The table, he took a book from the shelf and put (it) on'

(Déchaine 1993, 801)

Of Déchaine's alleged sources (cf. above), the only one that this author has not been able to search is den Dikken 1991. Hardly credible as a first-hand source for Norwegian anyway.

(---) (cf Corver 1990 for details).

- (8) b. Hvem<sub>i</sub> er det [t<sub>i</sub> sin tante]?  
who is it his aunt  
'Whose aunt is it?'  
c. Hvem<sub>i</sub> er det [t<sub>i</sub> sin bil]?  
who is it his car  
'Whose car is this?'  
d. Hvem<sub>i</sub> er han [t<sub>i</sub> sin bror]?

---

<sup>104</sup> Provided that Ramat's reference is correct. Cf. comment in above note.

who is he his brother  
'Whose brother is he?'

(---)

Corver (1990: 185) furthermore signals the contrast in (8g, h). (---)

(8) g. [Hvem sin tante]<sub>i</sub> er det [<sub>t</sub> sin katt]?  
who his aunt is that his cat  
'Whose aunt's cat is that?'

(---)

(Haegeman 2003, 225)

The two first sentences, (8) b. and c. are more or less acceptable. (Definitely not acceptable according to the rules of any normative grammar, however.) d. is simply ungrammatical, while g. is slightly unacceptable - and does indeed sound like a joke. Corver 1990 is mentioned as source. This is peculiar since it is impossible to get hold of Corver's thesis.<sup>105</sup> However, at least two of the examples mentioned above, originate from a Norwegian source:

(90) hvem er det sin tante?

(Taraldsen 1978a, 231)

(95) hvem sin tante er det sin katt?

(Taraldsen 1978a, 232)

The origin of (8) b. and g. respectively. It remains obscure what can be the origin of (8) c. and d. In the case of (8) c. this is immaterial, since it can be seen as a direct projection of (8) b., the only difference being a different noun, "bil", of a different gender. In the case of (8) d., however, the question of origin is all the more interesting.<sup>106</sup>

(---) Mainland Scandinavian has a construction involving the s-passive of the verb "find". In Danish it combines with the locative adverbial *der* "there" and in Swedish and Norwegian with the 3rd person neuter d-pronoun *det* "this". [96] Hopper (1998: 154) characterizes the Scandinavian s-passive as a morphological medio-passive (MP), where the reflexive pronoun *sik* became part of the verbal morphology. This medio-passive form is no longer productive, for regular passive formation a periphrastic passive form involving *blive* "become" is used. But it has survived in certain relics, including the existential construction.

(Cztinglar 2001, 95f)

Hopper 1998 is hardly the authoritative source for this central topic of Norwegian grammar.

The paragraph contains an erroneous assertion, cf. above. As for the validity of Hopper 1998:

(---) the Danish (and general Scandinavian) s-passive. Its origins were in a pre-Norse amalgamation of the reflexive pronoun *sik* with a verb, from where it went to the

<sup>105</sup> A strange fact in itself, given Haegeman's strict attitude towards internationally published references in other contexts. Cf. Haegeman 1994, 80.

<sup>106</sup> The topic of strange sentences of Norwegian origin will be dealt with elsewhere.

paradigmatization (Lehmann, 1985) of *sik* at the expense of the other pronouns, to its grammaticalization as a morphological medio-passive, and finally its replacement by a periphrastic passive with *blive* (=“become”, *werden*).

(Hopper 1998, 154)

Again, “replacement” is clearly an inexact description. Especially as it is contradicted by Hopper’s further descriptive analysis.<sup>107</sup>

The present account of the Norwegian binding system is based on Hellan (1980, 1988), Bresnan et al. (1983), and Dalrymple (1993). This account is somewhat “idealized” (Lødrup 1999a), by abstracting away from other factors that influence reflexive binding in Norwegian, such as thematic prominence (Hellan 1988, Dalrymple and Zaenen 1991, Dalrymple 1993).

(Bresnan 2000, 264n)

Despite their competence as theoretical linguists, neither Bresnan, Dalrymple, nor Zaenen can be considered appropriate sources as far as Norwegian is concerned. Additionally, Dalrymple and Zaenen 1991 is a relatively peripheral source in itself.<sup>108</sup>

Finally, the bibliographical reference is technically wrong in the following series of cases:

Lundeby, Einar (1965) *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske sprog*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

(Holmberg and Platzack 2005, 456)

“sprog” is incorrect.<sup>109</sup> The correct reference is

Lundeby, Einar: 1965, *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske språk*. (Scandinavian University Books) Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget

The appearance of “sprog” seems to indicate that the authors never saw the exhibit ... In Delsing’s case, however, “sprog” and not “språk” seems to be some sort of hypercorrection (i.e. in opposition to Swedish “språk”).

Lundeby, E: 1965. *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske sprog*. Trondheim. (Delsing 1993, 235)

Incorrect: “sprog” and “Trondheim”. Correct: “språk” and “Oslo”!

Delsing (1988), quoting Lundeby (1965), reports a whole series of languages different both from the typological and the genetic point of view, (---).

(Giusti 1995, 84)

---

<sup>107</sup> Lehmann 1985 is referred to for theoretical reasons. It contains no information about the Scandinavian medio-passive.

<sup>108</sup> To the extent that it for instance has been unavailable for the present author.

<sup>109</sup> Ironically, "sprog" is Danish and old-fashioned Dano-Norwegian, "Riksmål" (opposed by Lundeby), and substituted by "språk" in the 1938 reform of Bokmål.

In a way, Giusti's reference to Lundeby (via Delsing 1988) is better than just mentioning Delsing (1988). (Lundeby's work is a cornerstone of Norwegian grammar in this area.) Yet, the bibliographical reference provided by Giusti shows that Lundeby's monograph has not been consulted:

Lundeby, Einar: 1965, *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske sprog*, unpubl. diss., Trondheim.

(Giusti 1995, 93)

Incorrect: "sprog", "unpubl. diss.", and "Trondheim". Correct: "språk",<sup>110</sup> "(Scandinavian University Books), Universitetsforlaget"<sup>111</sup> and "Oslo".

## Inheritance

How did all the errors reported above come into being? In general, the deficient examples seem to be of the linguists' own invention. In some cases, however, the sources are mentioned. There are several kinds of sources. One is the general reference to informants: Native speakers of Norwegian are identified in an initial footnote of acknowledgement as the general source or members of a test panel.<sup>112</sup> Nothing is mentioned about the circumstances of the elicitation or test process itself, and it is not known whether the persons mentioned actually have recognised the examples as represented. In other cases, though, sources for particular deficient examples are explicitly given, both personal sources and published information. They will all be listed below.

For the cause of simplicity, everything not 100% correct is counted as a deficiency in the following overview, including erroneous and spurious references, wrong interpretations as well as oddities and straightforward errors of any kind, wrong characters and obvious typos. Not taken into consideration are incorrect or void references as well as imprecise references such as:

<sup>11</sup> Unless noted otherwise, the data and generalizations in this section and the next are taken from (---); Dalrymple (1993) (Marathi, Norwegian); (---). (Büding 2005, 59n)

## From published information, written by other foreigners

quoter

quoted

origin of the error

Auer 2005, 17

Widmark 2005

---

<sup>110</sup> What is extraordinary, is that in Delsing 1988, the correct form "språk" is used.

<sup>111</sup> The most important academic publisher in Norway in 1965.

<sup>112</sup> E.g. Maling and Zaenen (1982) extending thanks to Per Kristian Halvorsen, Lars Hellan, and Svein Lie. Cf. below.

- Cztinglar 2001, 95f  
Déchaine 1993, 801<sup>113</sup>  
Engels 2004, 275  
Fanselow 1991, 223 (1)  
Fanselow 1991, 223 (2)  
Fanselow 1991, 270  
Fanselow 1991, 271  
Fanselow 1991, 326n  
Fanselow 1991, 338n (1)  
Fanselow 1991, 338n (2)  
Fanselow 1991, 338n (3)  
Haegeman 2003, 225  
Haegeman 2004, 705  
Haider 1993, 643 (1)  
Haider 1993, 643 (2)  
Heine and Kuteva 2002, 104  
Kester 1996, 154  
Lobeck 1995, 60  
Mallen 1997, 71 (1)  
Mallen 1997, 71 (2)  
Merchant 2001, 68  
Müller 1995b, 243  
Müller 1995b, 337  
Müller 1995b, 417n  
Rosenbach 2002, 215f (1)  
Rosenbach 2002, 215f (2)  
Safir 1999, 588  
Watanabe 1996, 33f  
Willim 1999, 192  
Zeller 2001, 285  
Zeller 2002, 234
- Hopper 1998, 154  
den Dikken 1991?  
Svenonius 2002a, 223<sup>114</sup>  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 231  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 231  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 235  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 238  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 238  
Engdahl 1988a, 81  
Engdahl 1988a, 81  
Engdahl 1988a, 81  
Corver 1990, 185  
Delsing 1998  
Engdahl 1988b, 15  
Engdahl 1988b, 19  
Koptjevskaja-Tamm [2003, 660]  
Delsing 1993, 91  
Rizzi 1990, 57  
Svenonius 1993, 207/212f  
Svenonius 1993, 207/212f  
Lobeck 1995, 60  
Larson 1988, 356n  
Vikner 1990  
Fanselow 1991  
Jespersen [1960]  
Koptjevskaja-Tamm “forthcoming”  
Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, 201  
Platzack 1986, 218  
Giusti 1994, 252f  
Svenonius 1996a, 11  
Svenonius 1996a, 11
- Origin of the error
- Svenonius 1994, 3/8  
“Maling and Zaenen 1981”.  
Probably Maling and Zaenen 1982, 241  
Bernstein 1997, 90n  
Hopper 1998, 154  
Svenonius 2002a, 232  
Svenonius 2002a, 221  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 235
- Bobaljik 2002, 236  
Borsley 1993, 578
- Cheng and Sybesma 1999, 539  
Cztinglar 2001, 95f  
Engels 2004, 146n  
Ernst 2002, 434  
Fanselow 1991, 270

---

<sup>113</sup> Probably Déchaine’s error.

<sup>114</sup> No source given, but the example clearly has Svenonius 2002, 223 as its origin.

- Fanselow 1991, 333n (1)  
Fanselow 1991, 333n (2)  
Fanselow 1991, 338n  
Fanselow 1991, 326n  
Haider 2005, 35  
Holmberg and Platzack 2005, 427  
Hyams 2002, 261  
Katz 2003, 6f  
Kester 1996, 146n  
König and Haspelmath 1998, 576  
Lidz 1996, 122  
Ludlow 1999, 162  
Müller 1995b, 234  
Rooryck 2001, 166  
Safir 2004, 135  
Smith 2003, 386f  
Smith 2004, 585  
Toivonen 2003, 20  
Tomlin 1986, 65  
Ura 2000, 236  
Vikner 1995, 60  
Watanabe 1996, 33f  
Zeller 2001, 288f
- Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249  
Engdahl 1988a, 81  
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 236  
Holmberg and Platzack 1995, 172  
Svenonius 1996  
Izvorski 1997  
Izvorski 1997  
Svenonius 1993, 208n  
Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992, 622n<sup>115</sup>  
Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666  
Izvorski 1997  
Larson 1998, 356  
Izvorski 1997  
Lidz 1996, 118  
Ludlow 1999  
Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666  
Svenonius 1994, 3/8  
Haga 1976<sup>116</sup>  
Holmberg and Platzack 1995, 172  
Engdahl “1984, 12”. I.e. 1985, 13  
Platzack 1986, 218  
Svenonius 1996, 20 and 22

Uncertain origin of error

- Rizzi 1990, 125                      Engdahl (unknown title)

As for the references to linguistics literature, most of them are to the works of other foreign linguists. They are, in general, linguists of a theoretical rather than descriptive orientation.

### From “personal communication” with other foreign linguists

quoter

quoted

origin of the error

- |                                    |                       |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Cole, Hermon, and Huang 2001, xliv | Li-May Sung           |
| Haegeman 2004, 705                 | Anna Britta Stenström |
| Lefebvre 2004, 146f                | Martin Haspelmath     |
| Merchant 2000,1                    | Peter Svenonius       |

<sup>115</sup> There is a slight possibility that the error has Lars Johnsen (personal communication) as its origin.

<sup>116</sup> It has not been possible to verify the identity of this linguist. Thus, despite the Norwegian name, (s)he is liable to be an American.

Toyoshima 2001, 123f	Anders Holmberg
	origin of the error
Lefebvre 2004, 146f	Martin Haspelmath
Merchant 2000,1	Peter Svenonius
Merchant 2001, 64n	Peter Svenonius
Merchant 2002, 296	Peter Svenonius

In such cases, however, it is difficult, if not impossible, to detect the precise point where the error originated.

### **From published information written by Norwegians**

There are also various references to the works of Norwegian linguists, which in the present context implies that the quoter is the origin of the error or at least shows a certain lack of judgement in the choice of source, e.g. Bernini and Ramat 1996.

quoter	quoted
origin of the error	
Bejar and Massam 1999, 67	Taraldsen 1981, 378
Bergeton 2004, 254	Lødrup 1999, 367
Bergeton 2004, 300	Faarlund et al 1997,
Bernini and Ramat 1996, 233n	Marm and Sommerfelt 1943 [1981]
Bhatt 2002, 82	Åfarli 1994, 89
Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, 55	Vangsnes 1995, 91
Dalrymple 1993, 165	Hellan 1988a, 217
Déchaîne and Manfredi 1994, 245)	Hellan 1988, 104
Den Dikken and Næss 1993, 327	Askedal 1986, 31
Gavruseva 2000, 761	Taraldsen 1990, 419
Haider 1997, 18n	Åfarli 1985, 89
Haider 2000, 46	Taraldsen 1979
Harris and Campbell 1995, 206f	Marm and Sommerfelt 1943 [1967]
Hoekstra 1990, 213	Askedal 1986 ?
Hoekstra and Mulder 1990, 49	Askedal 1986, 31
Huang 2000, 20	Hellan 1988a, 104
Huang 2000, 20	Hellan 1991, 33
Ingham 2000, 15	Christensen 1991, 149
Jonas 1996, 105	Christensen and Taraldsen 1981, 72
Lazard 2001/1994, 236	Faarlund unpubl.
Lidz 1996, 135 (1)	Hellan 1988a, 113f
Lidz 1996, 135 (2)	Hellan 1988a, 113f

Lidz 1996, 137 (1)	Hellan 1988a, 113f
Lidz 1996, 137 (2)	Hellan 1988a, 231
Müller 1995b, 243	Christensen 1982
Newmeyer 1998, 267	Fiva 1984, 41
Ogawa 2001, 87 (1)	Taraldsen 1978b, 633f
Ogawa 2001, 87 (2)	Taraldsen 1978b, 634
Platzack 2002, 80	Faarlund et al 1997, 1056
Ramat 1987, 173	Marm and Sommerfelt 1943 [1981]
Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666	Hellan 1988a, 108
Roberts 1993, 265	Trosterud 1989
Sabel 1996, 85n	Christensen and Taraldsen 1989, 72f
Thráinsson 2001, 199	Nilsen 2000 (“1997”)
Van Gelderen 1997, 191	Christensen and Taraldsen 1989, 72

### From “personal communication” with Norwegian linguists

Norwegian linguists expressly mentioned as oral sources - “personal communication”:<sup>117</sup>

quoter	quoted
origin of the error	
Bernstein 1997, 90	Øystein Vangsnes
Cardinaletti 1997, 525	Knut Tarald Taraldsen
Cormack 1999, 60	Tor Åfarli
Craenenbroeck 2004, 113	Øystein Nilsen
Koopman 1999, 119	Arild Hestvik
Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000, 230n	Øystein Nilsen
Larson 1988, 356	Arild Hestvik
Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249	Knut Tarald Taraldsen
Richards 1997, 183	Arild Hestvik
Richards 2001, 77	Øystein Vangsnes
Safir 2004, 132	Arild Hestvik
Li-May Sung	Arild Hestvik
Svenonius 1993, 208n	Arild Hestvik

The majority of the Norwegian linguists quoted (both written sources and personal communication) must be classified as theoretical (Christensen, Fiva, Hellan, Hestvik, Johnsen, Lødrup, Nilsen, Sommerfelt, Taraldsen, Trosterud, Vangsnes, and Åfarli). Only Askedal, Faarlund, and Marm can, with a certain reservation, be considered descriptive linguists.

---

<sup>117</sup> As already mentioned, those ritually thanked in footnotes of acknowledgement have not been included in this list.

**“Transitive” inheritance**

In quite a few cases, it is possible to trace how deficient linguistic data are passed from one linguist to another. In most of them, the ultimate source is a Norwegian linguist:

Quoter	quoted/quoter	quoted
origin of the error		
Cole, Hermon and Huang 2001, xliv Müller 1995b, 243 Safir 1999, 588	Li-May Sung PC Larson 1988, 356 Giorgi and Longobardi 1991, 201	Hestvik PC Hestvik PC Taraldsen “talk”
origin of the error (1)		
Merchant 2001, 68	Lobeck 1995	Rizzi 1990,57
origin of the error		
Kester 1996, 146n Lidz 1996, 122 Smith 2004, 585 Cheng and Sybesma 1999, 539 Fanselow 1991, 333n	Svenonius 1993, 208n Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666 Reinhart and Reuland 1993, 666 Bernstein 1997, 90 Maling and Zaenen 1982, 249	Hestvik PC Hellan 1988a, 108 Hellan 1988a, 108 Vangsnes PC Taraldsen PC
origin of the error		
Smith 2003, 386f	Ludlow 1999	Izvorski 1997, 1

## References (reviewed titles with defects)

- Ackema, Peter and Ad Neeleman: 2002, "Syntactic atomicity". *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics*. 6, 93-128
- Ackema, Peter and Ad Neeleman: 2004, *Beyond morphology. Interface conditions on word formation*. (Oxford studies in theoretical linguistics 6) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Alexiadou, Artemis and Gisbert Fanselow: 2002, "On the correlation between morphology and syntax". In Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter and Werner Abraham (eds.): 2002, *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax. Proceedings from the 15th workshop on comparative Germanic syntax*. (Linguistik Aktuell 53) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 219-242
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena: 2003, *The syntax of ditransitives. Evidence from clitics*. (Studies in generative grammar 54) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter
- Auer, Peter: 2005, "Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/standard constellations". In Delbecq, Nicole, Johan van der Auwera, and Dirk Geeraerts (eds.): 2005, *Perspectives on variation. Sociolinguistic, historical, comparative*. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 163) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 7-42
- Avram, Larisa: 1987, "The Romanian *prezent* and the Norwegian *presens*. A semantic description". *Revue roumaine de linguistique. Numéro spécial publié à l'occasion du XIVe congrès international des linguistes. Berlin, du 10 au 15 Août 1987*. 32/3, 207-212
- Bejar, Susana and Diane Massam: 1999, "Multiple case checking". *Syntax* 2/2, 65-79
- Bergeton, Uffe: 2004, *The independence of binding and intensification I*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California. [Quotations from <http://www-scf.usc.edu/~bergeton/dissertation.htm>. (21 December 2005)]
- Bernini, Giuliano and Paolo Ramat: 1996, *Negative sentences in the languages of Europe*. (Empirical approaches to language typology 16) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter
- Bernstein, Judy B.: 1997, "Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages". *Lingua* 102, 87-113
- Bhatt, Rajesh: 2002, "The raising analysis of relative clauses: Evidence from adjectival modification". *Natural language semantics* 10, 43-90
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David: 2002, "A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and 'covert' movement". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 20, 197-267
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David and Höskuldur Thráinsson [Þráinsson]: 1998, "Two heads aren't always better than one". *Syntax* 11/1, 37-71

- Borsley, Robert D.: 1993, "Syntax in generative grammar". In Jacobs, Joachim, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann (eds.): *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. (Handbücher der Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 9.1/1)* Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter 570-581
- Brandner, Ellen: 1993, "The projection of categories and the nature of agreement". In Fanselow, Gisbert (ed): 1993, *The parametrization of universal grammar. (Linguistik Aktuell 8)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 73-121
- Bresnan, Joan: 2000, *Lexical-functional syntax. (Blackwell textbooks in linguistics 16)* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell
- Brugè, Laura: 2002, "The positions of demonstratives in the extended nominal projection". In Cinque, Guglielmo (ed.): 2002, *Functional structure in DP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures, volume 1. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press 15-53
- Büring, Daniel: 2005, *Binding theory. (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics)* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Cardinaletti, Anna: 1997, "Agreement and control in expletive constructions". *Linguistic inquiry* 28/3, 521-533
- Carlson, Greg N.: 1983, "Marking constituents". In Heny, Frank and Barry Richards (eds.): 1983, *Linguistic categories: Auxiliaries and related puzzles. I Categories. (Synthese language library 19)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel 69-98
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen and Rint Sybesma: 1999, "Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP". *Linguistic inquiry* 30/4, 509-542
- Cinque, Guglielmo: 1999, *Adverbs and functional heads. A cross-linguistic perspective. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and C.-T. James Huang: 2001, "Introduction. Long-distance reflexives: The state of the art". In Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and C.-T. James Huang (eds.): 2001, *Long-distance reflexives. (Syntax and semantics 33)* New York, NY: Academic Press xiii-xlv
- Coulmas, Florian: 2005, *Sociolinguistics. The study of speaker's choices.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university press
- Corazza, Eros: 2004, "Essential indexical and quasi-indicators". *Journal of semantics* 21, 341-374
- Cormack, Annabel: 1999, "Without specifiers". In Adger, David, Susan Pintzuk, Bernadette Plunkett, and George Tsoulas (eds.): 1999, *Specifiers. Minimalist approaches.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press 46-68
- Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van: 2004, *Ellipsis in Dutch dialects.* [Doctoral dissertation, Universiteit Leiden] (*LOT dissertation series 96*) Utrecht, The Netherlands: Igitur
- Cztinglar, Christine: 2001, "Decomposing existence. Evidence from Germanic". In Abraham, Werner and Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter (eds.): 2001, *Issues in formal*

- German(ic) typology*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 45) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 95-126
- Dahl, Östen: 2004, "Definite articles in Scandinavian: Competing grammaticalization processes in standard and non-standard varieties". In Kortmann, Bernd (ed.): 2004, *Dialectology meets typology. Dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective*. (*Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs* 153) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 147-180
- Dalrymple, Mary: 1993, *The syntax of anaphoric binding*. (*CSLI lecture notes* 36) Stanford, Cal: Center for the study of language and information
- Déchaïne, Rose-Marie: 1993, "Serial verb constructions" In Jacobs, Joachim, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann (eds.): *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. (*Handbücher der Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 9.1/1) Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter 799-825
- Déchaïne, Rose-Marie and Victor Manfredi: 1994, "Binding domains in Haitian" *Natural language and linguistic theory* 12/203-257
- Delsing, Lars-Olof: 1993, *The internal structure of noun phrases in the Scandinavian languages. A comparative study*. [Doctoral dissertation, Lunds universitet] Lund, Sweden: Institutionen för nordiska språk
- Delsing, Lars-Olof: 1998, "Possession in Germanic". In Alexiadou, Artemis and Chris Wilder (eds.): *Possessors, predicates and movement in the determiner phrase*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 22) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 87-108
- Deprez, Viviane: 1994, "Parameters of object movement". In Corver, Norbert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.): 1994, *Studies on scrambling. Movement and non-movement approaches to free word-order phenomena*. (*Studies in generative grammar* 41) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 101-152
- den Dikken, Marcel: 1995, *Particles. On the syntax of verb-particle, triadic, and causative constructions*. (*Oxford studies in comparative syntax*) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- den Dikken, Marcel and Alma Næss: 1993, "Case dependencies. The case of predicate inversion". *The linguistic review* 10, 303-336
- Dik, Simon C.: 1980, *Studies in functional grammar*. London, UK: Academic Press
- Engdahl, Elisabet: 1985, "Parasitic gaps, resumptive pronouns, and subject extractions". *Linguistics* 23, 3-44
- Engdahl, Elisabet: 1986, *Constituent questions. The syntax and semantics of questions with special reference to Swedish*. (*Studies in linguistics and philosophy* 27) Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel
- Engdahl, Elisabet: 1988 [1988a], "Interpreting questions". In Dowty, David R., Lauri Karttunen, and Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.): 1988, *Natural language parsing*. (*Studies in natural language processing*). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 67-93

- Engels, Eva: 2004, *Adverb Placement. An Optimality Theoretic Approach*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Humanwissenschaftliche Fakultät, Universität Potsdam, Germany. [Electronic version quoted: <http://opus.kobv.de/ubp/volltexte/2005/245/pdf/engels.pdf> (25 May 2006)]
- Ernst, Thomas: 2002, *The syntax of adjuncts*. (*Cambridge studies in linguistics* 96). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Everaert, Martin: 1986, *The syntax of reflexivization*. (*Publications in language sciences* 22) Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris
- Falk, Yehuda N.: 2001, *Lexical-functional grammar. An introduction to parallel constraint-based syntax*. (*CSLI lecture notes* 126) Stanford, Cal: CSLI publications
- Fanselow, Gisbert: 1991, *Minimale Syntax*. (*Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 32). Groningen, The Netherlands: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Germanistisch Instituut
- Feuillet, Jack: 1998, "Typologie de <être> et phrases essives". In Feuillet, Jack (ed.): 1998, *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*. (*Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-2*) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 663-751
- Gavruseva, Elena: 2000, "On the syntax of possessor extraction". *Lingua* 110, 743-772
- van Gelderen, Véronique: 1997, "Universals and minimalist features. Checking in Agr<sup>0</sup>". In Alexiadou, Artemis and T. Alan Hall (eds.): *Studies on universal grammar and typological variation*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 13) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 181-196
- van Gelderen, Véronique: 2003, *Scrambling unscrambled*. [Doctoral dissertation, Universiteit Leiden] (*LOT dissertation series* 83) Utrecht, The Netherlands: LOT
- Giorgi, Alessandra and Giuseppe Longobardi: 1991, *The syntax of noun phrases. Configuration, parameters and empty categories*. (*Cambridge studies in linguistics*) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Giusti, Francesca Fici: 1998, "Diathèse et voix marquée dans les langues d'Europe". In Feuillet, Jack (ed.): 1998, *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*. (*Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-2*). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 347-389
- Giusti, Giuliana: 1990 [1990a], "Floating quantifiers in Germanic". In Mascaró, Joan and Marina Nespó (eds.): 1990, *Grammar in progress: GLOW essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*. (*Studies in generative grammar* 36) Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris 137-146
- Giusti, Giuliana: 1990 [1990b], "Floating quantifiers, scrambling, and configurationality". *Linguistic Inquiry* 21/4, 633-641
- Giusti, Giuliana: 1994, "Enclitic articles and double definiteness: a comparative analysis of nominal structure in Romance and Germanic". *The linguistic review* 11, 241-255

- Giusti, Giuliana: 1995, "A unified structural representation of (abstract) case and article. Evidence from Germanic". In Haider, Hubert, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.): 1995, *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 31)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 77-93
- Guéron, J.: 1990, "Particles, prepositions, and verbs". In Mascaró, Joan and Marina Nespors (eds.): 1990, *Grammar in progress: GLOW essays for Henk van Riemsdijk. (Studies in generative grammar 36)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris 153-166
- Haerberli, Eric: 2002, *Features, categories and the syntax of A-positions. Cross-linguistic variation in the Germanic languages. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 54)*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer
- Haegeman, Liliane: 2003, "The external possessor construction in West Flemish". In Coene, Martine and Yves D'hulst (eds.): 2003, *From NP to DP. 2 The expression of possession in noun phrases (Linguistik Aktuell 56)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 221-256
- Haegeman, Liliane: 2004, "A DP-internal anaphor agreement effect". *Linguistic inquiry* 35/4, 704-712
- Haider, Hubert: 1993, "'Markiertheit" in der Generativen Grammatik". In Jacobs, Joachim, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann (eds.): *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. (Handbücher der Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 9.1/1)* Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter 635-645
- Haider, Hubert: 1997, "Precedence among predicates". *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics* 1/1, 3-41
- Haider, Hubert: 2000, "The license to license: Licensing of structural case plus economy yields Burzio's generalization". In Reuland, Eric (ed.): *Arguments and case. Explaining Burzio's generalization. (Linguistik Aktuell 34)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 31-55
- Haider, Hubert: 2005, "How to turn German into Icelandic - and derive the OV-VO contrasts." *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics* 8, 1-53
- Harbert, Wayne: 1995, "Binding theory, control and *pro*". In Webelhuth, Gert (ed.): 1995, *Government and binding theory and the minimalist program. Principles and parameters in syntactic theory. (Generative syntax 1)* Oxford, UK: Blackwell 177-240
- Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell: 1995, *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective. (Cambridge studies in linguistics 74)* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Haspelmath, Martin and Oda Buchholz: 1998, "Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe". In van der Auwera, Johan and Dónall P.Ó Baoill (eds.): *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-3)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 277-334
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva: 2002, *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

- Heller, Monica: 1988, "Introduction". In Heller, Monica: 1988, *Codeswitching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives. (Contributions to the sociology of language 48)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 1-24
- Hellinger, Marlis and Hadumod Bussmann (eds.): 2001-, *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men. (Impact. Studies in language and society 9-11)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Hendrick, Randall: 1995, "Morphosyntax". In Webelhuth, Gert (ed.): 1995, *Government and binding theory and the minimalist program. Principles and parameters in syntactic theory. (Generative syntax 1)* Oxford, UK: Blackwell 297-347
- Hoekstra, Teun: 1990, "Agreement and variables". In In Mascaró, Joan and Marina Nespor (eds.): 1990, *Grammar in progress: GLOW essays for Henk van Riemsdijk. (Studies in generative grammar 36)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris 211-220
- Hoekstra, Teun: 1995, "To have to be dative". In Haider, Hubert, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.): 1995, *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 31)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 119-137
- Hoekstra, Teun and Jacqueline Guéron: 2004, "T-chains and auxiliaries". In Sybesma, Rint, Sjef Barbiers, Marcel den Dikken, Jenny Doetjes, Gertjan Postma, and Guido vanden Wyngaerd (eds.): 2004, *Teun Hoekstra. Arguments and structure. Studies on the architecture of the sentence. (Studies in generative grammar 67)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 145-178
- Hoekstra, Teun and René Mulder: 1990, "Unergatives as copular verbs; locational and existential predication". *The linguistic review 7*, 1-79
- Holmberg, Anders: 1986, *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stockholms universitet. Stockholm, Sweden
- Holmberg, Anders: 1998, "Word order variation in some European SVO languages: a parametric approach". In Siewierska, Anna (ed.): *Constituent order in the languages of Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology, EURO TYP 20-1)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 553-598
- Holmberg, Anders: 1999, "Remarks on Holmberg's generalization". *Studia Linguistica 53*, 1-39
- Holmberg, Anders: 2002, "Expletives and agreement in Scandinavian passives". *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics 4*, 85-128
- Holmberg, Anders: 2005 [2005a], "Linearization in two ways". *Theoretical linguistics 31*, 1/2, 147-157
- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack: 1995, *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)* New York, NY: Oxford University Press

- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack: 2005, "The Scandinavian languages". In Cinque, Guglielmo and Richard S. Kayne (eds.): *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press 420-458
- Holmberg, Anders and Görel Sandström: 1996, "Scandinavian possessive constructions from a Northern Swedish viewpoint". In Black, James R. and Virginia Motapanyane (eds.): *Microparametric syntax and dialect variation. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV, Current issues in linguistic theory)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 95-120
- Holmberg, Anders and Jan Rijkhoff: 1998, "Word order in the Germanic languages". In Siewierska, Anna (ed.): *Constituent order in the languages of Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology, EURO-TYP 20-1)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 75-104
- Hopper, Paul: 1998, "The paradigm at the end of the universe". In Ramat, Anna G. and Paul Hopper (eds.): 1998, *The limits of grammaticalization. (Typological studies in language 37)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 147-158
- Hróarsdóttir, Þorbjörg: 2000, "Interacting movements in the history of Icelandic". In Pintzuk, Susan, George Tsoulas, and Anthony Warner (eds.): 2000, *Diachronic syntax. Models and mechanisms. (Oxford linguistics)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press 296-321
- Huang, Yan: 2000, *Anaphora. A cross-linguistic approach. (Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Hudson, Richard A.: 1996, *Sociolinguistics. (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics)* [second edition] Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university press
- Hyams, Nina: 2002, "Clausal structure in child Greek: a reply to Varlokosta, Vainikka and Rohrbacher and a reanalysis". *The linguistic review* 19, 225-269
- Ingham, Richard: 2000, "Negation and OV order in Late Middle English". *Journal of linguistics* 13-38
- Izvorski, Roumyana: 1997, "The present perfect as an epistemic modal". In Lawson, Aaron (ed.): *Conference on semantics and linguistic theory. [SALT VII. Proceedings from semantics and linguistics theory VII. Stanford University, April 21-23, 1997.]* Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University 222-239 [Electronic version quoted: <http://www-rcf.usc.edu/~pancheva/evidentialperfect.pdf> (22 September 2005)]
- Jonas, Dianne Elizabeth: 1996, *Clause structure and verbal syntax in Scandinavian and English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass. [Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, (58:2) 1997 Aug, 438. Harvard U, 1997. UMI microform 9721673 . (1997)]
- Katz, Graham: 2003, "A modal account of the English present perfect puzzle". In Young, Robert B. and Yuping Zhou (eds.): *Conference on semantics and linguistic theory. [SALT XIII. Proceedings from semantics and linguistic theory XIII]* Ithaca, NY:

- Cornell University [Quoted from <http://www.cogsci.uni-osnabrueck.de/~gkatz/Papers/SaltXIII.pdf> (21 August 2006)]
- Kemmer, Suzanne: 1993, *The middle voice. (Typological studies in language (TSL) 23)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Kester, Ellen-Petra: 1996, *The nature of adjectival inflection. (OTS dissertation series)* [Onderzoeksinstituut voor Taal en Spraak, Universiteit Utrecht] Utrecht, The Netherlands: LEd
- Kilarski, Marcin and Grzegorz Krynicki: 2005, "Not arbitrary, not regular: The magic of gender assignment". In Delbecq, Nicole, Johan van der Auwera, and Dirk Geeraerts (eds.): 2005, *Perspectives on variation. Sociolinguistic, historical, comparative. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 163)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 234-250
- König, Ekkehard and Martin Haspelmath: 1998, "Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe". In Feuillet, Jack (ed.): 1998, *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-2).* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 525-606
- Koopman, Hilda: 1999, "The internal and external distribution of pronominal DPs". In Johnson, Kyle and Ian Roberts (eds.): 1999, *Beyond principles and parameters. Essays in memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli. (Studies in Natural language and linguistic theory 45)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 91-132
- Koopman, Hilda: 2000, "Internal and external distribution". In *The syntax of specifiers and heads. Collected essays of Hilda J. Koopman. (Routledge leading linguists 3)* London, UK: Routledge 91-132
- Koopman, Hilda and Anna Szabolcsi: 2000, *Verbal complexes. (Current studies in linguistics series 34)* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria: 2003, "Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe". In Plank, Frans (ed.): 2003, *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-7)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 621-722
- Kuteva, Tania A.: 1999, "On 'sit'/'stand'/'lie' auxiliations". *Linguistics* 37/2, 191-213
- Larson, Richard K.: 1988, "On the double object construction". *Linguistic inquiry* 19/3, 335-391
- Larson, Martha Anne: 2005, *The empty object construction and related phenomena.* Unpublished doctoral thesis. Faculty of the Graduate School, Cornell University NY. [available at [http://greece.imk.fhg.de/publications/Larson2005\\_EOC\\_diss.pdf](http://greece.imk.fhg.de/publications/Larson2005_EOC_diss.pdf) (9 June 2006)]
- Lazard, Gilbert: 2001 [1994], "L'actant H: sujet ou objet?". In Lazard, Gilbert: 2001, *Études de linguistique générale. Typologie grammaticale.* Paris, France: Peeters 219-242. [Printed the first time in *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris* 89/1, 1-28. Quoted after the reprinted version]

- Lefebvre, Claire: 2004, "Coordinating constructions in Fongbe with reference to Haitian creole". In Haspelmath, Martin: 2004, *Coordinating constructions. (Typological studies in language 58)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 123–164
- Lenerz, Jürgen: 1985, "Zur Theorie syntaktischen Wandels: das expletive *es* in der Geschichte des Deutschen". In Abraham, Werner (ed.): *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen. (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 25)* Tübingen, Germany: Narr 99-136
- Lidz, Jeffrey L.: 1996, *Dimensions of reflexivity*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Delaware. [Electronic version quoted: [http://www.ling.udel.edu/dissertations/lidz\_96.pdf (8 September 2005)]<sup>118</sup>
- Lobeck, Anne: 1995, *Ellipsis. Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Ludlow, Peter: 1999, *Semantics, tense, and time. An essay in the metaphysics of natural language. ("A Bradford book")* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Maling, Joan: 1978a, "The complementizer in Middle English appositives." *Linguistic inquiry* 9/1, 719-725
- Maling, Joan: 1978b, "An asymmetry with respect to wh-islands." *Linguistic inquiry* 9/4, 75-89
- Maling, Joan: 1983, "Transitive adjectives: A case of categorial reanalysis". In Heny, Frank and Barry Richards (eds.): 1983, *Linguistic categories: Auxiliaries and related puzzles. I Categories. (Synthese language library 19)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel 253-289
- Maling, Joan: 2001, "Dative: The heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case, grammatical functions, and thematic roles." *Lingua* 11, 419-464
- Maling, Joan and Rex A. Sprouse: 1995, "Structural case, specifier-head relations, and the case of predicate NPs". In Haider, Hubert, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.): 1995, *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 31)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 167-186
- Maling, Joan and Annie Zaenen: 1982, "A phrase structure account of Scandinavian extraction phenomena". In Jacobson, Pauline and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.): *The nature of syntactic representation. (Synthese language library 15)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel 229-282
- Mallen, Enrique: 1997, "A minimalist approach to concord in noun phrases". *Theoretical linguistics* 23, 49-77
- Merchant, Jason: 2000, "On the behavior of PPs under sluicing in Germanic" The 15th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax (May 26-27, 2000, University of Groningen, The Netherlands. [http://odur.let.rug.nl/~zwart/cgsw/abstracts/merchant.pdf. (23 April 2005.)]

---

<sup>118</sup> As off May 2006, this much quoted dissertation appears to be no longer available in its electronic version however.

- Merchant, Jason: 2001, *The syntax of silence. Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. (*Oxford studies in theoretical linguistics* 1) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Merchant, Jason: 2002, "Swiping in Germanic". In Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter and Werner Abraham (eds.): 2002, *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax. Proceedings from the 15th workshop on comparative Germanic syntax*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 53) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 289-315
- Milroy, Lesley and Matthew Gordon: 2003, *Sociolinguistics. Method and interpretation*. (*Language and society* 34) Oxford, UK: Blackwell
- Müller, Gereon: 1995 [1995a], "Crossover effects, chain formation, and unambiguous binding". In Haider, Hubert, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.): 1995, *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*. (*Studies in natural language and linguistic theory* 31) Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 187-218
- Müller, Gereon: 1995 [1995b], *A-bar syntax. A study in movement type*. (*Studies in generative grammar* 42) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter
- Newman, John: 1996, *Give. A cognitive linguistic study*. (*Cognitive linguistics research* 7) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter
- Newmeyer, Frederick J.: 1998, *Language form and language function*. (*Language speech, and communication*) ("A Bradford book") Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Nicol, Fabrice: 2002, "Extended VP-shells and the verb-particle construction". In Dehé, Nicole, Ray Jackendoff, Andrew McIntyre, and Silke Urban (eds.): *Verb particle explorations*. (*Interface explorations* 1) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 165-190
- Norde, Muriel: 1998, "Grammaticalization versus reanalysis. The case of possessive constructions in Germanic". In Hogg, Richard M. and Linda van Bergen (eds.): *Historical linguistics 1995. Selected papers from the 12<sup>th</sup> international conference on historical linguistics, Manchester, August 1995* 2, *Germanic linguistics*. (*Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science*. Series IV, *Current issues in linguistic theory*) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 211-222
- Ogawa, Yoshiki: 2001, *A unified theory of verbal and nominal projections*. (*Oxford studies in comparative syntax*) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Pérez-Leroux, Ana T. and Thomas Roeper: 1999, "Scope and the structure of bare nominals: Evidence from child language". *Linguistics* 37/5, 927-969
- Perrot, Jean: 1998, "Visée communicative". In Feuillet, Jack (ed.): 1998, *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*. (*Empirical approaches to language typology*. EURO-TYP 20-2). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 607-661
- Pesetsky, David: 1982, "Complementizer - trace phenomena and the nominative island condition". *The linguistic review* 1, 297-343

- Plank, Frans: 2003, "Double articulation". In Plank, Frans (ed.): 2003, *Noun phrase structure in the languages of Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-7)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 337-395
- Platzack, Christer: 1986, "COMP, INFL, and Germanic word order". In Hellan, Lars and Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.): 1986, *Topics in Scandinavian syntax. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel 185-234
- Platzack, Christer: 2000, "A complement-of-N<sup>0</sup> account of restrictive and non-restrictive relatives: The case of Swedish". In Alexiadou, Artemis, Paul Law, André Meinunger, and Chris Wilder (eds.): 2000, *The syntax of relative clauses. (Linguistik Aktuell 32)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 265-308
- Platzack, Christer: 2002, "Relativization in the Germanic Languages, with Particular Emphasis on Scandinavian". In Poussa, Patricia (ed.): 2002, *Relativisation on the North Sea littoral. (LINCOS studies in language typology 7)* München, Germany: LINCOS 77-96
- Platzack, Christer and Inger Rosengren: 1997, "On the subject of imperatives. A minimalist account of the imperative clause". *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics* 1/3, 177-224
- Polikarpov, Anatoliy A.: "Some factors and regularities of analytic/synthetic development of language system". Paper presented at the workshop on language typology within the XIII International Conference on Historical Linguistics, 10 - 17 August 1997, Heinrich-Heine-Universität. Düsseldorf, Germany [Unpublished. Available at [http://www.philol.msu.ru/~lex/articles/fact\\_reg.htm](http://www.philol.msu.ru/~lex/articles/fact_reg.htm) (6 May 2006)]
- Ramat, Paolo: 1987, *Linguistic typology. (Empirical approaches to language typology 1)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter
- Reuland, Eric and Wim Kosmeijer: 1993, "Projecting inflecting verbs". In Fanselow, Gisbert (ed.): 1993, *The parametrization of universal grammar. (Linguistik aktuell 8)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 37-71
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland: 1993, "Reflexivity". *Linguistic inquiry* 24/4, 657-720
- Richards, Norvin: 1997, "Competition and disjoint reference". *Linguistic inquiry* 28/1, 178-187
- Richards, Norvin: 2001, *Movement in language. Interactions and architectures. (Oxford linguistics)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Rizzi, Luigi: 1990, *Relativized minimality. (Linguistic inquiry monographs 16)* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press
- Roberts, Ian: 1993, *Verbs and diachronic syntax. A comparative history of English and French. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 28)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer

- Rohrbacher, Bernhard Wolfgang: 1999, *Morphology-driven syntax. A theory of V to I raising and PRO-drop*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 15) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Romaine, Suzanne: 1994, *Language in society. An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford university press
- Rooryck, Johan: 2001, 'Evidentiality, part II'. *Glott international* 5/5, 161-168.  
[[http://www.linguistlistplus.com/glott/html/GI5501/GI5501\\_SOA.htm](http://www.linguistlistplus.com/glott/html/GI5501/GI5501_SOA.htm) and  
[http://athena.leidenuniv.nl/letteren/onderzoek/ulcl/content\\_docs/faculty/rooryck/evidentiality.iiglot.pdf](http://athena.leidenuniv.nl/letteren/onderzoek/ulcl/content_docs/faculty/rooryck/evidentiality.iiglot.pdf) (12 April 2006)]
- Rosenbach, Anette: 2002, *Genitive variation in English. Conceptual factors in synchronic and diachronic studies*. (*Topics in English linguistics* 42) Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter
- Sabel, Joachim: 1996, *Restrukturierung und Lokalität. Universelle Beschränkungen für Wortstellungsvarianten*. (*Studia grammatica* 42) Berlin, Germany: Akademie Verlag
- Safir, Ken: 1999, "Vehicle change and reconstruction in  $\bar{A}$ -chains". *Linguistic inquiry* 30/4, 587-620
- Safir, Ken: 2004, *The syntax of anaphora*. (*Oxford studies in comparative syntax*) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Schütze, Carson T.: 2001, "On the nature of default case". *Syntax* 4/3, 205-238
- Siewierska, Anna: 1988, *Word order rules* (*Croom Helm linguistics series*) London, UK: Croom Helm
- Smith, Mark: 2004, "Light and heavy reflexives". *Linguistics* 42/3, 573-615
- Smith, Quentin: 2003, "Reference to the Past and Future". In Jokić, Aleksandar and Quentin Smith: 2003, *Time, Tense, and Reference*. ("A Bradford book") Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press 357-390
- Svenonius, Peter: 1993, "Selection, adjunction and concord in the DP". *Studia linguistica* 47/2, 198-220
- Svenonius, Peter: 1994, *Dependent Nexus. Subordinate Predication Structures in English and the Scandinavian Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz. Santa Cruz, Cal. [Quotations from  
<http://lingo.stanford.edu/sag/L221a/sven/dncover.pdf> etc. (June 2005)]
- Svenonius, Peter: 2000, "Quantifier movement in Icelandic". In Svenonius, Peter (ed.): *The derivation of VO and OV*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 31) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 255-292
- Svenonius, Peter: 2002 [2002a], "Subject positions and the placement of adverbials". In Svenonius, Peter (ed.): *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*. (*Oxford studies in comparative syntax*) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press 201-242

- Svenonius, Peter: 2004, "On the edge". In Adger, David, Cécile de Cat and George Tsoulas (eds.): *Peripheries. Syntactic edges and their effects. (Studies in Natural language and linguistic theory 59)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 259-287
- Svenonius, Peter: 2005 [2005a], "How phonological is object shift?". *Theoretical linguistics* 31, 1/2, 215-227
- Swann, Joan: 2000, "Language choice and code-switching". In Mesthrie, Rajend, Joan Swann, Andrea Deumert and William L. Leap (eds.): *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh university press 148-183
- Tanaka, Tomoyuki: 2000, "On the development of transitive expletive constructions in the history of English". *Lingua* 110, 473-495
- Thiam, Ndiassé: 1997, "Alternance codique". In Moreau, Marie-Louise (ed.): 1997, *Sociolinguistique. Les concepts de base. (Psychologie et sciences humaines 218)* Bruxelles, Belgium: Mardaga 32-34
- Thráinsson [Práinsson], Höskuldur: 2001, "Object shift and scrambling". In Baltin, Mark and Chris Collins (eds.): *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell
- Toivonen, Ida: 2003, *Non-projecting words. A case study of Swedish particles. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 58)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer
- Tomlin, Russell S.: 1986, *Basic word order. Functional principles. (Croom Helm linguistics series)* London, UK: Croom Helm
- Toyoshima, Takashi: 2001, "Head-to-spec movement". In Alexandrova, Galina M. and Olga Arnaudova (eds.): 2001, *The minimalist parameter. Selected papers from the open linguistics forum. Ottawa, 21-23 March 1997. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. IV, Current issues in linguistic theory 192)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 115-136
- Ura, Hiroyuki: 2000, *Checking theory and grammatical functions in universal grammar. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta: 1992, "The definite determiner and the inalienable construction in French and English". *Linguistic inquiry* 23/4, 595-652
- Vikner, Sten: 1995, *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)* New York NY: Oxford University Press
- Vikner, Sten: 1997, "V<sup>0</sup>-to-I<sup>0</sup> movement and inflection for person in all tenses". In Haegeman, Liliane (ed.): 1997, *The new comparative syntax. (Longman linguistics library)* London, UK: Longman 189-213
- Watanabe, Akira: 1996, *Case absorption and WH-agreement. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 37)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer
- Webelhuth, Gert: 1992, *Principles and parameters of syntactic saturation. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax)* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

- Widmark, Gun: 2005, "Standard and colloquial languages in Scandinavia in the 19th century". In Bandle, Oscar et al. (eds.): *The Nordic languages. An international handbook of the history of the North Germanic Languages 2. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 22)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton deGruyter 1493-1505
- Willim, Ewa: 1999, "On the syntax of the genitive in nominals: the case of Polish". In Kenesei, István (ed.): 1999, *Crossing boundaries. Advances in the theory of Central and Eastern European languages. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. IV, Current issues in linguistic theory 182)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 179-209
- Young, Katherine McCreight: 1988, *Multiple case assignments*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Massachusetts Institute of technology, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy. [Available at <https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/1721.1/14409/1/20150387.pdf> (16 November2005)]
- Zeller, Jochen: 2001, *Particle verbs and local domains. (Linguistik Aktuell 41)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Zeller, Jochen: 2002, "Particle verbs ar heads and phrases". In Dehé, Nicole, Ray Jackendoff, Andrew McIntyre, and Silke Urban (eds.): *Verb particle explorations. (Interface explorations 1)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter

## Unpublished or non-refereed material

This material was encountered by chance during the search period. As such, it represents a small but fairly random selection of examples.

### Norwegian characters

8 Apparently, in Norwegian, bare verbs can form SMC, as pointed out to us by Tarald Taraldsen. Many thanks for discussion of this and related points to Anders Holmberg, Oystein Nilsen, and Peter Svenonius. A relevant example is this:

- (i) hvis du vil til Oslo er det bare aa sette seg paa toget  
if you want to Oslo is it only to sit RFL on the-train  
'If you want to go to Oslo, you only have to get on a train.'

(von Fintel and Iatridou 2005, 9n)

Errors: "aa" and "paa". Correct: "å" and "på".

Error: "Oystein". Correct: "Øystein".

Evidence for this position comes from Norwegian, in which it is possible to form a sufficiency modal construction with only and a bare verb (von Fintel & Iatridou 2005:14, fn. 8):

- (44) Hvis du vil til Oslo er det bare aa sette seg paa toget.  
if you want to Oslo is it only to sit Refl on the-train  
'If you want to go to Oslo, you only have to get on a train.'

(Huitink 2005, 17)

Errors: "aa" and "paa". Correct: "å" and "på"

- (12) Sa provoserer Salomes mannhunger fortsatt dagens publikum  
So provokes Salomes man-hunger still the.days audience  
'Then Salomes hunger for men still provokes todays audiences.'

- (13) Sa provoserer fortsatt Salomes mannhunger dagens publikum  
So provokes still Salomes man-hunger the.days audience

- (14) Sa provoserer den fortsatt dagens publikum  
So provokes Salomes man-hunger still the.days audience  
'Then it still provokes todays audiences.'

- (15) ?? Sa provoserer fortsatt den dagens publikum (unless subj is focused)  
So provokes still it the.days audience

(Adger 2005, 25)

Errors: "Sa". Correct: "Så" ("sa" is past form of SI 'say'.)

### Accidental errors

The behaviour of “ambient” expletives in Norwegian, Icelandic and German is illustrated in (5-7) below:

(5) a. det regnar igår (Norwegian)  
it rained yesterday

b. Igår regnar \*(det)  
yesterday rained \*(it)  
(Biberauer 2003 5)

Errors: “regnar”. Possible correct forms: “regnet” (Bokmål only) or “regna” (Bokmål or Nynorsk). “regnar” is Nynorsk present. Present is excluded because of “igår”. Since “igår” reflects obsolete Bokmål orthography (correct: “ i går”), “regnet” is liable to be the correct form. Although Danish orthography was changed at this point too quite a few years ago, “igår” is still felt to be Danish - and, in fact, is still widely used in Danish. This may be a clue to some of the other errors found in Biberauer’s examples of Norwegian.

(44) Hvis du vil til Oslo er det bare aa sette seg paa toget.  
if you want to Oslo is it only to sit Refl on the-train  
‘If you want to go to Oslo, you only have to get on a train.’

(Huitink 2005, 17)

Error: “toget”. Correct: “toget”.

(29) a. Vi syket Line opp for å løpe.  
b. ? Vi syket opp Line for å løpe.  
we psyched up Line up for to run  
‘We psyched Line up to run’

(Svenonius 1996b, 58)

Error: “syket”. Correct: “psyket”.

(30) a. Kokken brennte {\*svart} kyllingen {svart}. (Nor)  
the.cook burned black the.chicken black  
‘The cook burned the chicken black.’

(Svenonius 1996a, 11)

Error: “brennte”. Correct: “brente”.

(77) (---)  
c. Kellneren tørket {av} støvet {av}. (Nor)

(---)  
*the.waiter wiped off the.dust off*

(78) (---)  
c. Kellneren tørket {av} bordet {\*av} (Nor)

(---)

*the.waiter wiped off the.table off*

(Svenonius 1996a, 32)

Errors: “Kellneren”. Correct: “Kelneren”.

(35) (---)

b. De hellte (øl) i glasset.  
*they poured beer in the.glass*

(Svenonius 2003, 441)

Error: “hellte”. Correct “helte”.

(17) (---)

[130]

b. Vi skjønte ingenting.  
*we understood nothing*  
'We understood nothing'

(Svenonius 2002c, 129f.)

Error: “skjønnte”. Correct: “skjønte”.

(46) a. Forfatterne beholdte rettighetene til mange av manuskriptene sine.  
*The.authors retained the.rights to many of their the.manuscripts RFX*  
'The authors retained the rights to many of their manuscripts'

(---)

c. Ingen av forfatterne beholdte rettighetene til ingen av manuskriptene sine.  
*None of the.authors retained the.rights to none of the.manuskripts RFX*  
'None of the authors retained the rights to none of their manuscripts'

(Svenonius 2002b, 19)

Errors: “beholdte”. Correct “beholdt”.

(11) (---)

Han synger på ingen måte visesanger.  
*he sings on no way folk.songs*  
'In no sense does he sing folk songs'

(Svenonius 2002b, 5)

Error: “visesanger”. Correct: “viser” (of VISE ‘(folk)song’. (VISESANGER m means ‘ballad singer’.) VISESANG m is an idiosyncratic word: a possible word of the kind that one may find on the web in a very restricted number. It conveys the literal meaning ‘balladsong’, and has a childish ring.

(9) (---)

c. Han synger på ingen måte visesanger.  
*he sings on no way folk.songs*  
'In no sense does he sing folk songs'

(Svenonius 2002c, 126)

Error: “visesanger”. Correct: “viser” (of VISE ‘(folk)song’. (VISESANGER m means ‘ballad singer’.). Cf Svenonius 2002b, 5 above.

- (28) a. *Ingenting har de diskutert på åresvis (har de vel?)*  
*nothing has they discussed on years have they well*  
*'They haven't discussed anything in years (have they?)'*

(Svenonius 2002c, 134)

Odd. After "på" one should have expected "år og dag".

Error: "åresvis". Correct: "årevis". ÅRESVIS is a non standard form corresponding to a form with a limited distribution in certain dialects.

### Interference?

- (8) a. *Der er kommet en dreng* (Norwegian)  
*there is come a boy*

- b. *Igår er \*(der) kommet en dreng*  
*yesterday is \*(there) come a boy*

(Biberauer 2003 5)

Error: "dreng" in the sense of 'boy' is Danish. (Norwegian DRENG means 'farm hand'). Correct: "gutt". (As for "igår", cf. above.) The combination of "Der" and "er kommet" may be found in a dialect on the South coast. Still, it is felt by the vast majority of Norwegians as Danish.

- (11) a. *Der er blevet danset* (Norwegian)  
*there has been danced*

- b. *Igår er \*(der) blevet danset*  
*yesterday is \*(there) been danced*

(Biberauer 2003 6)

Errors: "blevet ". Correct: "blitt". Correct auxiliary: "har" (of HA 'have'), not "er" (of VÆRE 'be'). This is Danish. (As for "igår", cf. above.) The combination of "Der" and "er blevet (blitt)" may be found in a dialect on the South coast. Still, it is felt by the vast majority of Norwegians as Danish.

- (33) a. *Har {någon student} möjligen {någon student} läst boken? (Swe)*  
b. *Har {noen student} muligens {noen student} lest boken? (Nor)*  
*has any student possibly any student read the.book*  
*Has any student possibly read the book?.*

(Svenonius 1996a, 13)

Unacceptable. Something is wrong about the sequence of modalities and the interrogative mode as well as the phrase "noen student", which sounds rather Swedish. Correct Norwegian: "en (eller annen)".

- (29) a. *Vi syket Line opp for å løpe.*  
b. *Vi syket opp Line for å løpe.*  
*We psyched up Line up for to run*

‘We psyched Line up to run’

(Svenonius 1996b, 58)

As long as the object NP is not a reflexive pronoun, PSYKE NP OPP FOR Å VP is clearly the result of interference from English, cf. the translation. b. is an arbitrary variation of this pattern.

- (21) a. Små katter kan gjemme under sofaen, men store klarer det ikke.  
small cats can hide under sofa.DEF but big manage that not

(Svenonius 1992, 107)

The first (part of the) sentence lacks a “seg” following “gjemme”, as ‘hide [oneself]’ in English corresponds to GJEMME SEG in Norwegian. Thus, the “seg” missing is probably due to interference from English.

### Syntactic errors

- (41) (ex. 28 from Åfarli 1994:89)

(---)

- b. *som*-relative  
Det av husa som Jon bor  
that of houses-the SOM Jon lives  
‘the house where Jon lives’

(Bhatt 2005, 21)

The preposition, “i”, is missing in final position. Correct in Åfarli 1994, 89., cf. Bhatt 2002, 82.

- (30) (---)

- b. Musikerne anså {\*over} konserten {over}. (Nor)  
*the.musicians considered over the.concert over*  
‘The musicians considered the concert over.’

(Svenonius 1996a, 11)

ANSE NP OVER is an error. Correct: ANSE NP FOR (Å VÆRE) OVER..

However, Engdahl (1997:56) noted that Norwegian seems to allow the extraction of the subject of a free relative in some instances. She gave the example shown in (1).

- (1) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn <sub>t<sub>i</sub></sub> produserer<sup>1</sup>  
*this artist buy I what ever produces*  
‘I buy whatever this artist produces’

(Hogboom 2003, 78)

In general, this type of relatives is a peripheral phenomenon of Norwegian. As for this particular sentence, even a similar sentence without extraction is unacceptable, which also holds for the series of sentences below of the same origin. According to Engdahl 1997, 56 (cf. below), the origin of this example is the Norwegian linguist Torbjørn Nordgård. It has, however, inspired numerous

similar sentences in Hogoboom's paper, every one of them equally odd or worse, cf below.

(i)

- (a) Jeg kjøper hvor mye denne kunstneren enn produserer  
I buy how much this artist ever produces  
'I buy however much this artist produces'

(Hogoboom 2003, 78n)

(3)

- (a)  
(i) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist buy I what ever produces*  
'I buy whatever this artist produces'  
(ii) Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> oversetter jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this author translate I what ever produces*  
'I translate whatever this author produces'  
(iii) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kopierer jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist copy I what ever produces*  
'I copy whatever this artist produces'  
(iv) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> saboterer jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist sabotage I what ever produces*  
'I sabotage whatever this artist produces'

[81]

- (v) Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> leser jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this author read I what ever produces*  
'I read whatever this author produces'  
(vi) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> beundrer jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist admire I what ever produces*  
'I admire whatever this artist produces'

(b)

- (i) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> byr jeg på hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist bid I on what ever produces*  
'I bid for whatever this artist produces'  
(ii) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> selger jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist sell I what ever produces*  
'I sell whatever this artist produces'  
(iii) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> liker jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist like I what ever produces*  
'I like whatever this artist produces'  
(iv) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> hater jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist hate I what ever produces*  
'I hate whatever this artist produces'

(Hogoboom 2003, 80f.)

- (4) (a)
- (i) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist buy I what ever produces*  
 'I buy whatever this artist produces'
- (ii) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> finner på  
*this artist buy I what ever finds on*  
 'I buy whatever this artist thinks of'
- (iii) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> maler  
*this artist buy I what ever paints*  
 'I buy whatever this artist paints'
- (iv) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> lager  
*this artist buy I what ever makes*  
 'I buy whatever this artist makes'
- (v) Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> skriver  
*this author buy I what ever writes*  
 'I buy whatever this author writes'

[83]

- (vi) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> skaper  
*this artist buy I what ever creates*  
 'I buy whatever this artist creates'

(Hogoboom 2003, 82f.)

- (5) (a) Denne maleren<sub>i</sub> saboterer jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> maler  
*this painter sabotage I what ever paints*  
 'I sabotage whatever this painter paints'

(Hogoboom 2003, 84)

- (6) (a) Denne kokken<sub>i</sub> beundrer jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> lager  
*this cook admire I what ever makes*  
 'I admire whatever this cook makes'

(Hogoboom 2003, 84)

- (7) (a) John<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*John buy I what ever produces*  
 'I buy whatever John produces'

- (b) <sup>??</sup>Han<sub>i</sub> kjøper jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*he buy I what ever produces*  
 'I buy whatever he produces'

(Hogoboom 2003, 84)

- (8) Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> oversetter jeg hvor enn t<sub>i</sub> skriver  
*this author translate I where ever writes*  
 'I translate wherever this author writes'

(Hogoboom 2003, 85)

- (9) (a) Jeg fordømmer hva enn denne administrasjonen gjør  
*I condemn what ever this administration does*  
 (b) Denne administrasjonen fordømmer jeg hva enn gjør  
*this administration condemn I what ever does*  
 ‘I condemn this administration, whatever it does’

(---)

(Hogoboom 2003, 86)

- (10) (a) Denne kunstneren<sub>i</sub> liker jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> produserer  
*this artist like I what ever produces*  
 ‘I like whatever this artist produces’ or  
 ‘I like his artist, whatever she/he produces’  
 (b) Denne forfatteren<sub>i</sub> hater jeg hva enn t<sub>i</sub> skriver  
*this author hate I what ever writes*  
 ‘I hate whatever this author writes’ or  
 ‘I hate this author, whatever she/he writes’

(Hogoboom 2003, 86)<sup>119</sup>

- [ii] Da kledde han {på seg} genseren {på seg}. (Nor)  
 then clad he on RFX the.sweater on RFX  
 ‘Then he put the sweater on’

(Svenonius 1996a, 12n)

Unacceptable with “på seg” in final position.

- (1c) Mannen har (opp) drukket (opp) vinen (Nor)  
 man has up drunk up wine

(Vinka 1999)

Error: “(opp) drukket”. Neither “opp drukket” nor “oppdrukket” is correct

### Odd sentences

- (2) a. (---)  
 b. Da forstår Jens ikke oppgaven.  
*then understand Jens not the.assignment*  
 ‘Then Jens doesn’t understand the assignment’ (Norwegian)

(Svenonius 2005b, 2)

Odd, given the position of “ikke”. “ikke” between the subject and the direct object would have been idiomatically correct though, if accompanied by another adverb, e.g. “plutselig ikke” ‘all of a sudden not’.

- (3) ...at Jens helt må forstå oppgaven  
*that Jens completely must understand the.assignment*

<sup>119</sup> Observe the English translation ‘I like his artist, (---)’.

‘...that Jens must completely understand the assignment’ (Norwegian)

(Svenonius 2005b, 2)

Odd.

- (11) b. Jeg har mått-et huske nøklene.  
*I have.PRES must-PTCPL remember.INF the.keys*  
 ‘I have had to remember the keys’ (Norwegian)

(Svenonius 2005b, 7)

Although other sentences exhibiting the same construction are conceivable, this particular sentence is weird, due to a conflict between the semantics of the perfect and HUSKE ‘remember’, and the deontic reading of MÅ. (An epistemic reading is inconceivable.)

In impersonal constructions particle shift can be observed; English is quite restrictive with respect to impersonal constructions, but they are productive in Norwegian.<sup>1</sup>

- (9) a. Det datt {ut} noen jordbær {ut}. (Nor)  
*there fell out some strawberries out*  
 ‘Some strawberries fell out’  
 b. Det ramlet {ned} tre flasker {ned}.  
*there tumbled down three bottles down*  
 ‘Three bottles tumbled down’

(Svenonius 1996a, 4)

<sup>1</sup> Some speakers prefer the particle-NP order in these cases. This may be due to the fact that focused elements are often preferred at the right edge of a sentence, and the indefinite in an impersonal construction is typically focused. This may have more to do with the system of assigning sentential stress than with syntax proper.

(Svenonius 1996a, 4n)

NP-particle is definitely odd whatever the explanation.

- (27) a. Vi kastet {ut} hunden {ut}. (Nor)  
 b. Við hentum {út} hundinum {út}. (Ice)  
*we threw out the.dog out*  
 ‘We threw {out} the dog {out}’  
 c. Mannen har drukket {opp} vinen {opp}. (Nor)  
 d. Maðurinn hefur drukkið {upp} vínið {upp}. (Ice)  
*the.man has drunk up the.wine up*  
 ‘The man has drunk {up} the wine {up}’

The pattern above is slightly idealized. Norwegian exhibits dialectal variation, with at least some dialects preferring Prt-NP order (---). below). Many Icelandic speakers show a preference for NP-Prt order when the noun phrase is definite (---). However, for most Norwegian dialects and for non-definite noun phrases in Icelandic, there is free variation as indicated, and even for definite noun phrases in Icelandic as in (27b, d), the Prt-NP order is

not ungrammatical but simply dispreferred. Norwegian and Icelandic also pattern with English when the particle has a complement, as in (28), which makes particle shift impossible.

- (28) a. Vi kastet { \*ut } hunden { ut } av huset. (Nor)  
 b. Við hentum { \*út } hundinum { út } úr húsinu. (Ice)  
*we threw out the.dog out of the.house*  
 ‘We threw the dog out of the house’

Also as in English, unstressed pronouns must precede the particle, as illustrated in (29) below.

- (29) a. Vi kastet { \*ut } den { ut } (Nor)  
 b. Við hentum { \*út } honum { út } (Ice)  
*we threw out it out*  
 ‘We threw it out’

(Svenonius 1996a, 11)

Cf. comments on similar sentences above.

- (2c) Vi kastet (ut) hunden (ut). (Nor)  
*we threw out dog out*

(Vinka 1999)

- (77) (---)  
 c. Kellneren tørket { av } støvet { av }. (Nor)  
 (---)  
*the.waiter wiped off the.dust off*

- (78) (---)  
 c. Kellneren tørket { av } bordet { \*av } (Nor)  
 (---)  
*the.waiter wiped off the.table off*

(Svenonius 1996a, 32)

- (19) a. Han spiste tørrfisen opp. (Nor)  
 b. Han spiste opp tørrfisen.  
*he ate up the.dry.fish up*  
 ‘He ate up the dried fish’

(Svenonius 1996b, 55)

- (22) a. Jeg blåser ballonger opp. (Nor)  
 b. Jeg blåser opp ballonger  
*I blow up balloons up*  
 ‘I’m blowing up balloons’

(Svenonius 1996b, 55)

Western Norwegian (Svenonius 1996), behaves essentially as Swedish, which suggest that the feature [ $\pm$ telic] is strong, and thus forcing incorporation in passivized or passive-like non-predicative VPCs, (7).

- (7a) \*Me prøvde [ å få [ slaktet skore opp]]. (W.Nor)  
we tried to get carcass cut up  
(7b) Me prøvde [ å få [slaktet opp-skore]]. (W.Nor)  
we tried to get carcass up cut

On the other hand, in Standard Norwegian, Icelandic and English, the feature is *optionally* strong, hence (---).

(Vinka 1999)

At least the contention “optionally” is debatable. And there is no hyphen in “oppskore”.

(---) but in the impersonal constructions the participle is default singular in Western Norwegian (---)

- (56) (---)  
b. Det vart hogge ned mange tre. (WNor)  
(---)  
*there were chopped down many trees down*  
'Many trees were chopped down'

(Svenonius 1996a, 22)

This is not exactly the case. “hogge” (singular neutre) is the official Nynorsk norm, but “hogne” (plural) is widely used in Western Norway.

- (5) (---)  
c. Det vart hogge ned mange tre. (W. Norwegian)  
it became chopped.SG down many trees

(Svenonius 2001, 110)

Same remark as to Svenonius 1996a, 22 above.

Norwegian shows considerable variation on this point. Some dialects pattern essentially with Swedish, requiring or at least strongly preferring incorporation; an example is given in (51a) from the Leikanger dialect of Sogn (in western Norway). Other dialects strongly disprefer incorporation, for example as in (51b) from the Nordreisa dialect of Troms (in northern Norway).

- (51) a. ?? Trea vart hogne ned. Trea vart nedhogne. (WNor)  
b. Trærne ble hogd ned. ?? Trærne ble nedhogd. (NNor)  
*the.trees were chopped down the.trees were down.chopped*  
'The trees were chopped down'

For other dialects, there is substantial speaker and lexical variation.

(Svenonius 1996a, 20)<sup>120</sup>

Since a dialectal approach is made, this author finds it extraordinary that a form such as “trærne” is used to render the Nordreisa dialect. “(NNor)” is slightly misleading, as the uninitiated might think that it means ‘North Norwegian’ and not ‘Northern Norway’. The Nordreisa dialect is the continuation of a southern Norwegian dialect due to migration in not too distant history.

(19) Vi så det danses. (Nor)  
*we saw there be.danced*  
‘We saw dancing going on’

(Svenonius 1996a, 8)

Odd. Looks like a construct. This author can’t imagine a situation where this sentence is acceptable.

(23) (---)  
c. Han har sagt ingenting i timesvis.  
*He has said nothing in hours*  
‘He has said nothing for hours’ (‘contentless things’)

(Svenonius 2002b, 10)

In this sentence, “ingenting” ‘nothing’ can only be construed as a meta use of the word. The cause is “i timesvis” ‘for hours’, which indicates that the subject of the sentences has kept saying the word “ingenting” for hours. A correct (re)translation of ‘He has said nothing for hours’ is “Han har ikke sagt noe på flere timer.”

(24) (---)  
*Han har sagt fillesaker i timesvis.*  
*He has said trivial.things in hours*  
‘He has said trifling things for hours’

(Svenonius 2002b, 10)

A case parallel to Svenonius 2002b, 10 above.

(28) (---)  
b. *Ingenting har han sagt på timesvis.*  
*nothing has he said on hours*  
*He hasn’t said anything in hours*

(Svenonius 2002b, 11)

Cf. Svenonius 2002b, 10 above.

(25) a. *Du betaler for ingenting, og det gjør jeg også.*  
*you pay for nothing and that do I also*  
‘You are paying for nothing, and so am I’

[11]

---

<sup>120</sup> (51) a. is repeated in a different format as (55) a. later on.

- b. Hun ler uansett hva jeg sier, og han flirer også av ingenting  
*she laughs regardless what I say and he laughs also of nothing*  
'She laughs no matter what I say, and he laughs at nothing, too'
- c. Han har sagt ingenting i hele kveld, har han ikke?  
*he has said nothing in whole evening has he not*  
'He has said nothing all evening, hasn't he?'

(Svenonius 2002b, 10f)

"Du betaler for ingenting" looks like a short answer, unless it is followed by a clause, e.g. "når du kjøper en XXX". Additionally, a. is characterised by a certain "inconsistency" as far as the two coordinated sentences are concerned, which, in fact, is the case with b. and c. as well: "Hun ler uansett hva jeg sier," refers to one situation and "og han flirer også av ingenting" refers to a different one, although one should have expected it otherwise, due to "også" in the last conjunct. There is equally something unidiomatic about c. "har han ikke" seems to presuppose some sort of positive content of the sentence it is tagged to, which would mean a relatively pointless 'He has said the word "ingenting" all evening'. The unmarked interpretation of "Han har sagt ingenting i hele kveld", though, is of a negative nature – which requires a tag question such as " , har han vel?".

- (25) a. Du betaler for ingenting, og det gjør jeg også.  
*you pay for nothing and that do I also*  
'You are paying for nothing, and so am I'
- b. Hun ler uansett hva jeg sier, og han flirer også av ingenting  
*she laughs regardless what I say and he laughs also of nothing*  
'She laughs no matter what I say, and he laughs at nothing, too'

(Svenonius 2002c, 133)

Odd. Cf Svenonius 2002b, 10f above.

- (34) a. Kim ser fin ut i ingen klær.  
*Kim looks fine out in no clothes*  
'Kim looks good naked'  
Robin ville være fornøyd med ingen jobb.  
*Robin would be satisfied with no job*  
'Robin would be satisfied jobless'

(Svenonius 2002b, 13)

Idiomatically wrong. A normal way of expressing 'Kim looks good naked' will be "Kim ser fin ut naken" or "Kim ser fin ut uten klær."

- (35) a. I ingen klær ser Kim fin ut.  
*in no clothes looks Kim nice out*  
'In no clothes, Kim looks good' or 'In no clothes does Kim look good'
- b. Med ingen jobb ville Robin være fornøyd.  
*with no job would Robin be satisfied*

‘With no job, Robin would be satisfied’ or ‘With no job would Robin be satisfied’

(Svenonius 2002b, 13)

As above. With the additional anomaly of the sentence initial PP.

- (36) a. I ingen klær ser Kim fin ut, gjør han vel?  
*in no clothes looks Kim nice out does he well*  
‘In no clothes does Kim look good, does he?’

[14]

- c. I ingen klær ser Kim fin ut i det hele tatt  
*in no clothes looks Kim nice out in the whole taken*  
‘In no clothes does Kim look good at all’  
d. Med ingen jobb ville Robin overhodet være fornøyd  
*with no job would Robin overhead be satisfied*  
‘With no job would Robin be satisfied whatsoever’

(Svenonius 2002b, 13f)

As above. Note the tag question in c. Cf. Svenonius 2002b, 11 above.

- (37) a. Robin ville være lykkeligere med ingen dagjobb.  
*Robin would be happier with no day.job*  
‘Robin would be happier without a day job’  
b. Kim ser fin ut i ingen underbukser.  
*Kim looks fin out in no underpants*  
‘Kim looks good without underpants’  
c. Man må betale dyrt for ingen tilsetningsstoffer.  
*One must pay expensive for no additives*  
‘One must pay a lot for additive-free food’

(---)

- e. Jeg foretrekker klær som er lagd av ingen syntetiske stoffer.  
*I prefer clothes as are made of no synthetic materials*  
‘I prefer clothing which is made without synthetic materials’

(Svenonius 2002b, 14)

As above. Odd.

It is perhaps no surprise by now to the reader that the Norwegian examples in (34) lack the sentence negation reading (nor will it come as a surprise that some speakers reject them outright, without context).

- (34) a. Vesna ser fin ut i ingen klær.  
*Vesna looks fine out in no clothes*  
‘Vesna looks good naked’  
b. Sestre ville være fornøyd med ingen jobb.  
*Sestre would be satisfied with no job*  
‘Sestre would be satisfied jobless’

(Svenonius 2002c, 136)

Idiomatically wrong. A normal way of expressing ‘Vesna looks good naked’ will be “Vesna ser fin ut naken” or “Vesna ser fin ut uten klær.”

- (35) a. I ingen klær ser Kim fin ut.  
*in no clothes looks Kim nice out*  
‘In no clothes, Kim looks good’ or ‘In no clothes does Kim look good’  
b. Med ingen jobb ville Robin være fornøyd.  
*with no job would Robin be satisfied*  
‘With no job, Robin would be satisfied’ or ‘With no job would Robin be satisfied’

(Svenonius 2002c, 136)

As above. With the additional anomaly of the sentence initial PP.

- (36) a. I ingen klær ser Kim fin ut, gjør han vel?  
*in no clothes looks Kim nice out does he well*  
‘In no clothes does Kim look good, does he?’  
(---)  
c. I ingen klær ser Kim fin ut i det hele tatt  
*in no clothes looks Kim nice out in the whole taken*  
‘In no clothes does Kim look good at all’

[137]

- d. Med ingen jobb ville Robin overhodet være fornøyd  
*with no job would Robin overhead be satisfied*  
‘With no job would Robin be satisfied whatsoever’

(Svenonius 2002c, 136f)

As above. Note the tag question in c.

- (37) a. Marko ville være lykkeligere med ingen dagjobb.  
*Marko would be happier with no day.job*  
‘Marko would be happier without a day job’  
b. Ira ser fin ut i ingen underbukser.  
*Ira looks fin out in no underpants*  
‘Ira looks good without underpants’  
c. Man må betale dyrt for ingen tilsetningsstoffer.  
*One must pay expensive for no additives*  
‘One must pay a lot for additive-free food’  
(---)  
e. Jeg foretrekker klær som er lagd av ingen syntetiske stoffer.  
*I prefer clothes as are made of no synthetic materials*  
‘I prefer clothing which is made of no synthetic materials’

(Svenonius 2002c, 137)

As above. Odd.

- (46) (---)  
c. Ingen av forfatterne beholdte rettighetene til ingen av manuskriptene sine.

none of the.authors retained the.rights to none of the.manuskriptd RFX  
'None of the authors retained the rights to none of their manuscripts'

(Svenonius 2002b, 19)  
Odd.

(47) (---)

- c. Ingen av artistene beholdt rettighetene til ingen av låtene sine.  
*none of the.artists retained the.rights to none of the.songs RFX*  
'None of the artists retained the rights to none of their songs'

(Svenonius 2002c, 143)  
Odd.

- (42) a. Jeg vil ha et portrett av deg på veggen eller bilder av ingen.  
*I will have a portrait of you on the.wall or pictures of nobody*  
'I want a portrait of you on the wall or pictures of nobody'  
b. Jeg hilste på mange menn, men fedrene til ingen av vennene mine.  
*I greeted on many men, but the.fathers to none of the.friends my*  
'I met many men, but the fathers of none of my friends'  
c. ...med mindre du kjøper orkidéer og blomster av ingen billigere type  
*with less you buy orchids and flowers of no cheaper variety*  
'...unless you buy orchids and flowers of no cheaper variety'

(Svenonius 2002b, 16)

Odd. In connection with this group of examples one finds the following in a footnote: "These examples are at best stylistically awkward, (---)." A clear understatement.

- (42) a. Jeg vil ha et portrett av deg på veggen eller bilder av ingen.  
*I will have a portrait of you on the.wall or pictures of nobody*  
'I want a portrait of you on the wall or pictures of nobody'  
b. Jeg hilste på mange menn, men fedrene til ingen av vennene mine.  
*I greeted on many men, but the.fathers to none of the.friends my*  
'I met many men, but the fathers of none of my friends'  
c. ...med mindre du kjøper orkidéer og blomster av ingen billigere type.  
*with less you buy orchids and flowers of no cheaper variety*  
'...unless you buy orchids and flowers of no cheaper variety'

(Svenonius 2002c, 140)

Odd. In connection with this group of examples one finds the following in a footnote: "These examples are at best stylistically awkward, (---)." Again a clear understatement.

(45) (---)

- c. Studentene kunne på ingen måte svare på ingen oppgaver.  
*the.students could on no way answer on no assignments*  
'The students could in no sense answer none of the assignments'

(Svenonius 2002b, 18)

Sounds like a riddle.

- (46) (---)  
 c. Studentene kunne på ingen måte svare på ingen oppgaver.  
*the.students could on no way answer on no assignments*  
 ‘The students could in no sense answer none of the assignments’

(Svenonius 2002c, 142)

Odd. Cf. The above example.

- 10) Per/dere/\*jeg/\*meg hadde de trodd [<sub>CP</sub> t' [<sub>TP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> ville komme forsent]]  
 Per-N/A/you-N/A.pl/\*I-N/\*me-Ahad they thought [t' [t would come too.late]]

(Rezac s.a. 8)

Rezac refers to Taraldsen 1981, which, however, does not appear in his bibliography. As for the grammaticality of the (group of) sentence(s), see Bejar and Massam (1999, 67) above.

- (12) Sa provoserer Salomes mannshunger fortsatt dagens publikum  
 So provokes Salomes man-hunger still the.days audience  
 ‘Then Salomes hunger for men still provokes todays audiences.

- (13) Sa provoserer fortsatt Salomes mannshunger dagens publikum  
 So provokes still Salomes man-hunger the.days audience

- (14) Sa provoserer den fortsatt dagens publikum  
 So provokes Salomes man-hunger still the.days audience  
 ‘Then it still provokes todays audiences.

- (15) ?? Sa provoserer fortsatt den dagens publikum (unless subj is focused)  
 So provokes still it the.days audience

(Adger 2005, 25)

Cf. Svenonius 2002a, 221 (above) as far as the two first sentences are concerned. These sentences bear all the signs of being literary quotations from old-fashioned Dano-Norwegian sources at least one century ago. (No precise reference is given. Probably only the first one is a quotation in the first place.) As such, they are hard to understand for any contemporary native speaker of Norwegian - as they are for the grammarian, cf. the English translation. Note also the translation/gloss confusion in the case of (14). (15) is ungrammatical no matter the focus.

### Incorrect asterisks and other results of lack of understanding

- (3) a. \*Det ble tre journalister arrestert i natt. (Norwegian)  
 it became three journalists arrested in night

(Svenonius 2001, 110)

Ungrammatical? Not more than quite a few others of Svenonius’ Norwegian examples.

### Strange assertions

- (34) a. They stole (money) from the rich.  
 b. He drank (beer) out of the glass.  
 c. She unpacked (the clothes) from the bag.  
 d. We parked (the car) in the garage.

The examples in (34) are all independently object-drop verbs. (---). Norwegian, in contrast to English, allows structures corresponding to all of the examples in (33).

- (35) a. Kan du sette (varene) i kjøleskapet? (Norwegian)  
*can you put the.goods in the.refrigerator*  
 b. De hellte (øl) i glasset.  
*they poured beer in the.glass*  
 c. Vi dekket (bestikk) på bordet.  
*we covered silverware on the.table*  
 d. Vi lastet (kofferter) av bagasjetralen.  
*we loaded suitcases off the.baggage.cart*

(Svenonius 2003, 441

A conditioned truth. “Kan du sette I kjøleskapet?” is definitely odd. b. is acceptable (despite the orthographic error, cf. above). c. and d. are slightly odd. D. is only acceptable in some sort of generic sense: ‘We unloaded suitcases (and not bags) the entire day’. c. is just a little too much: DEKKE PÅ BORDET means ‘lay the table’. With bestikk ‘cutlery’, of course. What else? This author has problems imagining a context where c. will not represent a breach of the conversational rules.

- |      |    |                   |           |             |                     |            |             |        |
|------|----|-------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|--------|
| (53) | a. | The dog           | is        | tied.       | The dogs            | are        | tied.       |        |
|      | b. | Bikkja            | e         | bunde.      | Bikkjan             | e          | bunde.      | (NNor) |
|      | c. | Hunden            | er        | bundet.     | Hundene             | er         | bundet.     | (ENor) |
|      | d. | Hunden            | er        | bundet.     | Hundene             | er         | bundet.     | (Dan)  |
|      |    | <i>the.dog</i>    | <i>is</i> | <i>tied</i> | <i>the.dogs</i>     | <i>are</i> | <i>tied</i> |        |
|      |    | ‘The dog is tied’ |           |             | ‘The dogs are tied’ |            |             |        |

As already noted, English and Danish never allow incorporation. Northern Norwegian and Eastern Norwegian are more variable, but incorporation is never obligatory there as it is in Swedish, and is typically dispreferred (and often impossible). At the risk of oversimplification, I will treat Northern and Eastern Norwegian as non-incorporating.

The remaining languages do have agreement on participles (passive participles and unaccusative perfect participles with *be*), again oversimplifying the Norwegian situation by assuming a single Western Norwegian standard (see Sandøy 1988 for a detailed study of the distribution of agreeing participles in Norwegian dialects).<sup>14</sup>

- (54) a. Hunden är bunden. Hundarna är bundna. (Swe)  
 b. Hunden er bunden. Hundane er bundne. (WNor)

c.	Hundurin	er	bundin.	Hundarin eru	bundnir.	(Far)
d.	Hundurinn	er	bundinn.	Hundarnir eru	bundnir.	(Ice)
	<i>the.do</i>		<i>is tied</i>	<i>the.dogs</i>	<i>are tied</i>	
	'The dog is tied'			'The dogs are tied'		

The incorporating languages are Faroese, Western Norwegian, and Swedish (taking Faroese to be incorporating, i.e. despite the optionality there). The pattern is represented in (55), with Swedish requiring, Western Norwegian preferring, and Faroese allowing incorporation.

(Svenonius 1996a, 21)

As far as Norwegian is concerned, this is definitely an oversimplification. For instance, this author, native speaker of Eastern Norwegian, may perfectly well write “Hundene er bundne”. This is part of the charm of Norwegian variability

For Norwegian and Icelandic, an event-type reading allows use of *have*, whereas a stative reading requires (in Icelandic) or allows (in Norwegian) the auxiliary *be*.

[31]

(75)	a.	Hann	hefur	aldreg	komið	hingað.	(Ice)
	b.	Han	har	aldri	kommet	hit.	(Nor)
		<i>he</i>	<i>has</i>	<i>never</i>	<i>come</i>	<i>here</i>	
		'He has never come here'					
	c.	Hann	er	ekki	kominn	hingað.	(Ice)
	d.	Han	er	ikke	kommen	hit.	(Nor)
		<i>he</i>	<i>is</i>	<i>not</i>	<i>come</i>	<i>here</i>	
		'He has not come here' (i.e. he's not here now)					

(Svenonius 1996a, 30f.)

Odd to use “kommen” in a Bokmål sentence. Off-standard variant with a certain archaic connotation. To this author, no stative reading is possible. Besides, the unmarked form is “kommet”. In Nynorsk, “komen” would have been the correct form after a form of VERE ‘be’. However, “ikke” (not Nynorsk “ikkje”) is a clear indicator of Bokmål.

### Spurious references

Swedish *sig*. We come now to generalization [5]. The existence of obviative reflexives has been demonstrated in several languages, notably Hellan’s classic study of Norwegian anaphora (1988). I will draw my examples from Swedish, whose *sig* is very similar to Norwegian *seg* (Diderichsen 1937) and Danish *seg* (Vikner 1985).

(Kiparsky [s.a.], 11)

Diderichsen 1937 can hardly be said to be a relevant reference to the use of pronouns in Present-Day Norwegian.

## References<sup>121</sup> (reviewed titles) - not refereed

- Adger, David: (2005), "2.6. Finishing off yesterday's discussion". Unpublished paper (handout?). LOT winterschool 2005. Center for language and cognition Groningen. January 10-21, 2005. [Electronic version quoted: <http://www.let.rug.nl/~zwart/lot/adger1.pdf> (26 May 2006)]
- Bhatt, Rajesh: 2005, "The syntax and semantics of nominal modification". Handout. LOT summer school 2005, Universiteit Leiden. The syntax and semantics of nominal modification. June 13, 2005. [Available at <http://people.umass.edu/bhatt/752-s05/752-s05-11.pdf> (14 April 2006)]
- Biberauer, Theresa: 2003, "Reconsidering the EPP and Spec-TP in Germanic". In Astruc, L. & M. Richards (eds.) *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics (COPiL)* 1, 15-40. [Quotation from <http://people.pwf.cam.ac.uk/mtb23/nsp/Downloadablepapers.html> (26 April 2005)]
- Engdahl, Elisabet: 1997. "Relative clause extractions in context", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 60, 51-79
- von Fintel, Kai and Sabine Iatridou: 2005, "Anatomy of a modal". Unpublished manuscript. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, May 28, 2005 [<http://web.mit.edu/linguistics/www/iatridou/glow.pdf> (23 December 2005) 1-56]
- Hogoboom, S. L. Anya: 2003, "Subject Extraction out of Free Relatives in Norwegian". *Nordlyd* 31/1, 78-87
- Huitink, Janneke: 2005, "Analyzing anankastic conditionals and sufficiency modals". Unpublished manuscript. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Faculteit der filosofie. [Taalfilosofie/logica. <http://www.phil.kun.nl/tfl/janneke/console13-revised-Huitink.pdf> (23 December 2005) 1-21]
- Kiparsky, Paul: [s.a.<sup>122</sup>] "Disjoint reference and the typology of pronouns" [<http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/anaph.hierarchies-t.pdf> (22 September 2005) 1-55]
- Rezac, Milan: [s.a.] "Accusative Constructions and the George-Kornfeldt Hypothesis". Unpublished paper (University of Toronto) (1-11) [Quoted from the Arizona Minimalist Syntax Archives (The minimalist syntax homepage), Department of Linguistics (University of Arizona) <http://minimalism.linguistics.arizona.edu/AMSA/PDF/AMSA-201-0602.pdf> (22 September 2005)]
- Svenonius, Peter: 1992, "The extended projection of N: Identifying the head of the noun phrase". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 49, 95-121
- Svenonius, Peter: 1996 [1996a], "The Verb-Particle Alternation in the Scandinavian Languages". [<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000046> (29 September 2005)]

---

<sup>121</sup> Only those not already mentioned in one of the above list of references.

<sup>122</sup> Last modified 2002, according to <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/>

- Svenonius, Peter: 1996 [1996b], "The Optionality of Particle Shift". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 57, 47-75.
- Svenonius, Peter: 2002 [2002b], "Licencing negation in Norwegian".  
[<http://www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/papers/Svenonius02NegWPSS.pdf> (10 June 2006)]
- Svenonius, Peter: 2002 [2002c<sup>123</sup>], "Strains of negation in Norwegian". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 69, 121-146. [Available at  
<http://www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/papers/Svenonius02SNNWPSS.pdf> (14 June 2006)]
- Svenonius, Peter: 2003, "Limits on P: filling in holes vs. falling in holes". In Proceedings of 19th Scandinavian conference of linguistics. *Nordlyd* 31/2, 431-445
- Svenonius, Peter: 2005 [2005b], "1...3-2". [Available at  
<http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/@twxBjwrHkGLRmdRq/UKTJLSyI> (13 December 2005).  
Two of the examples listed above (Svenonius' examples (2) b. and (11) b., have been deleted from the current version (17 August 2006) of the paper, though, cf.  
<http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000200>]
- Vinka, Mikael: 1999, "Two Types of Verb Particle Constructions" Abstract to the *Penn Linguistics Colloquium* 23. [Available at  
<http://www.ling.upenn.edu/Events/PLC/plc23/vinka.html> (15 November 2005)]

---

<sup>123</sup> Apparently a more recent version of Svenonius 2002b.

## Other languages – a small sample

No effort has been spent searching actively for defective documentation of other languages. However, catching sight of several instances during the process is inevitable. Unfortunately, their existence seems to indicate that erroneous examples are not a privilege for a small and peripheral language such as Norwegian. A couple of errors have already been mentioned in passing. Here are a few more specimens, starting with the neighbouring languages:

Danish:

- c. (Vikner (1985)) (Inf)  
at Susan<sub>i</sub> overtalte Anne til [ at høre på {sig<sub>i</sub>/ ende<sub>i</sub>} ]  
that Susan persuaded Anne to [ that listen to self / her ]  
'that Susan<sub>i</sub> persuaded Anne to listen to her<sub>i</sub>'  
(Burzio 1996, 37)  
Codepage problems can cause disturbing problems ... As in Norwegian, "høre" in Danish means 'fornicate'. Misspellings likewise: "ende" mens 'behind'. "høre", on the other hand, means 'hear' and "hende" 'her'.

- (21) (---)  
c. Mange børn har plukket alle blomstrene. [Da.]  
many children have picked all the flowers  
(Jonas 1996, 60)  
Error: "blomstrene". Correct: "blomsterne".

Swedish:

- (75) suédois  
böken-a blev såld-es  
livre-PL devenir-PAS vendu-PL  
<Les livres ont été vendus>  
(Giusti 1998, 373)  
Error: "bökena". Correct: "böckerna". Error: "såldes" (medio-passive past form). Correct "sålda" (past participle plural)

- (115) a. Vafor laste studenterna inte alla den?  
why read the students not them  
Vafor laste studenterna den inte alla?  
b. Vafor laste studenterna inte alla artikeln?  
why read the students not the articles  
[203]  
\*Vafor laste studenterna artikeln inte alla?  
(Holmberg 1986:chap. 6, (7a))  
(Williams 1994, 202f.)

Errors: “Vafor” and “laste”. Correct: “Varför” and “läste”. “den” ‘singular’ is translated as ‘them’, “artikeln” ‘definite form singular’ as ‘the articles’. (115) b. is an inexact copy of Holmberg’s example (Holmberg 1986, 166). Holmberg’s own gloss contains “all”, which has been omitted in Williams’ copy.

Icelandic:

(31) Icelandic (from Collins and Thrainsson, [14])

- a. eg lana ekki Mariu b kurnar  
I lend not Maria the books  
‘I do not lend Maria the books’
- b. eg lana Mariu b kurnar ekki
- c. \*eg lana b kurnar Maria ekki

(Stroik 1999, 295)

Errors: “eg”, “lana”, “Mariu”, and “b kurnar”. Correct: “ég”, “lána”, “Maríu”, and “bækurnar” as in “Ég lána ekki Maríu/Maríu bækurnar” (Collins og Thráinsson 1993).

Die Daten (42) aus Sigurðsson (1988) belegen, daß dies nicht der Fall ist.

(---)

(42b) *hafði þér hitnað?*

(Fanselow 1991, 81)

Errors: “ð” ‘delta’ and “θ”<sup>124</sup> ‘capital theta’. Correct “ð” and “þ” as in “Hafði þér hitnað [t]?”.

(4) (---)

- b. Pessi<sub>nom</sub> hrinur<sub>nom i</sub>, Olafur hefur lofa Mariu hunum<sub>dat i</sub>  
this ring Olav has promised Maria hunum  
This ring, Olav has promised it to Maria

(Vat 1997, 69)

Errors: “Pessi”, “hrinur”, “Olafur”, “lofa”, “Mariu”, and “hunum”. Correct: “Þessi”, “hringur”, “Ólafur”, “lofað”, “Maríu”, and “honum”.

German:

[46] es gibt Löwen in Africa

(---)

[46'] in Africa gibt es Löwen

(Lazard 2001 [1994], 232)

Errors: “Africa”. Correct: “Afrika”.

---

<sup>124</sup> Not italics.

Two of many examples from one of the worlds most frequently spoken languages, Portuguese:

(70)      portugais  
          O nort    do    paí    foi            atingi-d-o (pela tempestade)  
          Le nord   PREP   pays   être: PAS   atteindre-PART-M  
          <Le nord du pays fut atteint (par la tempête)>

(Giusti 1998, 372)

Errors: “nort” and “paí”. Correct: “norte” and “país”. Additionally, the final preposition phrase is missing in the gloss.

(57)    (---)  
          [351]

          b. *Il    manuscrito    está pronto    para    ser    lido.*  
          The manuscript    is    ready    for    to-be    read  
          ‘The manuscript is ready to be read’

(Landau 1999, 350f.)

Error: “Il”. Correct: “O”. IL is Italian, O is portuguese...

And, finally, a language with the longest of philological traditions, Hebrew:

(3)    -    Ha'im    John    medaber    corfatit?  
          Q            John    speaks    French  
          ‘Does John speak French?’

(Holmberg 2005b, 2)

Error: “corfatit”. Correct: “tsorfatit” or “tzorfatit”. The “c” may have originated in an off-standard transliteration of Modern Hebrew.

According to now obsolete ISO standard ISO R259:  $\underset{z}$

According to Library of Congress transliteration rules: ts.

According to Hebrew Streams <http://www.hebrew-streams.org/works/hebrew/heb-ara-translit.pdf> (22 September 2005):

“academic”:  $\underset{s}$

“non academic” tz or ts

## References<sup>125</sup> (reviewed titles) other languages

- Burzio, Luigi: 1996, "The role of the antecedent in anaphoric relations". In Freidin, Robert (ed.): 1996, *Current issues in comparative grammar. (Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 35)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer 1-45
- Giusti, Francesca Fici: 1998, "Diathèse et voix marquée dans les langues d'Europe". In Feuillet, Jack (ed.): 1998, *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe. (Empirical approaches to language typology. EUROTYP 20-2)*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 347-389
- Holmberg, Anders: 2005 [2005b], "Null subjects and polarity focus". ["Forthcoming in *NELS 35 Proceedings*"] [quotation from: <http://people.pwf.cam.ac.uk/mtb23/nsp/Null%20Subjects%20and%20Polarity%20Focus.pdf> (26 April 2005)]
- Landau, Idan: 1999, "Psych-adjectives and semantic selection". *The linguistic review* 16, 333-358
- Stroik, Thomas S.: 1999, "The survive principle". *Linguistic analysis* 29/3-4, 278-303
- Vat, Jan: 1997, "Left dislocation, connectedness and reconstruction". In Anagnostopoulou, Elena, Henk van Riemsdijk, and Frans Zwarts (eds.): *Materials on left dislocation. (Linguistik aktuell 14)* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John benjamins 67-92
- Williams, Edwin: 1994, *Thematic structure in syntax. (Linguistic inquiry monographs 23)* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press

---

<sup>125</sup> Only those not already mentioned in one of the above lists of references.

## Final observations

The basic statistics have already been presented in the introduction, and there is no point in showing “individual” statistics catering for what linguist committed most errors of what type, where and when etc. The raw data are presented and everybody is free to count for oneself. On the other hand, a certain general pattern emerges: Excerpts and even particular example sentences that contain more than one error are commonplace. Frequently, the errors pertain to various levels of description (characters, morphology, syntax etc.) E.g.

- (33) a. (---)  
b. Slike foelsomme politiska fragor har jeg flere studenter som det ikke finnes noen som jeg tror ville våge å prata med om.

(Maling and Zaenen 1982, 242)

- (9) b. John synnes ham [vaere en god venn]

(Hoekstra 1995, 121)

- (41) Bordet<sub>i</sub> ble laft en duk pa t<sub>i</sub>  
the-table was put a cloth on

(Hendrick 1995, 321)

This is an indication that there is no singular “technical” misspelling of any kind involved.<sup>126</sup> In a certain sense, these are systematic errors; a clear sign of lack of competence as far as the language in question is concerned. Technically speaking, the errors may have been caused by the editor, the reviewer, the proof reader etc. Still, any error is eventually of the author’s responsibility. The impression of failing competence is strengthened by the fact that identical errors may appear in subsequent versions of the same text or, more important, in other texts by the same author (usually addressing the same problem). The examples are reused and so are the errors. E.g. Koopman 1999, 2000, Merchant 2000, 2001, 2002, and Zeller 2001, 2002. One further variant is ‘same sentence, different errors’, e.g. Maling 1978a, 87 and 1982, 245. Additionally, a number of linguists whose works exhibit errors are editors of books or journals where other errors are found. In the end, this inevitably affects the qualitative assessment of the errors.

Considered separately, most errors documented in this report are rather trivial. On the face of it, compiling the inventory may seem to be both pointless and utterly pedantic. However, the importance of the errors increases as a consequence of their quantity both for the individual linguist (cf. above) and for linguistics on the whole. The result points at the problematic relationship between current linguistics and its empirical base, i.e. to the very foundations of linguistics. That is why, in my view, a bit of pedantry is not out of place.

Strange as it may seem, there appears to be little if any difference between refereed and non-refereed papers with respect to extension and type of incorrect examples. Which, in turn, may undermine the confidence in the much-praised referee system and, in a few

---

<sup>126</sup> I.e. errors of the kind that this author in fact may have made during the compilation of the present inventory.

cases, in the solidity of academic institutions. This shows that linguistic publishing has a problem too. However, further analysis of the findings with respect to editorial practice as well as possible implications for linguistics will be given elsewhere.

## Bibliography (general)

Literature referred to by the present author and a selection of references appearing in the reviewed texts, i.e. titles containing no deficient documentation that will fall within the scope of this report.<sup>127</sup>

- Aass, Kristin Hauge: 1979, *Refleksivitet i moderne norsk. Bruken av seg og sin*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Institutt for nordisk språk og litteratur, Universitetet i Oslo. Oslo, Norway
- Åfarli, Tor Anders: 1985, "Norwegian verb particle constructions as causative constructions". *Nordic journal of linguistics* 8, 75-98
- Åfarli, Tor Anders: 1992, *The syntax of Norwegian passive constructions*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 7) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Åfarli, Tor Anders: 1994, "A promotion analysis of restrictive relative clauses". *Linguistic Review* 11/1, 81-100.
- Åfarli, Tor Anders and Chet Creider: 1987, "Nonsubject pro-drop in Norwegian". *Linguistic inquiry* 18, 339-345
- Askedal, Jon Ole: 1986, "On ergativity in Modern Norwegian". *Nordic journal of linguistics* 9, 25-45
- Austin, Jennifer R., Stefan Engelberg, and Gisa Rauh (eds.): 2004, *Adverbials. The interplay between meaning, context, and syntactic structure*. (*Linguistik Aktuell* 70) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins
- Bach, Edmund: 1974, *Syntactic theory*. New York, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Beito, Olav T.: 1986, *Nynorsk grammatikk. Lyd og ordlære*. [Second edition] Oslo, Norway: Det norske samlaget
- Bentzen, Kristine: 2003, "V-to-I movement in the absence of morphological cues. Evidence from adult and child Northern Norwegian". In Dahl, Anne, Peter Svenonius, and Marit Richardsen Westergaard (eds.): 2003, *Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, vol.31.3: Acquisition*. *Nordlyd* 31/3, 573-588
- Berkov, Valerij P.: 1988, "Resultative, passive and perfect in Norwegian". In Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (ed.): 1988, *Typology of resultative constructions*. [English translation edited by Bernard Comrie] (*Typological studies in language* 12) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins 433-448
- Besten, Johannes [Hans] Bernardus den: 1989, *Studies in West Germanic syntax*. [Doctoral dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, Belgium] Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Rodopi

---

<sup>127</sup> Only those titles that have not already been mentioned in one of the above lists of references.

- Blom, Jan-Petter and John J. Gumperz: 1972, "Social meaning in linguistic structures: Codeswitching in Norway". In Gumperz John J. and Dell Hymes (eds.): 1972, *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York, N.Y.: Holt, Reinhart and Winston 407-434
- Christensen, Kirsti Koch: 1982, "On multiple filler-gap constructions in Norwegian". In Engdahl, Elisabet and Eva Ejerhed (eds.): *Readings in unbounded dependencies in Scandinavian languages*. (Umeå studies in the humanities 43): Umeå, Sweden: 84, 137-158
- Christensen, Kirsti Koch: 1989, "Partisippkongruens, A'-argumenter og hv-flytting". In Jahr, Ernst Håkon and Ove Lorentz (eds.): *Syntaks*. (Studier i norsk språkvitenskap 4) 363-385
- Christensen, Kirsti Koch: 1991, "AGR adjunction and the structure of Scandinavian existential sentences". *Lingua* 84, 137-158
- Christensen, Kirsti Koch and Knut Tarald Taraldsen: 1989, "Expletive chain formation and past participle agreement in Scandinavian dialects". In Benincà, Paola (ed.): 1989, *Dialect variation and the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris 53-83
- Collins, C. and Thráinsson, Höskuldur: 1993, "Object shift in double object constructions and the theory of case". *MIT working papers in linguistics* 19, 131-174
- Comrie, Bernard: 1976, *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. (Cambridge textbooks in linguistics 2) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Creider, Chet A.: 1987 [1986]<sup>128</sup>, "Constituent-gap dependencies in Norwegian. An acceptability study". In Sankoff, David (ed.): 1987, *Diversity and Diachrony*. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series 4, *Current issues in linguistic theory* 53) Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins, 415-424
- Dahl, Östen: 1979, "Typology of sentence negation". *Linguistics* 17, 79-106
- Dalrymple, Mary and Annie Zaenen: 1991. "Modeling anaphoric superiority". Talk given at the International conference on current issues in computational linguistics, Penang, Malaysia
- Delsing, Lars-Olof: (1988), "The Scandinavian noun phrase". *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 42, 57-79
- Diderichsen, Paul: 1937, "Om pronominerne *sig* og *sin*". *Acta Philologica Scandinavica* 13, 1-92
- Diderichsen, Paul: 1968, *Elementær dansk grammatik*. [3<sup>rd</sup> version reprint] Copenhagen, Denmark: Gyldendal

---

<sup>128</sup> 1986 according to the author's own CV: 1986 [http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/anthropology/creider/cac\\_cv.html](http://www.ssc.uwo.ca/anthropology/creider/cac_cv.html) (22 September 2005)

- den Dikken, Marcel: 1991, *Serialization in Europe*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of English, Universiteit Leiden, The Netherlands
- Engdahl, Elisabet: 1984, "Subject gaps. An asymmetry between questions and relatives in Norwegian". *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 7, 1-19
- Engdahl, Elisabet: 1988 [1988b], "Implicational universals: Parametric variation in GB and GPSG". *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax*. 40, 1-25
- Engh, Jan: 1984, "On the Development of Complex Passive". [Paper read at the Second Workshop on Scandinavian Syntax and Theory of Grammar, Biskops-Arnö (Sweden) 1983] *Workingpaper in Scandinavian Syntax* 10, Trondheim, Norway
- Engh, Jan: 1994, *Verb i passiv fulgt av perfektum partisipp. Bruk og historie*. Oslo, Norway: Novus
- Faarlund, Jan Terje: 1981, "Obligatory fronting in a verb-initial language. An attempt at pragmatic syntax". In Hendrick, Roberta A., Carrie S. Masek, and Mary Frances Miller (eds.): *Papers from the seventeenth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. April 30 – May 1, 1981*. [CLS 17]. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago Linguistic Society (University of Chicago) 45-58
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie, Kjell Ivar Vannebo: 1997, *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget
- Fiva, Toril: 1984, "NP-Internal Chains in Norwegian", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 14
- Fiva, Toril: 1987, *Possessor chains in Norwegian*. (*Tromsø-studier i språkvitenskap* 9) Oslo, Norway: Novus
- Fretheim, Thorstein: 1976, "De besværlige hunkjønnssorda." *Dagbladet* 30 March 1976
- Grice, H. Paul: 1967, *Logic and conversation*. Unpublished lecture notes, Harvard
- Gundersen, Dag, Jan Engh, and Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld: 2001. *Språkvett: skrive regler. Grammatikk og språklige råd fra a til å*. Oslo, Norway: Kunnskapsforlaget
- Haegeman, Liliane: (1994), 'Review of T. Aafarli, "The Syntax of Norwegian Passive Constructions", *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today* 7. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company (1992)', *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 17/1, 77-89
- Haga, C.: 1976, "On two movement rules in Norwegian". *University of Washington working papers* 2, 25-31
- Haugen, Einar: 1972, "The inferential perfect in Scandinavian". *The Canadian journal of linguistics* 17, 132-139
- Hellan, Lars: 1988 [1988a], *Anaphora in Norwegian and the theory of grammar*. (*Studies in generative grammar* 32) Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris
- Hellan, Lars: 1988 [1988b], "The phrasal nature of double object clusters". *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 42, 3-24

- Hellan, Lars: 1991, "Containment and connectedness anaphors". In Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.): *Long distance anaphora*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 27-48
- Hestvik, Arild: 1986, "Case theory and Norwegian impersonal constructions: Subject-object alternations in active and passive verbs". *Nordic journal of linguistics* 9, 181-197
- Hestvik, Arild: 1990, "LF-Movement of pronouns and the computation of binding domains". Unpublished doctoral thesis. Brandeis University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (51:4) 1990 Oct., 1213A. (1990)
- Hestvik, Arild: 1992, "LF Movement of pronouns and antisubject orientation". *Linguistic inquiry* 23, 557-594
- Huang, C.-T. James and C.-S. Luther Liu 2001, "Logophoricity, Attitudes and ziji at the Interface". In Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and C.-T. James Huang (eds.): 2001, *Long-distance reflexives (Syntax and semantics 33)* New York, NY: Academic Press 141-195
- Jespersen, Otto: 1960, "Chapters on English". Reprinted in *Selected writings of Otto Jespersen*. London, UK: Allen and Unwin 153-345
- Johanson, Lars: 2000, "Turkic indirectives". In Johanson, Lars and Bo Utas (eds.): 2000, *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages. (Empirical approaches to language typology 24)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 61-87
- Johnsen, Lars: 1988, "A note on subcoordination". *University of Trondheim working papers of linguistics* 6, 195-201
- Josefsson, Gunlög: 1991, "Pseudocoordination - a VP + VP coordination." *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 47, 130-156
- Kayne, Richard S: (1981), "On certain differences between French and English". *Linguistic inquiry* 12, 349-371
- Legate, Julie Anne: 2003, "Some interface properties of the phase". *Linguistic Inquiry* 34/3, 506-516
- Lehmann, Christian: 1985, "Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic change". *Lingua e stile* 20/3, 303-318
- Longobardi, Giuseppe: 1994, "Reference and proper names. A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form". *Linguistic inquiry* 25, 609-665
- Lundeby, Einar: 1965, *Overbestemt substantiv i norsk og de andre nordiske språk. (Scandinavian University Books)* Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget
- Lødrup, Helge: 1989, *Norske hypotagmer. En LFG-beskrivelse av ikke-verbale hypotagmer. (Oslo-studier i språkvitenskap 4)* Oslo, Norway: Novus
- Lødrup, Helge: 1999, "Inalienables in Norwegian and binding theory". *Linguistics* 37/3, 365-388

- Maling, Joan: 1984, "Non-clause-bounded reflexives in modern Icelandic". *Linguistics and philosophy* 7/3, 211-241
- Maling, Joan and Annie Zaenen: 1981, "Germanic word order and surface filters". In Heny, Frank (ed.): 1981, *Binding and filtering. (Croom Helm linguistics series)* London, UK: Croom Helm 255-278
- Marm, Ingvald and Alf Sommerfelt: 1943, *Teach yourself Norwegian: a book of self-instruction in the Norwegian riksmål. (The EUP teach yourself books)* London, UK: English Universities Press [Marm, Ingvald and Alf Sommerfelt: 1981, *Teach yourself Norwegian*. Twelfth impression. Sevenoakes, UK: Hodder and Stoughton. [first edition 1943]
- Mæhlum, Brit: 1996, "Codeswitching in Hemnesberget - Myth or reality?". *Journal of pragmatics* 25/749-761
- Nilsen, Øystein: 2005, "Some notes on cyclic linearization". *Theoretical Linguistics* 31,173-183
- Nilsen, Øystein: 1997, "Adverbs and A-shift". *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 59, 1-32
- Nilsson, Kåre: 1994, *Norsk-portugisisk ordbok*. [Second edition] Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget
- Norsk språkråd: 1999, *Godt språk i lærebøker. Rettleiing i lærebokarbeid. (Norsk språkråds skrifter 6)* Oslo, Norway: Norsk språkråd
- Sandøy, Helge: 1988, "Samsvarbøying av adjektiv og perfektum partisipp i norske dialektar". In Bjørkum, Andreas and Arve Borg (eds.): *Nordiske Studiar. Innlegg på den tredje nordiske dialektologkonferansen 1986. (Skrifter frå Norsk målførearkiv 40)* 85-117. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget<sup>129</sup>
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann: 1993, "The structure of the Icelandic NP". *Studia linguistica* 47/2, 177-197
- Sung, Li-May: 1990, *Universals of reflexives*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]
- Svenonius, Peter: 2001, "Impersonal passives and the EPP. A phase-based analysis". In Holmer, Arthur, Jan-Olof Svantesson and Åke Viberg (eds.): 2001, *Proceedings of the 18th Scaninavian conference of linguistics. (Travaux de l'Institut de linguistique de Lund 39/2)* Lund, Sweden: Lunds universitet 109-125
- Taraldsen, Knut T. 1978 [1978a]. "The scope of *wh*-movement in Norwegian". In Fretheim, Thorstein and Lars Hellan (eds.): 1978: *Papers from the Trondheim syntax symposium 1977*. Trondheim, Norway: Lingvistisk institutt, Universitetet i Trondheim 203-254

---

<sup>129</sup> Svenonius' reference to Sandøy's paper contains an error: "samsvarbøying" (Bokmål) and not "samsvarbøying" (Nynorsk). (Svenonius 1996)

- Taraldsen, Knut T. 1978 [1978b]. "The scope of *wh*-movement in Norwegian". *Linguistic inquiry* 9, 623-640
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald: 1979, "Remarks on some central problems of Norwegian syntax". *Nordic journal of linguistics* 2, 23-54
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald: 1981, "Case-conflict in Norwegian topicalization". Burke, V. and J. Pustejovsky (eds.): 1981, *Proceedings of the eleventh annual meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, Graduate linguistics student association 377-398
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald: 1983, *Parametric variation in phrase structure. A case study*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Universitetet i Tromsø. Tromsø, Norway
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald: 1986, "On verb second and the functional content of syntactic categories". In Haider, Hubert and Martin Prinzhorn (eds.): 1986, *Verb second phenomena in Germanic languages. (Publications in language sciences 21)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris 5-25
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald: 1990, "D-projections are N-projections in Norwegian". In Mascaró, Joan and Marina Nespór (eds.): 1990, *Grammar in progress. GLOW essays for Henk van Riemsdijk. (Studies in generative grammar 36)* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris 419-431
- Vangsnes, Øystein Alexander: 1995, "Referentiality and argument positions in Icelandic". *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 55, 89-109
- Vikner, Sten: 1985: "Parameters of Binder and of Binding Category in Danish". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 23, 1-61
- Vikner, Sten: 1990, *Verb movement and the licensing of NP positions in the Germanic languages*. Doctoral dissertation. Université de Genève, Switzerland
- Vikner, Sten: 1991, "Relative *der* and other C° elements in Danish". *Lingua* 84/2-3, 109-136
- Vikner, Sten: 1994, "Scandinavian object shift and West Germanic scrambling". In Corver, Norbert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.): 1994, *Studies on scrambling. Movement and non-movement approaches to free word-order phenomena. (Studies in generative grammar 41)* Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter 487-517
- Vikør, Lars: 2001, *The Nordic languages. Their status and interrelations*. [3<sup>rd</sup> edition] (*Nordic Language Secretariat. Publication 14*) Oslo, Norway: Novus