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Ja eg har tenkt
at det finst ein stad der barna
er samla før dei blir fødde
der barna er i sjelene sine
Men dei snakkar likevel med kvarandre
på sin eigen mate
i sitt eige englespråk

I've been thinking
that there’s a place where the children
are gathered before they are born
where the children are in their souls
But they are talking to each other anyway
in their own way
with their angel language

From Jon Fosse – «Namnet» /«The Name»
(English translation by Gregory Motton)
Summary

Children acquiring many different languages have been reported to go through a stage where they use finite clauses and non-finite clauses – so-called Root Infinitives – interchangeably. In this thesis I investigate the Norwegian Root Infinitives, such as Jeg lese denne ‘I read this one’, and the Norwegian Root Infinitive stage, using data from 16 files with spontaneous speech from 12 monolingual two-year-olds acquiring Norwegian. The analysis is framed within generative grammar and the minimalist program. I review four different accounts for Root Infinitive in child language (the small-clause hypothesis, the truncation hypothesis, the unique checking constraint hypothesis, and the modal drop hypothesis) in light of the data gathered, and propose a new approach, drawing on the minimalist context-linked grammar of Sigurðsson (2004 and subsequent). Specifically, I propose that Root Infinitives are non-finite clauses, and not finite clauses with something silent or missing. I also argue that there is positive evidence in the child’s input that root clauses do not need to be finite, in form of a special Prescriptive Infinitive that exists in the North Germanic, e.g. gjømme seg inni der ‘hide self inside there’, which is particularly used in child-directed speech. In my analysis, I give an account for the structure of Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives, and show that their differences can be derived from their shared structure, making an overgeneralization account for Root Infinitives quite probable.

Root Infinitives have also been found in children with specific language impairment (SLI), and verb morphology has been proposed as a diagnostic tool for SLI. I discuss what impact the data and analysis provided in this thesis may have on the use of Root Infinitives as a diagnostic marker of SLI.
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1 Introduction

In this thesis I will investigate finiteness in child Norwegian, with emphasis on a specific structure found in some early child languages, around the age of two, namely the so-called Root Infinitive (RI). ¹

Root Infinitives are infinitive verbs that occur as the sole verb in a root clause. These have been described in a range of languages, among others English (e.g., Radford, 1990, pp. 138–170), German (e.g., Clahsen, 1988), Dutch (e.g., Jordens, 1990a), French (e.g., Pierce, 1992), Faroese (Jonas, 1995), Swedish (e.g., Platzack, 1990b), and (Northern) Norwegian (Westergaard, 2009). (See Guasti, 2002, pp. 128–145 and the references there.) Examples from these languages are given in (1).

(1) a. Papa have it English Eve, (1.06) (Guasti, 2002, p. 129)
    b. Thorsten Caeser haben German Andreas (2;01) (Poeppel & Wexler, 1993, p. 6)
        Thorsten C. (=doll) have.INF
    c. eve buiten kijken Dutch Tim (2;01.05–2;03.05) (Jordens, 1990a, p. 1416)
        just outside look.INF
    d. maman manger French Daniel (1;08.01) (Rasetti, 2000, p. 253)
        mummy eat.INF
    e. Osvald mussa hana Faroese Far. O. (2;0) (Jonas, 1995, p. 266)
        O. kiss.INF her
    f. Amma åka buss Swedish Hjalmar (1;08) (L. Christensen, 2003, p. 45)
        hjalmar go-by.INF bus
    g. Jeg lese denne Norwegian Anne 1 (2;04.02) (Present study)
        I read.INF this-one

In a certain period of development, particularly around the age of 2;0, children produce both Root Infinitives and adult-like finite clauses. This has been referred to as the Root Infinitive stage or Optional Infinitive stage.

¹ This structure has been termed Optional Infinitives (OI) by Wexler and colleagues (Schütze & Wexler, 1996b; Wexler, 1994, 1998). This is connected to specific theories for this construction, which I will get back
Over the last 25 years or so, different approaches to Root Infinitives have been proposed. In this study I use spontaneous language data from twelve typically developing two-year-old children, acquiring Norwegian as their L1, to investigate Root Infinitives in child Norwegian, and to test how they are best analysed. I will propose a new analysis based on the Minimalist Context-Linked Grammar outlined in Sigurðsson (2004, and subsequent).

I will also discuss what impacts my findings may have on the understanding of Root Infinitives in Specific Language Impairment (SLI).

1.1 Outline of the thesis

In the remainder of this chapter I give an overview of the characteristics of Root Infinitives as described in the literature (section 1.2), a brief overview of different approaches to Root Infinitives (section 1.3), the connection between Root Infinitives and specific language impairment (SLI) (section 1.3.4), the framework adopted for this thesis – generative grammar – and some of its most central notions (section 1.6), and, finally, a presentation of the research questions of the thesis (section 1.7).

The rest of the thesis is organized as follows. Section 2.1 gives an overview of the syntactic formalism used. Section 2.2 elaborates on the theoretical background regarding theories of language acquisition. Chapter 3 is a presentation of relevant aspects of Norwegian adult grammar. Chapter 4 gives an account and discussion of the methods used in collecting the data. Chapter 5 gives the result of the study. Chapter 6 gives a theoretical discussion based on the results, followed by a summary and proposals for further research in chapter 7.

1.2 Characteristics of Root Infinitives

In this section, I will go through the characteristics of Root Infinitives as described in the literature. The main features of Root Infinitives from the literature are summed up in table 1.
a. There are cross-linguistic differences in the amount of Root Infinitives: specifically in null subject languages Root Infinitives seem to be vanishingly rare.
b. The relative placement of the verb and clausal adverbials in Root Infinitives is adult-like.
c. Root Infinitives seem to be incompatible with non-subject topicalization and/or wh-questions in many languages.
d. There seems to be a relation between Root Infinitives and non-target null subjects in child language.
e. Root Infinitives are predominantly used with a modal interpretation, except in English.

Table 1: Characteristics of the Root Infinitive

Root Infinitives have also been reported to be incompatible with clitics in French (Pierce, 1989, p. 45) and clitics/weak pronouns in Dutch (Haegeman, 1995, p. 234). And finally, auxiliary verbs are not found as Root Infinitives (Poeppel & Wexler, 1993; Wexler, 1994). However, these two points will not further be elaborated in this thesis.

1.2.1 Cross-linguistic differences

As evident from the examples in (1), a Root Infinitive stage exists in many languages, but the frequency of Root Infinitives seems to differ from language to language, being close to non-existent in some. Especially in null subject languages, such as Spanish and Italian, the rate of Root Infinitives seems to be particularly low. Table 2 gives an overview of the percentage of Root Infinitives in a number of languages. Possible differences in designs in the different studies, and different coding difficulties from the different languages, must be borne in mind when comparing the numbers.
Table 2: The rate of Root Infinitives in different languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Age Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1;09–2;06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1;09–2;07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2;02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1;10–2;05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2;01–2;08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1;09–1;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2;01–1;06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2;06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2;03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The rate of Root Infinitives in different languages


1.2.2 Verb placement and negation

Although children use finite verbs and Root Infinitives interchangeably in the Root Infinitive stage, the distribution is not random. In languages like French, German, Dutch, Faroese, Swedish, and Norwegian the verb generally tends to follow the negation or other sentential adverbs in Root Infinitive clauses, and to precede them in finite clauses (Deprez & Pierce, 1993; Jonas, 1995; Pierce, 1992; Plunkett & Strömqvist, 1990; Santelmann, 1995; Waldmann, 2008; Weissenborn, 1990; Westergaard, 2009).

(2) a. pas manger not eat-INF la poupé the doll (Wexler, 1994, pp. 309–310)

b. est pas mort Is not dead

c. nicht aua machen not ouch make-INF

d. macht nicht aua make.PRES not ouch

e. ik ook doen I also do-INF Tim (2:01–2:03) (Jordens, 1990a, pp. 1415–1416),

f. kan niet open can not open Tim (2:01–2:03)
Furthermore, children acquiring the Germanic SOV languages German and Dutch seem to systematically use «finite verb forms in first or second position […] and non-finite verb forms in final position» (Jordens, 1990, p. 1416; see the examples (2c-f). See also Poeppel & Wexler, 1993). Both the different verb placement in the SOV languages and the relative placement of the verb and sentential adverbs, as discussed above and exemplified in (2), are target-like in these languages.
1.2.3 Root Infinitives and Null Subjects

In non-null subject languages – languages that have a general subject requirement – young children in the age of interest here often omit subjects. Some examples are given in 3.

(3) a. ikke sitte denne Benedikte (2;01.06) (present study)
   not sit.INF this

   b. være her William (2;5.22)
   be.INF here

Cross-linguistically, children acquiring these languages omit the subject in Root Infinitives proportionally more often than in finite clauses (Haegeman, 1995; Hamann & Plunkett, 1998; Rasetti, 2000). (So-called «Root Null Subjects», see Guasti, 2002, pp. 163–172 and the references there.) According to Phillips (1996, p. 593), this difference is either non-existent or less significant in English, than the other Germanic languages.

There are also similarities between Root Infinitives and Null Subjects in child language, as both are reported to appear rarely in wh-questions and topicalizations (Guasti, 2002, p. 159) (see the next section). Hamann and Plunkett (1998) also found a high correlation between null subjects in finite clauses and Root Infinitives (p. 60) in Danish child language, indicating that Null Subjects and Root Infinitives are related phenomena. The same is found for French child language by Rasetti (2000).

In English child language, the subjects of Root Infinitives are often reported to have accusative case. This will be discussed further in section 1.3.3 and 6.3.

---

2 We find the same in adult Norwegian (topic-drop), although to a lesser extent than in child language, and predominantly with 1st person singular pronoun, and always clause initial.

   i. (jeg) har ikke tid nå
      (I) have not time now
      ‘(I) don’t have time now’

   ii. ?(han) har ikke tid nå
      (he) have not time now
      ‘(he) doesn’t have time now’

   iii. nå har *(jeg) ikke tid
      now have (I) not time
      ‘now (I) haven’t got time’
1.2.4 Topicalization and *wh*-questions

Both topicalizations and (non-subject) *wh*-questions have a constituent other than the subject that has been fronted to the left edge of the clause. Target-like examples from my own data are given in (4).

(4) a. den skal jeg ta Ingrid 2 topicalization that one shall I take (2;10.28) ‘that one I’ll take’

b. hvem er det da? Magnus 2 *wh*-question who is that then (2;09.22) ‘who’s that, then?’

c. hva sier toget? Anne 1 *wh*-question what says the train (2;04.02) ‘what does the train say?’

In verb second (V2) languages (such as Scandinavian, German and Dutch), where the finite verb is obligatorily in second position, non-subject topicalizations seem to be incompatible with Root Infinitives (Guasti, 2002, p. 132; Poeppel & Wexler, 1993).

In Mainland Scandinavian, German, Dutch and French (at least), Root Infinitives seem to be incompatible with *wh*-questions, but not in English, where Root Infinitives are common in *wh*-questions (Bromberger & Wexler, 1995; Westergaard, forthcoming). This is seen in examples such as (5).

(5) a. what the dolly have? Eve (1;11) (Westergaard, forthcoming).

In French and other Romance languages, fronting the *wh*-word is sometimes optional, and it is grammatical to leave it *in-situ* – so-called *wh*-in-*situ*. Children at a young stage (pre 2;06) are reported to produce disproportionately many *wh*-in-*situ* questions compared to adult data (e.g., Zuckerman & Hulk, 2001). Some examples of child *wh*-in-*situ* are given in (6).

(6) a. marche sur quoi Cedric Augustin (Hamann, 2000, p. 179)
wants on what C. (2;06.16) ‘on what does C. walk’

b. est où maman is where mummy ‘where is mummy’
Hamann (2000) noted in her data from child French that «RIs occur in neither question type [fronted wh or wh in situ]» (p. 180).

Although RIs are generally not found in wh-questions and topicalizations in Norwegian and Swedish, both Westergaard (2009, forthcoming) and Josefsson (2002) report some stray examples: «It is true that such findings are rare, even though they are not totally absent» (Josefsson, 2002, p. 301). Some examples are given in (7).

(7) b. det jeg gjøre Lucas 2 topicalization (present study) that I do.INF (2;04.02)
   a. kor æ legge den hen? Ina wh-question (Westergaard, 2009, p. 218)
   Where I lay.INF it LOC (2;07.08)

1.2.5 Modal interpretation

Root Infinitives have been reported to get a root modal/intentional interpretation in many languages (e.g., Hoekstra & Hyams, 1998; Ingram & Thompson, 1996). This has been termed the ‘modal reference effect’ by Hoekstra and Hyams (1998). (See Hyams, 2012 for an overview.). This is nicely summed up in the following quote from L. Christensen (2003) on the «temporal types» of Root Infinitives:

*“A main temporal type at the root infinitive stage is the intentional or deontic (immediate) future [...] where] the child by his utterance is expressing what he wants to do himself or what he wants someone else to do in the immediate future.”* (L. Christensen, 2003, p. 42)

The same has been noted for child Norwegian by Westergaard (2009), who proposes that this is due to a missing auxiliary: «[T]he context shows that these [Root Infinitives with negations] are constructions where there is an auxiliary missing, typically a modal» (p. 121) (cf. section 1.3.4). An example, with disambiguating context is given in (8).

(8) a. Magnus: pappa lese denne Magnus 1 (present study) daddy read.INF this (2;03.10)
   Father skal pappa lese gruffalo?
   ‘do you want daddy to read (the book about) Gruffalo?’

The same fact has been argued to be evident from the fact that Root Infinitives are used more often with eventive predicates than stative predicates in ‘modal reference effect’
languages – the so-called «eventivity constraint» (e.g., Hockstra & Hyams, 1998; Wijnen, 1998). In English, however, none of these effects are found in Root Infinitives (Hyams, 2012).

Eventive predicates are predicates that denote a process or transition, such as *play outside* in the Root Infinitive in (9a), whereas stative predicates are predicates that denote a state, such as *want apple* in the Root Infinitive in (9b).

(9) a. Niekje buiten spelen
    N. outside play-INF
    Niek (=Speaker) wants to play outside

b. Papa want apple

The reason this can be related to modal interpretation is that root/deontic modality prototypically selects eventive predicates, whereas this is not the case for epistemic modality (see e.g., Eide, 2005). Compare (10a) and (10b). Furthermore, children are generally found to not acquire epistemic modality before around age three, i.e., after the alleged Root Infinitive stage, and much later than root/deontic modality (see e.g., Papafragou, 1998 and references there). Thus, the relative predominance of eventive predicates in Root Infinitive yields quantitative indications that Root Infinitives are, in some sense, root modal.

(10) a. He must need help
    = ‘it must be the case that he needs help’
    Epistemic modality

b. You must get help
    = ‘you ought to/should get help’
    Root/deontic modality

This subject will be elaborated in section 6.4.

1.3 Different approaches to Root Infinitives

The Root Infinitives have been subject of extensive study and different theories have been proposed to account for them. In this section I present a short review of four of these
approaches: the small-clause hypothesis, the truncation hypothesis, the Unique Checking Constraint hypothesis (UCC), and the modal drop hypothesis.  

1.3.1 Small-clause hypothesis

In order to explain the Small-clause hypothesis, and some of the other hypotheses of Root Infinitives I will give below, I need to introduce the three-layered CP–TP–vP structure (see Platzack, 2010). This is standardly assumed to be the structure of all clauses in all languages, whether they have material present in all three layers or not. We will return to the actual workings of this structure in chapter 2.1, but for now the simplified representation in (11) will have to suffice.

(11)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
vP
\end{array}
\]

(a) \(\text{den}_i\text{ skal} \text{jeg ta} \text{den}_i\text{ that-one will I take.INF that-one}

(b) \(\text{hva} / \text{toff-toff}_i \text{sier}_j \text{toget sier}_j \text{hva} / \text{toff toff}_i \text{what / choo choo says the.train says what / choo choo}

The vP is responsible for argument structure (it describes the event and introduces its participants. The TP is responsible for verbal inflection, connecting the proposition expressed in the vP to a timeline, e.g., with an auxiliary in (11a), or present tense inflection in (11b), which in Norwegian involves verb movement. (It is common to assume that the inflected verb as well as the subject move further up in the structure in Norwegian, but this is irrelevant for the discussion here.) The CP represents the left periphery, where topicalized elements and \(w/h\)-question-words are inserted or moved (The syntactic derivation will be elaborated in section 2.1.).

---

3 Hypotheses that propose that Root Infinitives is due to incomplete acquisition of morpho-phonology, such as the Surface Account of Leonard (1989), fail to explain any of the characteristics outlined in the previous sections, and will therefore not be considered in this thesis.
The hypotheses I call *small-clause hypotheses* here, state that in early child language, there is no structure above the vP (Platzack, 1990; Radford, 1990, *inter alia*), making child utterances comparable to *small-clauses* such as the words inside the square brackets in (12) (cf. e.g., Åfarli & Eide, 2003, pp. 175-179).

(12) Aïda hørte [toget si tøff tøff]  
A. heard [the-train say choo choo]

In a discussion of Swedish Root Infinitives, Platzack (1990a) has suggested that child language is deprived of functional categories (cf. Radford, 1990 inter alia), and that «sequences of words uttered by children at this stage can be described within the limits of VP» (p. 17), viz., that «the concept of finiteness does not play any syntactic role» (p. 20). In other words, verbs may have a finite or infinitive form, but the child will treat them as the same. This would explain why we don’t find Root Infinitives in topicalizations and *wh*-questions, as the children do not have the structure to support it, viz., the CP.

However, Platzack (1992) challenges Platzack (1990a) and proposes to split Early Swedish into Early Early Swedish and Late Early Swedish, because of the relative order of finite verbs and the negative adverbial. The latter stage, he assumes, has structures that need to be explained with structure above the vP (but not necessarily always), while children in the former stage never do.

### 1.3.2 Truncation hypothesis

Somewhat similar to the small-clause hypothesis is the truncation hypothesis (Rizzi, 1993/1994, 2000). According to this hypothesis, children’s clauses need not be whole CPs. The structure can be *truncated* anywhere below the CP, the result being that every projection above the truncation is deleted as well. Lack of TP implies lack of tense, rendering Root Infinitives. Because of the *truncation mechanism*, the CP will consequently also be deleted. Therefore there is no structure in Root Infinitives to support *wh*-questions or topicalizations (Rizzi, 1993/1994, p. 380).

### 1.3.3 Unique Checking Constraint hypothesis

Wexler’s (1998) Unique Checking Constraint (UCC) hypothesis builds on his earlier Optional Infinitive account (e.g., Wexler, 1994) and the Agreement/Tense Omission Model
(ATOM) (e.g., Schütze & Wexler, 1996a). These approaches presuppose that the TP in (11) is split into an AgrP, responsible for subject–verb agreement, and a TP, responsible for tense. ATOM assumes that the child in the Optional Infinitive stage, where they interchangeably use Root Infinitives and finite clauses, optionally can omit the TP or the AgrP (or both). In either option – the omission of TP or the omission of AgrP – the verb will often lack tense or agreement inflection, which in English will result in a bare verb stem. In this approach, as opposed to Rizzi’s (1993/1994) truncation theory, it is just the one or two projections that are missing from the structure. The CP is still intact.

The motivation for ATOM was that children in the Optional Infinitive often use accusative case on the subject (him not go) or drop the subject altogether. Schütze and Wexler (1996a) and Wexler (1998) assume that AgrP licenses nominative case, and when this is omitted, the subject receives default case, which in English is accusative. When TP is omitted, Schütze and Wexler (1996a) and Wexler (1998) propose that a null subject PRO is licensed, as in non-finite structures in English (Mary tried [PRO to leave]) instead of an overt subject.4

Building on the ATOM model, and inspired by Chomsky’s Minimalist Program (Chomsky, 1995 and subsequent), Wexler (1998) proposed the Unique Checking Constraint (UCC). A more detailed explanation of UCC will be given in chapter 6.3. For now it will suffice to say that UCC presupposes a constraint on the child’s grammar which obstructs her from satisfying the needs of both TP and AgrP, whereby one of them must be omitted.5

1.3.4 Modal drop hypotheses

As mentioned in section 1.2.5, Root Infinitives are reported to often get a modal interpretation (the modal reference effect) and are predominantly used with eventive predicates (the eventivity constraint, Hoekstra & Hyams, 1998). This has led some scholars to propose that Root Infinitives involve missing or silent (modal) auxiliaries (e.g., Hyams, 2012; Jordens, 1990a, 1990b; Josefsson, 2002; Westergaard, 2009, forthcoming). That children often omit auxiliaries was noted already in Brown (1973), and Wijnen (1998) argues, for Dutch, «that temporal reference of these [RI] constructions is essentially free»

4 That the subject is dropped also in finite clauses in child language, is explained as a Topic- or Diary-drop (Wexler, 1998).

5 Technically, Wexler (1998) proposes that there are uninterpretable D-features [uD] in both Agr° and T°, but the child’s grammar initially has a constraint that disallows the subject’s D-feature to check off more than one of the [uD] features (the UCC). Therefore, the [uD] in Agr° or T° would remain unchecked, whereby one of the categories must be omitted, otherwise the derivation will crash.
(p. 396), although a use «which is similar to the effect of a modal auxiliary such as wil (want) or the inchoative auxiliary gaat (is going to) is observed most frequently» (p. 396). To explain why English doesn’t show the modal reference effect or the eventivity constraint, Hyams (2012) proposes an English null do, which is modally (and aspectually) neutral.

The modal drop hypotheses can account for all the characteristics of Root Infinitives mentioned in section 1.2, except for the incompatibility with topicalizations and wh-questions in some languages (as pointed out by Poeppel and Wexler, 1993 and Wexler, 1994, but see Westergaard, forthcoming). The target-like placement of negation and verb and the modal interpretation are readily explained as this patterns as expected if the Root Infinitives involved missing auxiliaries (cf. section 2.1.5). This also explains why auxiliaries never seem to occur as Root Infinitives.

1.3.5 Section conclusion
Although all these approaches have their explanatory strengths, I will argue in chapter 6 that none of them are completely satisfactory, either on empirical or theoretical grounds. The question of how RIs should be understood and analysed still remains unanswered in a satisfactory way.

1.4 Root Infinitives in adult language
Some scholars have pointed out that Root Infinitives are not non-existent in adult languages either (Haegeman, 1995; Lasser, 2002; Kupisch & Rinke, 2007, inter alia). Many of the proposals mentioned above assume that all adult root clauses are finite, or that root clauses with infinitives in adult language are marked or special. Wijnen (1998) writes that «in adult Dutch, infinitives are not allowed as independent predicates, with the exception of a small number of marked cases» (p. 386, my emphasis), and Rizzi (1993/1994) writes that «natural languages allow them [RIs] in some special constructions» (p. 375, my emphasis), devaluing whatever impact these structures might have on language acquisition in the respective languages. On the other hand, Lasser (2002) argues that the adult Root Infinitives must be taken into account in the description and analysis of child Root Infinitives, and that the approaches mentioned above «make inadequate predictions about children’s linguistic behaviour subsequent to the so-called optional-infinitive stage» (p. 767). In what follows I
present an adult Root Infinitive structure I argue to have a noteworthy impact on child language.

An adult root infinitive with an imperative-like meaning has been described for both Romance and Germanic languages, and goes under different monikers: Hortative infinitive, Jussive infinitive or Prescriptive Infinitive. Some examples with references are given in (13).

(13) a. **partire** immediatamente! Italian (Rizzi, 1993/1994, p. 375)

  leave-INF immediately

b. ne pas le **toucher**!

  French (Haegeman, 1995, p. 206)

  ‘don’t touch it!’

c. nicht **stossen**!


  ‘don’t hit yourself!’

d. Hier geen fietsen **plaatsen**!

  Dutch (Wijnen, 1998, p. 387)

  ‘Don’t park your bicycle here!’

e. **ikkje** **spise** den!

  Norwegian (Johannessen, submitted)

  not eat-INF it

  ‘don’t eat it!’

f. inte **hälla** mjölken!

  Swedish (Johannessen, submitted)

  not pour-INF the-milk

  ‘don’t pour the milk!’

g. **tørre** din næse

  Danish (Johannessen, submitted)

  dry-INF your nose

h. **ekki** **sitja** héra

  Icelandic (Johannessen, submitted)

  not sit-INF here

  ‘don’t sit here’

Since Johannessen (submitted) gives the most extensive account of these constructions in Norwegian and other North Germanic languages, I will adopt her term, *Prescriptive Infinitive*, in this thesis.

According to Johannessen (submitted), the Prescriptive Infinitives in North Germanic languages are predominantly «used in a very limited pragmatic context of a pleasant
atmosphere by adults towards very young children», and she therefore calls them «Child-directed Prescriptive Infinitives». This detail makes them even more relevant for us. The Norwegian Prescriptive Infinitive and its characteristics are discussed in section 3.2

There are other Root Infinitives in adult Norwegian as well. Apart from different elided structures, Norwegian also has the «Mad Magazine sentence», (a term coined by Akmajian, 1984). An example is given in (14). Although this construction is found in many languages (see e.g., Etxepare & Grohmann, 2005; Lambrecht, 1990), I have heard none in our adult data (as opposed to Prescriptive Infinitives, of which there are plenty), and I will just mention it here.

(14) André jobbe på en lørdag!? aldr! ‘André work on a Saturday!? Never!’

### 1.5 Finiteness and SLI

Verb morphology has been considered especially problematic for children with specific language impairment (SLI), even to the extent that it has been proposed as a clinical marker or diagnostic tool (Rice & Wexler, 1996; Hanne Gram Simonsen & Bjerkan, 1998). Some scholars have proposed that these problems in SLI children are an extended period of the Root Infinitive stage which Typically Developing (TD) children go through (cf. Leonard, 2014, pp. 241–270 and the references there). Thus, the relevance of SLI in the present study is twofold. First, assessing the development of an adult-like system of finiteness in typically developing children can be useful in diagnosing and assessing the development of children with SLI. Second, the way we understand and analyse Root Infinitives in typical language development will have an impact on how we understand Root Infinitives in impaired language development. The data in this study are the norming data of the N-LARSP chart (Kristoffersen, Simonsen, Ribu, Løver, & Strand, forthcoming), the Norwegian adaptation of LARSP (Language Assessment Remediation and Screening Procedure; Crystal, 1979; Crystal, Fletcher, & Garman, 1976). LARSP is a procedure for screening children with SLI, which should make the data apt for a discussion of Root Infinitives in SLI in light of the findings in this thesis.

---

6 SLI is a language impairment that cannot be ascribed to other cognitive of physiological deficits. See section 2.3.
As mentioned above, problems with verb morphology in SLI have been proposed as a prolonged Root Infinitive stage, and the theories vary as to how Root Infinitives are analysed, i.e., a delay rather than a deviance. Other accounts see the problems with verb morphology in SLI as a deviance in the grammar. One of the approaches in favour of a delay-account is the Surface Account of Leonard (1989) that sees Root Infinitives in SLI as incomplete acquisition of morpho-phonology, due to difficulties with perception of inflectional affixes, due to their relatively short duration and amplitude and therefore low salience in the input. This again results in incomplete inflectional paradigms. According to Leonard (1989), SLI children have a prolonged Root Infinitive stage because «these children are especially limited in their ability to perceive grammatical elements» (1989, p. 186), and therefore need a larger amount of input in order to correctly acquire inflectional paradigms.

Another delay account for verb morphology problems in SLI is the Extended Unique Checking Constraint hypothesis (EUCC) (Wexler, 2003), where the SLI children have the same constraint on their grammar – the Unique Checking Constraint – as TD children, but for a longer period (cf. sections 1.3.3 and 6.3).

Other accounts, which we can call deviance-accounts, view the cause of the difficulties with verb morphology observed in SLI children as a deviant grammar, rather than a delayed one. One of these accounts is the Representational Deficit for Dependent Relations (RDDR) hypothesis (see e.g., van der Lely, 1998). In RDDR, the deviant grammar of SLI children is seen as deficiency in the syntactic operation move (cf. section 2.1).

I argue that the dichotomy between deviance or delay explanations for Root Infinitives in SLI can be construed as whether it is a deviance in the grammatical system that has a direct or indirect effect on it in the former case, or if it is just a side effect of a deficiency in another, more peripheral system in the latter case. If the deviance is grammatical and has a direct effect, we would expect the Root Infinitive stage in SLI children to be deviant from TD children and not just prolonged. Conversely, if the deviance was a more peripheral one, one could expect that it had an impact on the processing of linguistic data, with the effect that the SLI child would need more input to acquire rules and constraints, resulting in a delayed acquisition.
For reasons of space and because the language of TD children is the main focus of this thesis, I am prevented from elaborating on the subject and the different theories here. We will however return to SLI in section 2.3. The topic of delay vs. deviance in light of the data and analysis provided in this thesis is discussed section 6.6.

1.6 Theoretical framework

I frame this study within generative theory and the minimalist research program (Chomsky, 1993 and subsequent). I view language as a «device», able to generate an infinite number of sentences based on finite means. This «device» – the generative component – involves innate principles specific to language, distinct from other human cognitive abilities.

The generative grammar is a part of the speaker’s competence («the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language» Chomsky, 1965, p. 4), as distinguished from her performance («the actual use of language in concrete situations» Chomsky, 1965, p. 4). The speaker’s competence is also called the internalized language (I-language), and is the object of study in this approach to language. In a dichotomous relation with I-language is the notion of Externalized Language (E-Language). E-Language is «the notion of language as a collection (or system) of actions or behaviours of some sort» (Chomsky, 1986, p. 20), i.e., language as a sum of performances, such as the notion of a specific languages (e.g., English or Norwegian).

Central to generative grammar, is the notion of a Faculty of Language (FL). FL is a part of the human cognitive capacity, particularly dedicated to language, and shared by all humans. An I-language is thus a state of the FL, and the starting point – the initial state of FL – is Universal Grammar (UG) (Chomsky, 2007, p. 1; 2013, p. 33). The study of language acquisition is thus the study of the transition from a «blank» UG to particular I-languages. Details are given in section 2.2. As will be evident I will assume that:

• there are no child specific principles of grammar.
• the C-T-v structure is universal.

7 I-language is understood as «some element of the mind of the person who knows the language, acquired by the learner, and used by the speaker-hearer» (Chomsky, 1986, p. 22), i.e., the specific, individual grammar, which is the result of forces driving language acquisition and variation just mentioned above.
there is micro-parametric variation, as outlined in section 2.2.1, where we assume that language acquisition basically involves learning which features are connected to which categories (cf. section 2.1).

1.7 Research questions

My research questions take as a point of departure the descriptions, analyses, and hypotheses outlined above. The new data gathered and the analysis given in this thesis may throw light on the acquisition of verbal morphosyntax in typically developing children, and possibly also atypical developing children learning Norwegian.

1. Is there a Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian child language?

2. How should Root Infinitives be understood within the theoretical framework of generative minimalist syntax?

   2.1 To what extent do the four hypotheses outlined above (the small-clause hypothesis, the truncation hypothesis, the unique checking constraint hypothesis, and the modal drop hypothesis) give satisfactory analyses of Root Infinitives, empirically and theoretically?

   2.2 Can a more satisfactory analysis of the Root Infinitive be given, based on new data from Norwegian child language?

3. What impact will the analysis put forward in this thesis have on Root Infinitives as a diagnostic marker for Specific Language Impairment, in particular within the N-LARSP scheme?

The research questions will be addressed through a combination of empirical data and theoretical discussion. The study is mainly qualitative in nature, but makes use of statistical methods to identify patterns in the data and trends in the development.
2 Theoretical background

In this chapter, I will sketch out the syntactic formalism of this thesis (section 2.1), elaborate on the approach to language acquisition introduced in section 1.6 (section 2.2), and give a further discussion on SLI (section 2.3). (The specific formalism used in my analysis builds on the formalism outlined in the following section, and will be sketched out in section 6.5.)

2.1 Syntactic theory

In this chapter I will outline the syntactic formalism I will use in this thesis.

2.1.1 The X-bar scheme and the CP-TP-vP system

Central for most modern models in transformational generative grammar, is the notion of projection: a head drawn from the lexicon projects – or «builds» – its own syntactic structure. The head X (often X°) projects a middle projection (X’, or X-bar), and a maximal projection (XP). The derivation of grammatical clauses proceeds in the manner described in the ensuing chapter. All projections are taken to be binary branching, see (15), allowing for a sister of the head (ZP) – the comp(lement) position – and a sister of the bar-projection (YP) – the spec(ificator) position. (See e.g., Hornstein, Nunes, & Grohmann, 2005, Chapter 6)

(15)  
```
   XP
  /\  
(YP) X'
  /\  
 X (ZP)
```

We assume there are three different levels or domains of the syntactic derivation, each bearing specific functions. These are often referred to as the v-domain, the T-domain, and the C-domain.
The v-domain, also called «the lexical layer» (Rizzi, 1997, p. 281), is headed by a verbal element, and establishes argument structure and event structure. The T-domain introduces inflectional features, such as tense, aspect, and subject-verb agreement. The C-domain is responsible for introducing information about the (linguistic or extra-linguistic) context to the syntax. In a matrix clause, this includes temporal information, temporally anchoring the clause to the speech event, information about the speech event participants, such as the addressee(s), and old and new information in the discourse (e.g., Platzack, 2010, p. 98). For a subordinate clause the structure is basically the same, but the C-domain establishes the connection to the matrix clause.

Each domain is often thought to have several projections, the number, names and functions of which differ between scholars. In the illustration above the three domains have been collapsed for simplicity.

As Epstein, Thráinsson, and Zwart (1996) put it, a «standard distinction exists in linguistic theory between contentful elements and functional elements. Word stems [here: roots, cf. section 2.1.4] are contentful elements, whereas inflectional morphemes are functional elements» (p. 11). Contentful elements are elements such as verbs and nouns. Functional elements are harder to define, but may convey morphological notions that are often expressed by inflectional morphemes, such as tense and definiteness. Often, however, they are present without phonetic form in the syntactic derivation, or only indirectly through movement of other elements (cf. section 2.1.3). The division of labour between functional and lexical elements is subject to some debate, but this lies outside the scope of the present thesis.
2.1.2 The syntactic derivation

In most transformational accounts of syntax (Chomsky, 1993 [1981] and subsequent), it is assumed that the syntax interacts with two «external systems: «the articulatory-perceptual system A-P and the conceptual-intentional system C-I» (Chomsky, 1995, p. 2). Simply put, A-P is responsible for the sensory-motor component of language processing, transforming grammatical symbols into sound or signs (or arguably letters) in language production, or vice versa in language perception. C-I is responsible for the thought component of language processing, involving whatever part of cognition adhering to that (Chomsky, 2013).

Consequently, there are two interfaces between the syntax and the two external systems: Logic Form (LF) to C-I, and Phonetic Form (PF) to A-P. These interfaces have several conditions that need to be satisfied in order for the syntactic derivation to be interpretable at each of the external systems A-P and C-I. According to minimalist theory, these criteria are the main driving force of the syntax. This is the hypothesis of minimal design: «a theory of language that takes a linguistic expression to be nothing other than a formal object that satisfies the interface conditions in an optimal way» (Chomsky, 1993, p. 5).

In an operation called Spell-Out, the syntactic derivation splits and is sent to LF and PF, where it is objected to further operations separately. Before Spell-Out, all the interface conditions must have been met, or the derivation will crash.

![Figure 1: The derivational language mechanism. Adapted from Epstein et al. (1996, p. 5).](image)

The interface conditions are construed as a restriction in the interfaces that some features in the derivation are uninterpretable for C-I (or, for some features, possibly A-P), and need to be deleted before Spell-Out. (Features are discussed below.) In order to delete the uninterpretable features, the syntax has two mechanisms available: Merge and Agree.
There are two types of Merge: *external* merge and *internal* merge. External merge combines two elements, while internal merge makes a copy of one element in the structure and merges that copy somewhere else in the same structure (cf. e.g. Platzack, 2010).\(^8\) Agree will be introduced below.

### 2.1.3 Features

The interface conditions introduced above are conceived in terms of grammatical features, in the manner outlined above and in this section. In line with Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), I assume that features can be valued/unvalued and interpretable/uninterpretable. Interpretable features are features that contribute to the semantic interpretation of the head where it resides (Pesetsky & Torrego, 2007, p. 264), i.e., it is interpretable by the conceptual-intentional system (C-I), thus, it can be sent to the interface (LF). If a feature does not contribute to the semantic interpretation, it is uninterpretable by C-I, and must be checked through Agree (and deleted) by another instance of the same feature.

Unvalued features are features that need to receive a value from a valued instance of the same feature – a matching feature – before Spell-Out or the derivation will crash (Pesetsky & Torrego, 2007, p. 263).

Feature checking is done by a head with a feature that needs to be checked (for the reasons described above) – a *probe* – searching within its C-command domain\(^9\) for a head with features that can satisfy the probe – a *goal*. This is the mechanism referred to as *A*gree.

Some features are marked EPP, which indicates that the matching of that feature need to be visible for the articulatory-perceptual (A-P) system. This is made visible through the goal being merged either to the head where the feature resides, or in the specifier of the head through internal merge. The EPP feature is then deleted. (Platzack, 2010, pp. 78-79).

---

\(^8\) Internal merge is often called *move*, as the operation moves one element from one place in the structure to another place in the structure, leaving a *copy* or a *trace*, depending on the specific framework.

\(^9\) C-command is defined as follows. «Node A c-commands node B iff (a) A ≠ B, (b) A does not dominate B and B does not dominate A [i.e., neither is the mother node of the other], and (c) every X that dominates A also dominates B» (C-command). The C-commanding domain of A comprises of all nodes that are C-commanded by A.
An important class of features for the discussion in this thesis is φ-features (the Greek letter phi). φ-features are features such as number, person and gender, which for example can have implication for subject–verb and noun–adjective agreement.

2.1.4 Late insertion and distributed morphology

In the analysis in this thesis I will assume a Late insertion-theory of morphology along the lines of Distributional Morphology as sketched out in Halle and Marantz (1994). In this name lies that the different morphological properties are distributed into separate modules, rather than being representations of sound/meaning-pairs stored in a single list. In the following, I will present the procedure sketched out in Harley (2015) inter alia.

Instead of one list, distributed morphology assumes that there are three. The first list is the list that is needed for the syntactic derivation. Since the syntactic derivation in minimalist syntax is assumed to be nothing more than an operation to satisfy the interface criteria, and the interface criteria involve features, I assume that this list contains feature bundles, both functional and contentful. The contentful elements are roots, which often are represented as «abstract roots» with a numerical address (e.g., ROOT\textsubscript{347}), where the numerical address works as an instruction to the two other lists. A subset of this list to be inserted in syntax – the numeration – is manipulated by the syntactic operations Merge and Agree to build a syntactic structure that can satisfy the interface criteria before Spell-Out. At Spell-Out, the syntactic structure has several terminal nodes («end branches» on the syntactic tree). The syntactic structure is then sent both to LF and PF as described above. At PF, the terminal nodes need to be filled with phonetic content. Elements from a second list – a list of vocabulary items – then race or compete to fill the terminal nodes with phonological content. The vocabulary item has a phonetic form and a set of features, and the vocabulary item with the most complete subset of the features in the terminal node becomes «victorious» and is inserted into the node. At LF, further operations are possibly applied before the semantic interpretation of the feature bundles and the roots in the terminal nodes are supplied from the third list, which is connected to the (mental) encyclopedia.

Since we now operate with three lists instead of one, we need to revise the derivational model in figure 1 somewhat.
2.1.5 Verb inflection in the syntactic derivation

There are two functional categories that are specially connected to verb inflection, and thus particularly interesting to us here: finiteness and tense. As we will see in chapter 6, there are several ways this can be analysed. For clarity, I will present a possible, and somewhat rudimentary derivation of a finite root clause here.

A root (e.g. ROOT₃₄₇, which at C–I will get the meaning ‘RUN’) is merged into a vP.¹⁰ v°, now bearing the root, has an uninterpretable, valued tense feature, e.g. \([u_r: \text{PAST}]\). The vP is further merged into the complement of a negation phrase (NegP), which has a negation in it. The NegP, with the vP inside of it, is further merged into the complement of a TP. T° has an interpretable, unvalued tense feature, \([i_r: \_]\), which needs to be valued before Spell Out and acts as a probe. T° finds v° in its C-commanding domain, enters into an agree-relation with it, and inherits its value (Pesetsky & Torrego, 2007).¹¹

The TP is further merged into the complement position of the CP. Rizzi (1997) has proposed that the CP is split into several functional projections, as sketched out below – the so-called split CP. The topmost projection, ForceP, encodes the «illocutionary force» of the utterance (cf. Searle, 1976), i.e., whether it is an interrogative, an imperative, an exclamative, or a declarative and so forth is marked in Force°. The lowest projection of the split CP,

---

¹⁰ It is often assumed that roots are first merged into structure as root phrases (√P), which later are inserted into noun phrases (nP) or verb phrases (vP). Thus, the root ROOT₃₄₇ can get a verbal form and interpretation, e.g. ran or a nominal form and interpretation, e.g. (a) run. This operation is of less importance to us here.

¹¹ Any use of temporal expressions, such as then, before or now, in the discussion of the syntactic derivation throughout this thesis, should not be taken as indications that I imply some specific temporality or chronology of the derivation. The model outlined here is not meant to be a description of brain activity, but a formal representation of the principle we believe to underlie it.
Fin(iteness)P encodes finiteness (the functions of finiteness will be sufficiently elaborated from section 6.5.1 and on). The other projections, TopP and FocP, are of less importance here, and will not concern us further.

Continuing on the syntactic derivation, I assume there to be an unvalued finiteness feature in Fin°, and that this feature is EPP-marked ([EPP]). Being EPP-marked, it demands to be overtly checked by movement to itself or its specifier position, in this case by the finite verb. Therefore, the finite verb in v° moves to Fin°, crucially past the NegP. For reasons we do not need to get into here, let us assume a subject DP, which has been merged into Spec-vP, and moved into Spec-TP, moves lastly to Spec-FinP, creating the V2 effect (cf. e.g., Platzack, 2010). We have thus arrived at the clause in (17): Audun løper ikke ‘Audun isn’t running’.

(17)
If an auxiliary were to be inserted, the auxiliary would be finite and move to Fin\(^{\circ}\), while the main verb would be non-finite and left in \(v^{\circ}\), not crossing the negation.

### 2.2 Language acquisition

The question of language acquisition – how children acquire such a complex system as a language in such a quick and seemingly effortless manner – has been one of the primary locomotors of linguistic theory in the 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century. First, behaviourist psychologists proposed that language was merely a set of rules that had to be automatized (see Skinner, 1957). In this theory, the child was assumed to mimic the language in her environment (the stimuli). She was assumed to be «rewarded» (e.g., by a positive response, or an indication that she has been understood) for uttering something «correctly», in which case the rule was *positively reinforced*. If the child would utter something «incorrectly», the child would be «punished» (e.g., by correction, or by not being understood), in which case the rule would be *negatively reinforced*.

In his 1959 critique of Skinner’s book, Chomsky argued that the behaviourist view could not be upheld. Children (and adults) end up with a grammar that can comprehend and produce utterances which they have never before encountered (cf. section 1.6 on the «generative component»), and that they cannot have been «rewarded» for. In Chomsky’s words:

> *It appears that we recognize a new item as a sentence not because it matches some familiar item in any simple way, but because it is generated by the grammar that each individual has somehow and in some form internalized. And we understand a new sentence, in part, because we are somehow capable of determining the process by which this sentence is derived in this grammar.* (Chomsky, 1959)

This notion – that children acquire the capability of producing a potentially infinite number of sentences, although the number of sentences in their stimulus is finite – is one of two main points in the *poverty of the stimulus* argument. The other point is the lack of negative evidence in the child’s input, i.e., the child is never told which interpretation different sentences cannot have or which sentences are ill formed. This has lead to the *innateness* theory, that children bring something to the language acquisition process:
Consideration of the character of the grammar that is acquired, the degenerate quality and narrowly limited extent of the available data, the striking uniformity of the resulting grammars, and their independence of intelligence, motivation, and emotional state, over wide ranges of variation, leave little hope that much of the structure of the language can be learned by an organism initially uninformed as to its general character. (Chomsky, 1965, p. 58)

What is assumed to be brought to the language acquisition is the Universal Grammar (UG, cf. section 1.6 and the next section).

So-called usage-based theories want to account for language acquisition by arguing that children use their general cognitive abilities to discover language in the input data (see e.g., Bybee, 2010 and Tomasello, 2003). In these approaches, the child is often thought to start by acquiring lexically specific phrases in a token-based manner. The human brain, these theories argue, is specialized in discovering patterns and making generalizations over the stimuli. The child uses these abilities to gradually generalize over tokens of lexically specific phrases to make increasingly abstract schemes or structures. In these approaches, there is no innate UG, only domain general principles (i.e., principles not specific to language) that govern the linguistic ability.

As for the poverty of stimulus argument, more recent studies of child-directed speech (CDS, also known as motherese) have shown that caretakers scaffold their speech in specific and consistent ways, which means that the input is somewhat less degenerate than indicated in the citation above. (For a review of the characteristics of CDS, see Soderstrom, 2007).

Despite the scaffolding of the child’s language input, I will assume UG as a cognitive component dedicated to language. One reason is the lack of negative evidence and the presence of constraints (that sometimes appear to be specific to language). While rules possibly can be learned by positive evidence, learning of constraints would need negative evidence (cf. Crain & Lillo-Martin, 1999, p. 53). Consider the examples in (18), from Berwick, Pietroski, Yankama, and Chomsky (2011, p. 1210). The correct response to (18a) is unambiguously (18b), and never (18c).
(18) a. can eagles that fly eat?
    b. eagles that fly can eat
    c. eagles that can fly eat

As is evident from (18b) and (18c), there are two possible extraction sites for the modal auxiliary *can* in the polarity question in (18a): either before *eat* in the matrix clause, or before *fly* in the embedded relative clause. Given this, the relevant question is: how can the child learn that (18c) is not an appropriate answer to (18a) without negative evidence?

The extent to which the innate principles are part of general cognition or UG is not fully understood. But it seems clear that there are some aspects of the linguistic system that cannot be fully accounted for in terms of other cognitive systems. (See e.g., Adger, 2013 in response to the usage-based account proposed by Goldberg, 2013).

As mentioned in section 1.6, I will frame this thesis within generative grammar, and I regard the study of language acquisition as the study of the transition from UG to particular I-languages. In order to explore this, a discussion of the nature of UG and parametric variation is needed. In the following sections, I will therefore outline an approach to linguistic variation.

### 2.2.1 UG and parametric variation

In section 2.1.2 I outlined Chomsky’s (1993) ypothesis of minimal design, where the syntactic derivation is seen as «a formal object that satisfies the interface conditions in an optimal way» (p. 5). As an implication, to the extent that the syntactic derivation varies between languages it is restricted to which features partake in the derivation and need to be checked before Spell Out.

Further, language variation must necessarily be limited to what is *visible* in the child’s primary linguistic data, i.e., «Saussurean arbitrariness (association of concepts with phonological matrices), properties of grammatical formatives (inflection, etc.), and readily detectable properties that hold of lexical items generally» (Chomsky, 1995, pp. 169-170). Thus, language variation in the computation of syntactic structures is restricted to the lexicon, specifically inflectional features. This is the so-called Borer-Chomsky conjuncture, coined by Baker (2008, p. 156).
(19)  a.  «Parametric variation is restricted to the lexicon, and insofar as syntactic computation is concerned, to a narrow category of morphological properties, primarily inflectional.» (Chomsky, 2001, p. 2)

b.  «The availability of variation [is restricted] to the possibilities which are offered by one single component: the inflectional component.» (Borer, 1984, p. 3)

This means, as pointed out already in Platzack (1996), that language acquisition must be construed as the child figuring out what the features of different functional heads are.

This contrasts with earlier assumptions about language variation in generative grammar, where it was proposed that some parts of UG were realized as a set of binary parameters of certain principles of UG. These parameters were valued as positive or negative based on the child’s input, and language variation could be accounted for by the constellation of different parameters (e.g., Chomsky, 1981). According to the Borer-Chomsky-conjuncture variation is a 2nd factor phenomenon – based on the linguistic experience of the child – but is limited by UG and principles not specific to language – the 1st and 3rd of Chomsky’s (2005, p. 6) «three factors in language design», a simplified version of which is given in (20).

(20)  *Three factors in language design*. Adapted from (Chomsky, 2005, p. 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Linguistic input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Principles not specific to language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minimalist assumption is that UG is minimal, and perhaps «comprises only the core computational mechanisms [...] as they appear in narrow syntax and the mappings to the interfaces» (Hauser, Chomsky, & Fitch, 2002, p. 1573).12 A part of the minimalist program is to identify how much of language acquisition and variation can be accredited to the 2nd factor: «The [minimalist program] seeks to approach the problem ‘from bottom up’: How little can be attributed to UG [to account for language acquisition,] while still accounting for the variety of I-languages attained» (Chomsky, 2007, p. 4), i.e., to minimalize UG. Thus, «responsible nativists try to account for the knowledge attained with the sparsest plausible language-specific schematism» (Berwick et al., 2011, p. 1210).

---

12 This quote from Hauser et al. (2002) actually discuss the faculty of language in the narrow sense (NFL), but I argue that it corresponds to UG the way it is defined in this thesis.
In this thesis, I will take a strong minimalist stance, and attribute as little as possible to language-specific (UG) principles. In the next section I will discuss the implications this has on how we understand language acquisition.

2.2.2 Implications for language acquisition

Now, we return to the question of how the child’s transition from the «default state» UG, to a full-fledged I-language (cf. section 1.6). In the previous section I argued, in line with the Borer-Chomsky conjuncture, that language acquisition must be construed as involving the child’s figuring out what the different syntactic features of the language are, from the input (i.e., the 2nd factor). I add to this that language acquisition is also dependent on the maturing of principles not specific to language (i.e., the 3rd factor). The remaining question is whether the 1st factor – UG – is also subject to maturation – a maturational account (see e.g., Borer & Wexler, 1987) – or whether it has its mature form from birth or from very early on – the Full Competence Hypothesis (see e.g., Poeppel & Wexler, 1993).

As I have assumed a minimalist UG that only comprises the computational mechanisms of syntax, I see no reason why it should need much time to mature. I will therefore adopt the Full Competence Hypothesis, and assume that children’s UG is like the adult UG. I.e., it is driven by exactly the same mechanisms. This means that the differences between adult and child language depend on 2nd and 3rd factors, i.e., incomplete (interpretation of the) input, and immature principles not specific to language. Since the child’s linguistic competence is constrained by the same UG that constraints adult language, the Full Competence Hypothesis is tantamount to saying that child grammar cannot vary from adult grammar in other ways than adult grammars can vary from each other (the Modularity Matching Model, cf. Crain & Thornton, 1998).

In this approach then, there can be no principles of UG specific to children, since the adult and the child UG is the same. I assume further that the CP-TP-vP structure outlined in section 2.1.1 is universal and available to children.

The feat of language acquisition then boils down to the child associating different features with different functional and lexical projections, in a micro-parametric way (see e.g.,

---

13 If UG does need to mature, I will anyway propose that it, given its minimal size, would have matured before the age of 2;0, and consequently in the children in this study.
Westergaard, 2009), guided and limited by UG and their continuously maturing domain-general (3rd factor) principles,

### 2.3 Specific language impairment

Specific language impairment (SLI) has traditionally been believed to be *specific to language*, hence its name. A definition of SLI as a deficit in language development that cannot be ascribed to neurological damage, hearing impairment, deformations in the speech organs, severe environmental deprivation, or mental retardation (cf. Leonard, 2014), presupposes *per se* that the language system is modular and domain specific. If language is domain general, there can be no such thing as impairment specific to language.

There are however scientific findings that indicate that SLI isn’t as specific to language as its name indicates. For example, Ullman and Pierpont (2005) argue in their extensive review for the Procedural Deficit Hypothesis, in which they argue that SLI can be ascribed to a deficit in the procedural memory system. If this is correct, a theoretical framework is still needed to fathom *why* and *how* this is related to the linguistic processing, and to describe its grammatical reflexes.

Regardless of whether or not SLI is specific to language, it is clear that how we understand the nature of SLI has ramifications for how we understand the nature of language, i.e., whether language is *domain specific*, and to what extent. Consequently the theoretical investigation of SLI has consequences for our understanding of language acquisition and language in general, and their cognitive disposition.

In section 1.5, it was noted that verb morphology has been reported to be particularly problematic for SLI children. Several explanation for this have been put forward, and some of them were reviewed in section 1.5. In an extensive review of the results from several experimental studies of tense acquisition in children and adolescents with SLI, Bishop (2014) concluded that the findings to this date do not support explanations that involve problems with phonological formulation or application of morphophonological rules. The former cannot explain why children with SLI perform poorly on grammaticality judgments, word monitoring, and show different problems in passives and past tense. The latter cannot
explain why children with SLI have problems with both regular and irregular verb forms (Bishop, 2014, p. 5). Bishop argues that

_The pattern of errors observed in grammaticality judgement and word-monitoring tasks, plus the frequency of bare stem errors on irregular as well as regular verbs suggest that the problem for children with SLI is in knowing when to apply tense marking, rather than with how to do so. In other words, the problem is with syntax rather than morphophonological rules._ (Bishop, 2014, p. 5 emphasis original)

SLI children make out a heterogeneous group (cf. Leonard, 2014, pp. 3 and 29-32) with regard to the severity of the deviance, and also with regard to which linguistic area is deviant. As indicated in the quote above, not all subgroups are interesting to us. To the extent that this thesis has relevance for SLI, the relevance is limited to subgroups of SLI that have problems with (morpho)syntax, and probably corresponds more or less with the so-called Grammatical SLI (G-SLI) group, which has particular problems with different syntactic operations, such as past tense marking, theta-role assignment, and binding principles. The grammars of these speakers are not completely deprived of any of these operations, but target and non-target forms co-occur in their output (van der Lely, 2003, pp. 125-126).
3 Some details about Norwegian

Norwegian is a North Germanic, Scandinavian language with approximately 5 million native speakers, mainly in Norway. The dialect under investigation in this thesis is the dialect found in and around Oslo. In this chapter I will first discuss the verbal morphology in Norwegian, and the Norwegian Prescriptive Infinitive.

3.1 Verbal morphology

In Norwegian, the verb is marked for tense – present or past – but not for person or number agreement. Ignoring the imperative for now, Norwegian has two finite – past and present – and two non-finite verb forms – infinitive and past participle. The present participle is adjectival in Norwegian (Faarlund, Lie, & Vannebo, 1997, p. 117)\(^{14}\).

Norwegian conjugations can be divided into two weak verb classes and a few strong verb classes. In addition, some verbs have irregular or suppletive verb paradigms (see Faarlund et al., 1997, pp. 474-507). The defining difference between the weak and strong groups is whether the preterite is marked by a suffix, as in the weak verbs (-a/-te), or whether it is «marked» with a bare stem, often with a vowel change, as in the strong verbs. The regular group can be further divided into two subclasses: the large weak (LW) and the small weak (SW) class on basis of their morphological paradigms (Ragnarsdottir, Simonsen, & Plunkett, 1999) (see table 3).\(^{15}\) The regular verb classes have a much higher type frequency than the irregular class. According to Ragnarsdottir et al., the weak classes amount to 96% of the Norwegian verbs (p. 587). Conversely most irregular verbs have a relatively high token frequency.

\(^{14}\) The present participle always has the verb stem plus the ending -ende (e.g., drikkende ’drinking’) in Norwegian.

\(^{15}\) Both the regular and irregular verbs can be further subdivided into smaller groups on basis of morphological differences, but here the distinction made in table 3 will suffice.
Some verbs have a difference in accent tones between the infinitive and present tense forms. This mostly pertains to the irregular verbs, but also some verbs that were irregular in earlier stages of the language and have been regularized (Haugen, 1967, p. 194). Most regular verbs have accent tone 2 in both the infinitive and the present tense. In the South-Eastern dialect, accent tone 2 is characterized by a high falling pitch in the first syllable (Bjerkan, 2005, p. 213). In the subgroup with accent tone differentiation, the infinitives have accent tone 2, but the present tense has accent tone 1, which is characterized by a steady, low pitch in the first syllable in the South-Eastern dialect (Bjerkan, 2005, p. 213). I will refer to the verb groups that have accent tone 1 in present tense as T1 verbs, and the verbs that have accent tone 2 throughout the paradigm as T2 verbs. Some examples are given in (21), written orthographically with superscripted numbers to indicate the different accent tones for simplicity.

(21) Infinitive (accent tone 2) Present tense (accent tone 1)
    å₂komme 'to come' å¹kommer
    å₂sitte 'to sit' å¹sitter
    å₂lese 'to read' å¹leser

As will become evident in chapter 4, this distinction will be important in the coding of the data. A list of T1 verbs in our data is given in Appendix 1.

### 3.2 The Norwegian Prescriptive Infinitive

As mentioned in chapter 1.4, Norwegian has a prescriptive infinitive, which is predominantly used in child-directed speech. To my knowledge, the Norwegian prescriptive infinitive has not yet been described in any published material, but Johannessen (submitted) gives a thorough account of it in all living North Germanic languages and its syntactic and pragmatic characteristics. She calls it Child-directed Prescriptive Infinitives (CDPI), but for
brevity, and because we will also discuss this construction in child language later, I will use the term Prescriptive Infinitive in this thesis.

According to Johannessen’s seminal work, the Prescriptive Infinitive differs syntactically in numerous ways from the standard imperative. In both the imperative and the prescriptive infinitives the subject is often omitted, but when the subject is overtly expressed, it follows the verb in imperatives and precedes the verb in Prescriptive infinitives (compare (22a) and (22b)). In Norwegian imperatives, the negation can either follow or precede the verb, whereas in the Prescriptive Infinitive it can only precede the verb (compare (22c-f)). With some exceptions (see the discussion in chapter 6.5.9, or Faarlund et al., 1997, p. 589 ), the Norwegian imperative can only have a second person subject, which is evident on the reflexive pronoun when the subject is not overt. In the Prescriptive Infinitive on the other hand, the subject seems to be restricted to lexical DPs and a 3rd person reflexive pronoun (compare (22a) and (22b)).

(22)  
a. gå dere i forveien, så kommer jeg etter  
go.IMP YOU.PL in ahead, then kome.PRES I after  
‘you go ahead, I’ll come later’  

b. … Nora sitte rolig der Nora  
N. sit.INF quietly there N.  
‘Nora sit quietly there, Nora’  

  c. ikke gjør det!  
not do.IMP it  
‘don’t do it!’  

  d. bli ikke lærer …  
become.IMP not teacher  
‘don’t become a teacher…’  

(…hvis du ønsker en avstressende job)  
(…if you want a relaxing job)’  

e. ikke klore da får mamma vondt!  
not scratch.INF then gets mummy pain  
‘don’t scratch, that’ll hurt mummy!’  

f. *klore ikke da får mamma vondt  
Prescriptive Infinitive  
(Present study)
The characteristics of the Prescriptive Infinitive are summed up in table 4.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Prescriptive (imperative) force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Subject often omitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The subject is always 3rd person, as evident from the reflexive pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>If the subject is overtly expressed, it is never a pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Negation always precedes the verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Typically directed towards children or pets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Characteristics of the Child-directed Prescriptive Infinitive
4 Method and data collection

Choice of method should be motivated by the research question: what data will best give an answer to the research question at hand. All choices relevant for methodology need to be thoroughly justified and reported, to assure i) the method’s reliability (so that the results are possible to replicate), ii) its aptness in comparative studies (to ascertain whether we can compare the findings with findings from other groups and others can make comparable studies (Finestack, Payesteh, Disher, & Julien, 2014), and iii) its aptness in answering the research questions (to assure the validity of the study).

Here the use of the data is twofold, with one primary and one secondary motivation for the method. The primary motivation for the method is its application in the norming of the N-LARSP chart (Kristoffersen et al., forthcoming). The secondary motivation is the object of this thesis – investigating Root Infinitives in Norwegian child language. In the following sections I will present the methods we used to collect these data.

Before I present the method we employed, I will give a general review of typical methods for investigating child language and their general advantages and disadvantages in section 4.1. Throughout this chapter, the ability of the data to answer the research questions is heavily weighted. In section 4.3 and 4.4 I will present the design of the LARSP norming study, and the procedure employed in collecting, transcribing, and excerpting the data, and, in section 4.4.4, the coding procedure employed for this study. In section 4.5 I will mention the guidelines adopted regarding ethics and data storage. In section 4.6 I will discuss the reliability and validity of the study, given the methodology outlined here. Finally, in section 4.7, I will introduce the statistical measures that will be used on the result.

As the data underlying this thesis also underlies the study in (Kristoffersen et al., forthcoming) and (Løver, 2015), the methodology will be identical to the point of coding.

4.1 How to investigate child language

There are several ways to study child language, and which ways are preferable depend on what your object of study is. There is a primary distinction between testing language comprehension and language production and different methodologies within those groups.
There is reason to believe that children’s comprehension surpasses their productive language, and that they even comprehend language before their first words (Karmiloff & Karmiloff-Smith, 2001, p. 31; Lust, 2006, p. 193). There exist several experimental paradigms for assessing both speech perception and language comprehension in pre-linguistic children. There are however reasons for not considering such approaches in this study: primarily because this thesis investigates a specific structure found in children’s productive language, and secondarily because the data gathered constitutes norming data for the N-LARSP chart, which makes use of children’s spontaneous speech. This will be elaborated below. Therefore I will only review tests of productive language in this section.

4.1.1 Parent reporting

Many of the first studies of child language were diary studies: reports from parents with (more or less) systematic records of the development of one child over a long period of time (cf. Karmiloff & Karmiloff-Smith, 2001, p. 18; Naigles, 2012, p. 241; Rowe, 2012, p. 193; Saxton, 2010, p. 18). Parental questionnaire studies are another type of parental reporting, where a set of parents report on the linguistic comprehension and/or production of their children. In parental reporting methods the linguistic complexity of each study will be limited by the metalinguistic competence of the parent(s), and highly so in parental questionnaire studies, where little or no pre-existing knowledge of linguistics can be expected.

The sporadic nature of many diary studies, along with the fact that the diary records are written in an everyday situation alongside all other tasks of daily life, makes the diary method highly selective (Tomasello & Stahl, 2004, p. 102).

Although the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory (CDI) has been validated in a laboratory setting as being representative of the child’s repertoire (Karmiloff & Karmiloff-Smith, 2001, p. 38), it mostly studies lexical acquisition, and asks very general questions of grammatical complexities. In a qualitative study of more complex syntactic structures, a larger number of instances in different contexts are preferred. Therefore parental questionnaire studies are less suited for our goal.
4.1.2 Elicited production

*Elicited production* is an experimental methodology where the subject is supplied with specific, thoroughly devised stimuli to *provoke* certain structures. One of the most famous elicited production studies is the *Wug*-study of Berko (1958), where the subjects (children from five and a half to seven years old) were presented with nonce words (i.e., words that don’t actually exist in the language but follow its phonotactics), which the subjects therefore cannot possibly have learned. These nonce words were used to investigate the children’s morphosyntactic abilities in number and tense inflection. The stimuli were given as questions or incomplete phrases, such as in (23), which the child answered through completing the stimulus sentence (the expected form in this case being *ricked*).

(23) «This is a man who knows how to *rick*. He is *ricking*. He did the same thing yesterday. What did he do yesterday? Yesterday he ____» (Berko, 1958, p. 165)

Many syntactic structures are very sparse, bordering on non-existent, in the spontaneous output of children, because they demand very specific contexts. Elicited production tasks must be used to access such structures in child language, since they probably would not be found in studies monitoring spontaneous production. In such experiments, the subject is asked specific questions, often accompanying illustrations or puppets, in order to provoke very specific syntactic structures. An example from the seminal study of structure dependency of Crain (1991, p. 602) is given in (24). As one can imagine, the type of sentences elicited from the child in (24) demands a highly specific context, and is vanishingly rare in spontaneous speech:

(24) Adult researcher: Ask Jabba if the man who is running is bald
    Expected child response: Is the man who is running __ bald?

This kind of experiment is designed to tap as directly as possible onto linguistic competence, and to minimize the *performance noise*. Crain and Thornton (1998) argue that elicited production in many instances is superior to, e.g., spontaneous speech sampling, as this «eliminates many of the difficulties that arise in attempting to interpret a child’s intended meaning, a frequent problem when examining transcripts of children’s spontaneous speech» (Crain & Thornton, 1998, p. 141). As the experimental situation is controlled, experimental studies are easy to replicate, i.e., are very reliable, and are easy to compare cross-linguistically.
In an experimental setting, the number of variables that are measured has to be limited (Lieven & Behrens, 2012, p. 227). Prior to designing an elicited production task, one must have precise hypotheses about the structures one is studying and the contexts in which one expects them to appear. Another challenge with experimental studies in general, is the ecological validity, i.e. to what extent the result is generalizable to the population we investigate in a non-experimental setting, or if the variation found in the sample is just «newly provoked by exposing the aggregate [viz. the sample] to a probing instrument or test situation» (Brunswik, 1949, p. 177). As one can imagine, an experimental situation can often be alienating for the child, perhaps making the linguistic output unnatural. At the same time, it is important to bear in mind that many elicited production experiments are not designed to test natural language use, as mentioned above, but rather wish to minimize it to access the underlying mechanisms.

In conducting any behavioural experiment, the experimenter is faced with the problems of the demand characteristics of the experimental situation. The demand characteristics are the cues of the hypothesis underlying the experiment and which are conceived by the subjects (Orne, 1962, p. 779). The subjects of an experiment are often well aware of their role, and generally try to behave like good subjects and see it as their role to confirm the hypothesis. This is a problem for the ecological validity of the study, as the subjects are not neutrally and passively responding to the stimulus. Because of this, experimenters have developed methods of concealing the aim of the experiment. We would also expect demand characteristics to be a smaller problem with children than with adults (but see the discussion at the end of the ensuing chapter).

### 4.1.3 Natural speech sampling

The use of transcribed spontaneous speech data is widely applied in studies of language acquisition, and – as all other methods – has its advantages and disadvantages. Although there exist projects such as the Human Speechome project where the total audial and visual environment of a child is recorded 24 hours a day (Roy et al., 2006), most recorded collections of spontaneous speech need to be limited in some way for several reasons, the most prominent being the time-consuming activity of transcribing. This limitation makes natural speech sampling inadequate for studies of linguistic structures that appear sparsely in the language output, as discussed above (Rowe, 2012, p. 198). Thus, the absence of a structure in the transcription is not necessarily because the child not yet having acquired it.
Conversely, the presence of a complex structure should not in itself be taken as evidence of acquisition, as it could be (in part or as a whole) rote-learned (Eisenbeiss, 2010, p. 13; Lieven & Behrens, 2012, p. 227), unless any sign of productive use is found. No matter how natural the setting of the recording is, the resulting corpora will not be able to represent the child’s linguistic competence, and I will argue that it is categorically so, due to the division between language competence and language performance (cf. section 1.6).

There is also a problem of interpretation. The controlled conditions of elicited production strongly limit the possibility of what the child intends to say. (Still, the responses need to be interpreted, both linguistically and theoretically). The utterances in natural speech sampling are more open for interpretation on behalf of the transcriber, especially due to the phonological distortions of the children (Gerken, 2000, p. 45; Lust, 2006, p. 132). As Ochs (1979) points out, we cannot consider the problems of selective observation or selective bias as ruled out with use of auditory or audio-visual recordings. They are merely postponed «until the moment at which the researcher sits down to transcribe the material» (p. 44).

Although the problems of validity associated with experimental settings are not present to the same degree in spontaneous speech, they are not entirely eliminated. The presence of a recording device, let alone a researcher, contributes to making the situation unfamiliar for the child (Tomasello & Stahl, 2004, p. 102), i.e., the observer’s paradox (Labov, 1972, p. 209). As for the demand characteristics, this is present at least in the parents, who may encourage their children to perform as well as possible, and older children may have been made aware of the objective of the session by their parents, or infer it from the recording equipment. The unfamiliarity of the situation and the demand characteristics can either make the child more timid, speaking less than she normally would, or the child may act out some unnatural role. 16 Both circumstances weaken the validity of the data.

The impossibility of recreating the exact setting of the recording session poses a threat to the reliability of the study and its aptness for cross-linguistic and cross-population comparison.

Despite these methodological issues, sampling of spontaneous speech is a widely used method for studying language acquisition, and this is due to its not insignificant superiority to other methods. For example, one has the possibility of approaching the material

---

16 These are based on my own observations from the data collection.
inductively, or bottom-up, as well as testing specific hypotheses deductively, or top-down, whereas experimental methods are best suited for the latter. Also, as mentioned above, data from spontaneous speech corpora can be tested against more variables, and these tests can be done subsequently, after the material has been gathered, whereas in an experimental paradigm one would have to conduct another experiment if, in light of the gathered material one wanted to look at yet another variable. Since the recorded sound or video files presumably are stored, the data is also verifiable and available for others’ close analysis, as opposed to diary or parental questionnaire studies. Lastly, natural speech corpora are the only way to study the learner’s input (Eisenbeiss, 2010, p. 14).

For qualitative studies of the use and internal structure of linguistic structures in child language, corpora of actual utterances are by far the most preferable, since these are the only place where we can expect linguistic structures to appear in many different contexts and situations. This is especially the case when introspection (the investigator’s own grammaticality judgments) is out of the question. Obtaining grammaticality judgments from young children are notoriously difficult as they have not acquired the necessary metalinguistic competence yet (Lust, 2006, pp. 130-131).

In sum, although natural speech sampling has its drawbacks, spontaneous speech sampling is the best tool available to answer many research questions, e.g., the norming data of the N-LARSP, which we turn to below.

4.1.4 Group vs. case study

Case studies, such as diary studies, and spontaneous speech studies with one or just a few subjects, have the advantage of being able to make in-depth qualitative investigations of certain phenomena, because one has the ability to investigate large amounts of data from the participant(s). Group studies do not have the same possibilities for in-depth qualitative investigations for practical reasons, since the amount of data quickly would be unmanageable. Group studies are therefore predominantly quantitative in nature. The results of group studies can, qua their large number of subjects, often be generalized to the population. The same is not necessarily true with case studies, since the findings can be results of idiosyncrasies in the few subjects (Bjerkan, 2000, pp. 56-58). Flyvbjerg (2006) however argues that results of case studies can be generalized, e.g., by falsification (as in Popper’s (1959) black swan examples, where the observation of just one black swan
falsifies the hypothesis that all swans are white). As will become evident in the sections below, I have tried to bypass the caveats of case studies by employing a multiple case design, where I use 12 informants. This makes it possible to generalize the result somewhat, and also employ quantitative methods on the data to identify patterns and developmental trends.

4.2 LARSP

The LARSP Chart is an assessment tool for morphology and syntactic structures, specifically designed to assess children with Specific Language Impairment (SLI). The original LARSP Chart for English consists of seven age stages from 0;9 to 4;6 and beyond. Each stage has its own set of morphological forms and syntactic structures. The syntactic structures include constituents in clause structure and parts-of-speech in phrase structure. The morphological forms include inflectional endings and compounding. The Chart is a norm or a baseline for typical language development. The placement of each instance of a morphological form or a syntactic structure into a stage is based on the order of acquisition in typical language development. Thereby, the chart tells us when we would expect each syntactic structure or morphological form to emerge, at least in a comparable amount and type of data to the clinical situation in which it is being used. The typical clinical situation with the LARSP chart is defined as 30 minutes in Crystal et al. (1976). Importantly for this discussion, LARSP taps on and compares (30 minutes of) language performances, and not linguistic competences. A preliminary version of the N-LARSP chart was constructed using corpus data of child Norwegian (see Kristoffersen et al. (forthcoming) for an overview over the different corpora and the exact number of files and utterances). The preliminary chart (provided by Ingeborg Ribu) is given in Appendix 2.

The analysis in this thesis is based on the norming data for the N-LARSP chart. In the following section I will account for the methods we used in collecting these data, and the considerations underlying the different choices.

4.3 Design

We considered natural speech sampling as the most adequate method for norming the N-LARSP chart, and the rationale is as follows. The N-LARSP chart is meant as a baseline for language production and is meant to be used for screening children with possible speech
problems, based on a clinical session from which spontaneous speech has been recorded and transcribed. As mentioned above, the clinical session is defined as 30 minutes by Crystal et al. (1976), with interaction between the therapist and the patient. Given the nature of spontaneous speech recording, using parent reporting, covering the total linguistic abilities of the child, or elicited production (perhaps on each structure in the N-LARSP chart), could give a too exhaustive picture of the child’s linguistic abilities to be comparable to the clinical situation outlined above.

The number, length and density of recordings must be considered in light of each study (Rowe, 2012, p. 199). For the norming data of the N-LARSP chart, we adopted the design of the study norming the Dutch version of LARSP, GRAMAT (Bol, 2012; Bol & Kuiken, 1980, 1988, 1990) with some modifications. In the N-LARSP norming data we recorded two boys and two girls in each of the seven age stages. We did two recording sessions for each child so each would be present in two consecutive stages, with the exception of four in the first and the last stage respectively. These had no successive or preceding stage to age into or out of. This gave us eight recordings in each stage, yielding altogether 56 recordings (see table 5). This design has the advantage of being both cross-sectional and longitudinal, but the disadvantage of having a very sparse sampling (~6 months). The longitudinal design has the benefit of i) evening out possible developmental discontinuities which otherwise could have appeared in a pure cross-sectional study as an effect of individual differences in language development among the subjects, and ii) making us able to investigate the development of certain features on the individual level at two different points in time. The sparse sampling makes it difficult to say anything about the development of different structures, but lets us keep the workload manageable while retaining the high number of informants.

17 Because of the therapist-patient interaction and presence of recording equipment in the clinical situation, one could actually argue that the presence of a researcher and recording equipment in the collection of the norming data actually bolsters its ecological validity rather than decreasing it, albeit only for this specific use of it.
For the present research question and analysis however, the design outlined above is possibly less ideal. In an exploration of Root Infinitives across different contexts, and a partly controlled eliciting situation, eliciting certain discourse contexts (past, present, conditional, etc.) would probably have yielded the ideal basis for the analysis. Such an approach would however have weakened the comparability of my results and conclusions, as most studies in the field are based on spontaneous speech sampling.

Other available corpora of child language, such as the ones found in the Child Language Data Exchange System (CHILDES) project (cf. MacWhinney, 1991), often have denser samples of fewer children. In the design outlined above, there is a sparse sampling (only one or two samples per child) over a large amount of children (32, of which 12 make part of this study). In this lies the risk that a specific linguistic structure seemingly dependent on the discourse context is in fact dependent on the developmental stage of the child, but this can be avoided by showing the same tendencies across several subjects, which I have the possibility of, given the size of the group.

### 4.4 The procedure

In their large meta-study of reliability in journal papers on language acquisition, Finestack et al. (2014) proposed a checklist of information to report on the procedures in such studies. This checklist consists of sampling context, sample length, transcription procedures, transcription reliability, coding procedures, and coding reliability. In the following sections I will report on all these points (and their sub-points, see Finestack et al. (2014, p. 2278)), though under different headings.

#### 4.4.1 The sample

Table 5: Recording scheme, N-LARSP (N=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage (age)</th>
<th>I (1;0–1;6)</th>
<th>II (1;6–2;0)</th>
<th>III (2;0–2;6)</th>
<th>IV (2;6–3;0)</th>
<th>V (2;6–3;0)</th>
<th>VI (3;6–4;6)</th>
<th>VII (4;6–5;6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We gathered informants from the social network of the N-LARSP research committee, and delivered information letters to local day cares. Meta-information was gathered with an electronic form through a service provided by the University of Oslo (Appendix 1).

We did not have enough volunteers to weigh the subjects against the parents’ socioeconomic status. There are some syntactic dialectal differences in Norwegian. In order to make the group dialectally uniform, we required that the informants live and have grown up in the South-Eastern part of Norway, in the area around Oslo, i.e. be speakers of the dialect of this area. We did not see it as feasible to impose the same requirement on the parents, as it would have made the requirements too specific, with the possible result of not having enough volunteers. We nevertheless made dialects of the parents a variable in the questionnaire. We divided the dialectal variety into six main groups: southern («sørlansk»), western («vestlandsk»), middle («mittorvsk»), north («nordlandsk»), east («østlandsk»), and other («annet») (see Appendix 3). We included the «other» dialect as a possibility for parents who felt a strong dialectal identity to a mixed dialect, or for other reasons defined their Norwegian outside of the five geographical categories. (See Kristoffersen et al. (forthcoming) for information on the other informants of the N-LARSP study.

As the LARSP chart is to be applied as a screening tool, we wanted to exclude children with possible pathological speech problems from the study.\textsuperscript{18} Prematurely born children were excluded for the same reason. We also chose to exclude children from multilingual homes, primarily for fear of possible differences between multilingual and monolingual language acquisition, and secondarily because we wanted to be able to use the LARSP chart for testing multilingual/monolingual differences.\textsuperscript{19} These criteria were listed in the information/invitation letter to the parents (see Appendix 4).

\textbf{4.4.2 Data collection}

The data were collected in a play setting, with at least one investigator, often with one or two of the caretakers present. To encourage the child to speak, we had a selection of toys (vehicles and animals) for all the children. For the older children (III – VII), we also brought

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{18} The subjects of the study were presumed to be typically developing, but many of the children are too young for SLI to be visible.

\textsuperscript{19} This being said, it would have been extremely difficult – if not even impossible – to find enough children in the Oslo area that had not at all been exposed to foreign languages, as most daycares have immigrants in the staff or immigrant children among the attendees.
\end{footnotesize}
an adapted version of the Norwegian folk tale *De tre bukkene bruse* ("Three billy goats gruff", collected by Asbjørnsen and Moe (1843/1844)), which we encouraged the child to recount, either by their own recollection using the pictures, or after the investigator or a parent had read it aloud to them. The oldest children (VI – VII) were also encouraged to give a narrative from their own life (e.g., Christmas eve, what did you do in day-care that specific day, etc.), as a means of eliciting typical narrative data. Although the children were encouraged to engage in these specific activities, we always let the playing happen on their premises, for example if they didn’t want to read at all, or wanted to read another book. Each session lasted not much longer than an hour. This design is comparable to that of the Jin, Oh, and Razak (2012, p. 221) adaptation of LARSP to Mandarin Chinese.

The sessions were recorded using a Zoom h2® or Zoom h2n® Handy Recorder, using the two built-in microphones, giving a surround recording (360°) in two tracks (stereo), with sound quality no lower than MP3 224 kb/s.

### 4.4.3 Transcription

The level of detail of the transcription is dependent on the research question (Rowe, 2012, p. 202), so a transcription that serves your purpose is not necessarily an information-packed transcript: «A more useful transcript is a more selective one» (Ochs, 1979, p. 44). Transcription is, beyond doubt, the most time-consuming part of the data collection, and the more detailed and phonetically correct the transcript, the more time-consuming the transcription process. Therefore we didn’t want to transcribe more precisely than we needed. We considered an orthographic transcription to be sufficiently precise for the N-LARSP chart, as it mainly consists of syntactic structures, and some morphological, quite salient, forms. I transcribed one half of the recordings, the other master student on the project (M. Aa. Løver) transcribed the other. We used the transcription software ELAN (Brugman & Russel, 2004; Crasborn & Sloetjes, 2008; Lausberg & Sloetjes, 2009; Sloetjes & Wittenburg, 2008; Wittenburg, Brugman, Russel, Klassmann, & Sloetjes, 2006). Utterances were segmented into Minimal Terminable Units (T-Units) (Hunt, 1965, 1970). This is also the utterance definition used in Bol and Kuiken (1988). A T-Unit is defined as «one main clause plus any subordinate clause or nonclausal structure that is attached to or embedded in it» (Hunt, 1970, p. 4), or, in written language, the «shortest units which it is grammatically allowable to punctuate as sentences» (Hunt, 1970, p. 4). This means that coordinated matrix
clauses were segmented into two (or more) t-units. This only occurred in the files from the older children.

As the T-Unit was initially developed for written language, how to treat typical speech language phenomena, such as sentence ellipsis, false starts, and discourse markers needed to be additionally specified. Bol and Kuiken (1988) additionally used pauses and intonation contours in determining utterance borders. This generally did not pose a large problem, but we found the procedure in Young (1995, p. 38) to be feasible, in excluding «backchannel cues such as mhm and yeah, and discourse boundary markers such as okay», integrating false starts into the following T-unit and counting elliptical constructions as T-units. All child utterances that were imitations of an adult were coded as echoes, and were not considered in the analysis.

We based the codes for pauses, unintelligible utterances, etc. on the transcription-manual of the LIA project (Hagen, Håberg, Olsen, & Søfteland, 2014), but revised it somewhat to accommodate some peculiarities of child language.

As Ochs (1979) points out, the transcription is the part of the procedure which is most sensitive to problems of reliability, and where the problem of selective bias emerges, which is why thorough reporting of the procedures is important. Specifically challenging in this regard, and of importance for this thesis, is how to transcribe the verb morphology. As mentioned in chapter 3.1, the only difference between the present and infinitive forms in many verbs in South-Eastern Norwegian, is an –r [ɾ]. Typically, this is also one of the phonemes children with this dialect acquire last, using instead other intermediate forms, acoustically resembling the target r, such as [ɔ], [l] or [j] (Bjerkan, 2005, p. 217). All of these produce a salient narrowing of the preceding vowel. In many contexts, the r in the target language is marked only by partial progressive assimilation, resulting in retroflexion, such that /r/ + /l/ = [l], /r/ + /s/ = [s], /r/ + /t/ = [t], /r/ + /d/ = [d], and /r/ + /n/ = [n] (cf. e.g., Bjerkan, 2005, p. 215). In other contexts where the r precedes a consonant that cannot be easily retroflexed, for example labials [p b f v], velars [k g ɡ], and palatals [ʃ], the r can be

---

20 «Bij het vaststellen van de uitingsgrens speelt het intonatiepatroon eveneens een rol: bij bevestigingen geeft een dalende intonatiecontour aan het eind van een uiting aan dat de uiting gerealiseerd is. Eveneens wordt gelet op de duur van de pauze tussen twee verschillende uittingen.» (Bol & Kuiken, 1988, p. 23)

21 The rationale for using the transcription manual of the LIA-project was that the LIA-project is hosted by the digital humanities section in our department and it seemed fruitful in plans of digitalizing the corpus and making it electronically searchable to use their framework.
syncopated without any assimilation in the following consonant. To sum up, this means that verb forms that sound like an infinitive might well be reduced or non-target present tense forms, but, crucially, not the other way around. In transcribing, we chose a conservative approach, where we did not infer anything from the context. We only transcribed verbs as present tense when we heard a salient r or one of the intermediate phonemes or when the following consonant was saliently assimilated.

In addition, as mentioned in chapter 3.1, many verbs have an accent tone difference between the present and infinitive forms. In section 3.1 I called those verbs T1 verbs, as opposed to T2 verbs, which do not have this distinction. (The T1/T2-distribution of the verbs in the data material is given in Appendix 1.) This accent tone difference makes it possible to distinguish between an infinitive and a present tense form in T1 verbs, even when an inflectional –r is not present. However, in many instances, e.g., when followed by a verb particle, the present tense form of the T1 verb can get accent tone 2, viz. behave like a T2 verb, depending on which syllables are stressed (compare (25b) and (25c)(Haugen, 1967, p. 198). When this occurs, it is impossible to discern the present tense form from the infinitive (compare (25b) and (25d)).

(25) a. han setter plata på
   he put.PR the.record on
   han /'ssete/ plata på
   ‘he puts the record on’

b. han setter på plata
   han /'isetepo/ plata
   (without stressed particle)

c. han /'iset ‘po/ plata
   ‘he puts on the record’

d. han skal sette på plata
   he shall.PR put.INF on the record
   han skal /'isetepo/ plata
   ‘he is going to put on the record’

I personally went through all the relevant files and marked the relevant verbs for accent tone 1 and 2 where they were discernable, and where in doubt (as I am not myself a native speaker of the Oslo dialect), I opened the relevant sections in Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2014) and inspected the pitch pattern of the first syllable.
Romøren (2011) found that typically developing children between 29 and 36 months of age produced words with target accent accent in 88.2% to 98% (with a mean of 93.7 and a standard deviation of 3.4722), in an elicited production task. For Swedish, Hellquist and Olsson (1981) (cited in Plunkett and Strömqvist (1990)), found, also using an elicited production task with only words with a post-stress syllable, that children in aged 2–5 tend to overgeneralize accent 2 (6.1% of the cases) more than accent 1 (2.4% of the cases). Kadin and Engstrøm (2007) found the same tendency towards accent 2 in Swedish in 18 and 24 month olds, using spontaneous speech, and concluded «that most Swedish children at 24 months of age have established a productive command of the word accent contrast» (p. 70).

Since there is a difference in the accents between Swedish and Norwegian (as there is between different Norwegian dialects), we cannot conclude that the same overgeneralization pattern also holds for Norwegian, but we can at least suppose that children of the age in this study produce the appropriate word accents quite consistently.

For the transcription for norming of the N-LARSP chart, consult Kristoffersen et al. (forthcoming).

For this study, different amounts of data were used for each child. As this is a qualitative study of the Root Infinitive, I do not regard this as methodologically problematic. For the exact amount of coded material used for each child, cf. section 4.4.4 and 5.3.

4.4.4 Coding
(For the coding of the data for norming of the N-LARSP chart, see Kristoffersen et al. (forthcoming).)

In order to validate the result, I employed strict coding criteria in order to excerpt the utterances with unambiguous finiteness. The coding criteria are given in table 6.

Some verbs were morphologically saliently marked for finiteness in the data. These include i) the strong and suppletive verbs, where the stem of the verb differs between the infinitive and the other forms (a. in table 6, cf. table 3 chapter 3.1), ii) past tense verbs or past of all verb classes except the large weak verb class (b. in table 6, cf. table 3 chapter 3.1). The past tense verbs and past participles verbs of the large weak class are homophonous, and are

22 These are my own calculations based on the data given in Romøren (2011, p. 60)
therefore ambiguous. iii) present tense verbs where there was an (audible) r-like phoneme word-finally (c. in table 6). Of the three criteria a.-c. in table 6, infinitives can only be excerpted based on criterion a. As this would render too few unambiguous utterances with Root Infinitives, a fourth criterion, d., was employed. In chapter 3.1 I mentioned that in some verbs the accent tone differs between the infinitive and the present tense (cf. section 4.4.3). I called this group of verbs T1. In utterances with verbs lacking a word-final r-like phoneme, but where the verb was a T1, the accent tone was used as a coding criterion.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Where the stem of the verb differs (e.g., vite – vet ‘know – knows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Past tense verbs and past participles of the small weak class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Verbs pronounced with an r-like phoneme word finally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>T1-verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The coding criteria

Employing these coding criteria gave 1181 unambiguous utterances with verbs (including repetitions, cf. below) and 835 ambiguous utterances with verbs. The number of ambiguous and unambiguous utterances with verbs for each child is given in Appendix 7, and all the ambiguous utterances are listed in Appendix 8.

To make sure that the linguistic knowledge of the child was not overrepresented, repetitions of the same utterance within 30 seconds were marked as repetitions, and were not counted in the results. Utterances that only differed with a backchannel cues, such as ja ‘yes’, (see section 4.4.3) were also counted as repetitions.

Target-like ellipses were coded as such and not counted in the Root Infinitive and null subject results. Instances where there was an unintelligible or poorly pronounced verb or clause (marked §u or +u in the transcript) which could have had impact on the interpretation and the analysis, were also counted as ambiguous. This was done in order to not count clauses with an unintelligible auxiliary or subject as Root Infinitives or null subject clauses.

Imperatives were not counted in the analysis, since I wanted to count null subject clauses, and imperatives predominantly do not have overt subjects. In addition, some scholars have argued that imperatives are not finite (see Platzack & Rosengren, 1997).

### 4.5 Ethics and data storage
We recorded and stored all data as specified in the approved application to Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste (‘Norwegian Social Science Data Services’, NSD). We asked the parents of every participating child to sign a consent form (Appendix 5). We stored and treated (transcribed, coded etc.) the sound files and other sensitive information on a password-protected server at the University of Oslo. We will delete the link between the parents’ names and the informant codes and nicknames within the end of the project (officially December 2016) along with all written material that can connect the participants to the study. We have anonymized all the children’s names by giving them nicknames, and censored all sensitive information in the files.

4.6 Reliability and validity

Throughout this chapter, I have accounted for the possible pitfalls for the reliability of this study, and I will conclude and elaborate here. The reliability of a study is the degree to which one by using the same methods can obtain the same results. The largest pitfalls for reliability in a study of this kind are i) the data collection, ii) the transcription, and iii) the coding. As for the data collection, I have thoroughly accounted for the procedure in chapter 4.4.2. A possible challenge arises in the case where we were not able to persuade the subjects into reading The Billy Goats Gruff or giving a narrative. I nevertheless do not consider this a large problem, as this study is qualitative, and while the differences in extra-linguistic context can have a large effect on the quantitative distribution, my study is not very sensitive to quantitative effects. Additionally, the objects under study – verb phrases – are not very context sensitive, but should occur across the board. Another possible pitfall for reliability is the presence of the researcher, (unconsciously) influencing the child’s output to his or her advantage. Given that this is a qualitative study, it is hard to imagine how I (or the other researcher) could have influenced the child into producing Root Infinitives and/or finite verbs, anterior to having studied them and their distribution in Norwegian, adding to the argument that this is still disputed for other languages.

The procedures for transcription were given in 4.4.3. We controlled the reliability of the transcription by swapping a section of it (174 utterances from Jan (3;03.11)). This gave a coefficient of 95%. We considered this satisfactory.
The procedures for coding were given in 4.4.4. Most of the procedure consisted of categorizing different utterances by discrete criteria (finite–non-finite, negated–non-negated, etc.) based on the transcription.

Given the lack of extra-linguistic context in the transcription, I had to rely on adjacent utterances, from children or adults, and my own interpretation. This is the method used (at least) in Ingram and Thompson (1996) and Josefsson (2002), and as the last author notes:

> However, to use a native speaker’s intuition in the analysis is a commonly accepted method within the generative research program, and it is, I believe, the only method known hitherto to use to find out whether or not an utterance conforms to the adult grammar. (p. 277)

In addition, the use of any corpora would need interpretation, in the same way as any linguistic data do. Text corpora must be interpreted by researchers that have a certain knowledge of the language(s) in question. There is always a risk that the linguistic knowledge and theoretical prejudices of the researcher can influence the coding procedure, no matter how accurately and comprehensively the corpus has been transcribed.

I have accounted for the validity of this study throughout this chapter. The validity is the degree to which the study measures what it sets out to measure. The largest pitfall regarding the validity of the study, which hasn’t yet been discussed, is the possible selection bias of the sample (see 4.4.1), which may be skewed toward a group with high socio-economical status, as these are the most liable to volunteer to scientific studies (Quené, 2010, p. 273). However, as far as I am informed, socio-economic differences lie along the lines of acquisition rate and quantity of input and not the grammar per se, so this does not pose a problem for this study.

### 4.7 Statistical methods

In the following chapter, I will use quantitative measures to discuss the data. On the discussion of the development of Root Infinitives from one stage to the next, I measure the effect size in the children I have longitudinal data on. Cohen’s $d$, which I am using, is one of
the most common ways of measuring effect size (Field, Miles, & Field, 2012). The formula for Cohen’s $d$ is as follows (Cohen, 1992).

Let $d$ be effect size, $\sigma$ be (pooled) standard deviation, and $\text{mean}_{1\text{st}}$ and $\text{mean}_{2\text{nd}}$ are the mean values of the $1^{st}$ and $2^{nd}$ recordings respectively.

$$d = \frac{\text{mean}_{1\text{st}} - \text{mean}_{2\text{nd}}}{\sigma}$$

Pooled standard deviation (Cohen, 1988, p. 44) is equated as follows, where $\sigma_{1\text{st}}$ and $\sigma_{2\text{nd}}$ are the standard deviations of the first and the second recordings respectively.

$$\sigma_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{1\text{st}}^2 + \sigma_{2\text{nd}}^2}{2}}$$

According to Cohen (1992), «small, medium, and large [effect sizes] are respectively .10, .30, and .50» (p. 156), i.e., everything higher than 0.50 is a large effect size.

I also use the Fisher’s and Pearson’s chi-square test. These tests measure the probability that distribution of numbers in a matrix is random. If the probability for the distribution being random is less than a 20th part ($p<0.05$), the result is considered significant. In addition, I use Spearman’s rank correlation, which measures whether there is a correlation between two sets of data. This test gives a coefficient ($\rho$) between $-1.0$ to $+1.0$, where negative and positive numbers are negative and positive correlation, and everything above 0.5 (or below -0.5) is considered a strong correlation. The significance of the result is dependent on the amount of data (Rowntree, 1981, pp. 163-166).
5 Results

In this chapter I will first present the results and investigate whether there is a Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian. As noted in section 1.2, there are especially five characteristics of Root Infinitives that have been reported in the literature, recapped here as table 7. These characteristics need to be addressed before we can proceed with the analysis.

| a. | There are cross-linguistic differences in the amount of Root Infinitives: specifically in null subject languages Root Infinitives seem to be vanishingly rare. |
| b. | The relative placement of the verb and clausal adverbials in Root Infinitives is adult-like |
| c. | Root Infinitives seem to be incompatible with non-subject topicalization and/or wh-questions in many languages. |
| d. | There seem to be a relation between Root Infinitives and non target null subjects in child language. |
| e. | Root Infinitives are predominantly used with a modal interpretation, except in English |

Table 7: Characteristic of the Root Infinitive (repeated)

In chapter 1.4 and 3.2 we saw also in that there are Root Infinitives in the adult language as well, in the form of Prescriptive or Jussive Infinitives. Where these constructions appear in the child data, they ought to be considered separately, since they cannot be counted as non-target-like.

In this chapter I will first look at Prescriptive Infinitives in our child data. After that, I will discuss the remaining Root Infinitives in relation to the five different characteristics in table 7. I will then review the different lines of explanations for the Root Infinitive, before I finally present my own analysis, and how that explains the different characteristics in table 7.

5.1 Prescriptive infinitives

In chapter 3.2 the characteristics of the Prescriptive Infinitive, as given in Johannessen (submitted), was given in table 4, repeated here as table 8.
5.1 Child-directed Prescriptive Infinitive

Since these constructions, where they appear in the child data, cannot be counted as non-target-like, all utterances matching these criteria were not counted in the results given below. In total, there were 67 utterances matching these criteria in the files, with instances ranging from files from the youngest to the second oldest informant (Ingrid 2, 2;10.28). Some examples are given in (26). (Here an example from the first file of Lucas is included for illustration.)

(26) a. hjelpe
help. INF

b. ikke lese denne lese denne
not read. INF this-one read. INF this-one

benedikte (2;01;06)

benedikte (2;01;06)

b. ikke lese denne lese denne
not read. INF this-one read. INF this-one

benedikte (2;01;06)

benedikte (2;01;06)

c. pappa lese den lese denne

MAGNUS 1 (2;03.10)

MAGNUS 1 (2;03.10)

d. sitte rett

INGRID 2 (2;10.28)

INGRID 2 (2;10.28)

Furthermore, I found no instances of Root Infinitives with an imperative force that were not in compliance with the characteristics in table 8, viz. no instances of post-verbal negation or 2nd person pronoun. This can indicate that at an early age, the children have acquired this construction and that they use it productively. Moreover, the older children often direct the Prescriptive Infinitives towards their dolls and toys, as seen in (26b), which can indicate that they start realizing the social component of the (Child-directed) Prescriptive Infinitives (table 8f). All utterances that coincided with criteria a-e in table 8, are given in Appendix 9.

5.2 Root Participles

There were ten unambiguous Root Participles in the data, a meagre number compared to the amount of Root Infinitives, which will be discussed in the next section. An exhaustive list is
5.3 Root Infinitives

The number of Root Infinitive clauses and finite clauses in all the files under investigation is given in table 9. The files are listed according to the child’s age at each recording. Column $b$ shows the portion of Root Infinitives in relation to the total unambiguous utterances, and column $a$ shows the percentage of Root Infinitives.

Note that both imperatives and Prescriptive Infinitives are excluded from these data. In the first file of Emil (Emil 1, 2;03.29), his control of the tone accents was deemed too poor for this to be used as a marker in the coding procedure. Therefore, the results of Emil 1 have been excluded from the equation of the total, the mean and the standard deviation.

All unambiguous finite utterances are given in Appendix 11, and all unambiguous Root Infinitives are given in Appendix 12.
Noting the large individual variation, as evident both from the specific percentages, and the standard deviations, we see from the mean percentage that the amount of Root Infinitives is relatively high (26.54%) in stage III, and then plummets down to 2.08% in stage IV.
Concentrating on stage III, if we compare this with the numbers reported in different studies for different languages given in table 10, we see that the data from this study place themselves somewhere between Swedish, and French, and German, bearing in mind the possibility of slightly different designs in the studies (although all are natural speech sampling) and different coding challenges for each languages. We should also bear in mind that Prescriptive Infinitives, to the extent that they exist in the languages, are not excluded in other studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Age Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1;09–2;06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1;09–2;02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Portuguese</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2;07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1;10–2;05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2;01–2;06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1;09–2;08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2;01–1;06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2;03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Percentage of Root Infinitives in different languages (repeated)

- a: adapted from Torrens (1995, p. 466) (Castilian and Catalan);
- b: adapted from Guasti (1993/1994, p. 6);
- c: Kupisch and Rinke (2007, p. 103);
- d: Josefsson (2002, p. 283);
- e: Pierce (1989);
- f: adapted from Phillips (2010), citing Behrens (1993);
- g: adapted from Poeppel and Wexler (1993, p. 6);
- h: adapted from Phillips (2010), citing Krämer (1993);
- i: Wexler et al. (2004, p. 172);

### 5.3.1 The decline of Root Infinitives and some notes on the LARSP-chart.

From table 9, it seems that the frequency of Root Infinitives declines and the construction disappears during stage IV. A Pearson’s chi squared test showed a highly significant difference between the rate of Root Infinitives in stage III and stage IV ($\chi^2 = 447.15, p < 0.001$). To exclude the possibility that the difference between stage III and stage IV is due to individual differences, the effect sizes for the three informants with longitudinal data, Magnus, Anne, and Ingrid (Emil still excluded), were measured using Cohen’s $d$ (see chapter 4.7). A very strong effect size was found ($d = 1.82$).

---

23 The Pearson’s chi squared test takes as an assumption that the observations are independent (Field et al., 2012). Therefore, samples were excluded such that no one child is in both groups, but still yielding an equal number of boys and girls. This gives two alternatives, since we cannot use Emil 1 anyway. Either Anne 1 and Ingrid 2, or Ingrid 1 and Ingrid 2 are excluded. This was done randomly for the numbers given above. For reference: the other alternative was equally significant ($\chi^2 = 89.39, p$-value < 0.001).
Based on these results we can assume that the Optional Infinitive stage lasts at most through stage IV (2;6–3;0) in the LARSP-chart, and that we would not expect to find any Root Infinitives in stage V (3;0–3;6). This information could be useful in studies into language pathology and in diagnostics (cf. 6.6).

5.3.2 Finiteness and null subjects

As mentioned in chapter 1.2.3, the rate of null subjects is cross-linguistically found to be higher in infinitives than in finite clauses (so-called «Root Null Subjects», Guasti, 2002, pp. 163-164). In table 11 the distribution of null subjects is given for all the files in our data. As mentioned in the coding procedure in chapter 4.4.4, all target-like elliptical structures were marked as such, and are excluded from the data given here.
### Table 11: Null subjects in the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Finite Clauses</th>
<th>Root Infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>7/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>11/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4/138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>17/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>9/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>9/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excl. Emil 1)</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
<td>70/296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (excl. Emil 1)</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar (2;06.04)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus (2;08.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnea (2;09.15)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3/62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2 (2;09.22)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie (2;09.28)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2 (2;10;02)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2 (2;10;28)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9/210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2 (2;11.17)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>26/668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected we find null subjects in both contexts. Some examples are given in (27).
Regarding stage III, where the children do produce a certain amount of Root Infinitives and null subject clauses, we also see that there are individual differences between the children. Although the cross-linguistic tendency that there be a larger percentage of null subject clauses in Root Infinitives is borne out for most of the children in stage III, there are two children that do not show this pattern: Kari and Lucas. This is probably due to the small sample size. Kari is the informant with the fewest unambiguous utterances (N=24), and Lucas played a game where he screamed *der brenner* ‘there.LOC burns’ throughout the recordings. Although many of these utterances from Lucas were excluded as self-echoes according to the coding procedures, many did not. This means that finite clauses without overt subjects are overrepresented in the file. Despite these two anomalies, a Pearson’s chi-squared test on the collapsed data from stage III did show a highly significant difference between the amount of null subjects in Root Infinitives and finite clauses ($\chi^2 = 23.018, p < 0.001$). We must therefore conclude that the connection holds for Norwegian as well.
Hamann and Plunkett (1998) found a high correlation between null subjects in finite clauses and Root Infinitives (p. 60) in Danish child language, indicating that null subjects and Root Infinitives are related phenomena. The same is found for French child language by Rasetti (2000). Looking at stage III, a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient showed no significance, but possibly a trend in the correlation between the percentage of Root Infinitives and the percentage of null subjects in finite clauses (rho ≈ 0.71, p ≈ 0.09). The strong correlation coefficient (rho ≈ 0.71) does however indicate that the correlation would have been significant if we had a larger data set.

5.3.3 Finiteness and negation

Let’s turn to the relative placement of clausal adverbials. As mentioned, it has been reported that clausal adverbials, such as negation, follow the verb in finite clauses and precedes the verb in Root Clauses, as shown in the examples in (28) from the present material.

(28) a. ikke sitte denne
    not sit.INF this
    sitte her
    sit.INF here
    Benedikte (2;1.06)

b. Pus ikke spise meg
    Puss not eat.INF me
    Benedikte (2;01.06)

c. den ## der passer ikke der
    It there fit.PRES not there
    Lucas (2;04.02)

In table Error! Reference source not found. we see the relevant numbers from all the files. We clearly see that the negation follows the verb when it is finite, and precedes the verb when it is not. Emil 1 is again excluded for the reasons given above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Finite verb</th>
<th>Root Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-neg</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg-V</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: verb-neg placement

This, however, is an overall small sample. All but one of the infinitive examples stem from one informant, Benedikte, who has no examples of negation in her finite clauses. However, the results do not go against the reports from similar languages where the difference has
been reported (e.g., Jonas, 1995, p. 271; Plunkett & Strömqvist, 1990, pp. 50–51; Santelmann, 1995, p. 208; Waldmann, 2008, p. 146; Westergaard, 2009, p. 114). It would be surprising if our data were to pattern differently from Swedish, Faroese and Northern Norwegian.

On a Fisher squared test of significance, this pattern showed high significance ($p < 0.001$). One might argue that this is due to the high percentage of finite verbs matching the V-neg pattern from the older children who do not have Root Infinitives to a large extent, biasing the data, but a Fisher squared test of the relative verb-negation-placement in stage III only (see 0) also yielded high significance ($p < 0.001$). We must therefore conclude that this pattern also holds for (South-Eastern) Norwegian.

I take these data to indicate that finiteness does have a syntactic reality in the Root Infinitive stage (pace Platzack, 1990, cf. section 6.1 below), and, furthermore that the finite verb in finite clauses has moved out of the vP to some higher functional projection (T or C), and that then non-finite verb of Root Infinitives is left in the vP, as given in (29) (with irrelevant details omitted). (cf. section 2.1.5.)

(29) b. \[XP \text{ pus} [\text{NegP} \text{ ikke} [\text{vP spise meg}]]\]

c. \[(\text{den der}) [XP \text{ passer} [\text{NegP} \text{ ikke} [\text{vP t\_i der}]]\]

5.3.4 Topicalization and \textit{wh}-questions

As discussed in chapter 1.2.4, topicalizations and \textit{wh}-questions seem to be incompatible with Root Infinitives. Such constructions are rare in our data, as evident in table 13, which shows the instances of topicalizations and \textit{wh}-questions in the files with a certain amount of Root Infinitives ($\geq 10\%$), and whether they are found in clauses with a finite verb or in Root Infinitive clauses. Again, this is a small sample, and the data here is not conclusive, which is not surprising given that the amount of unambiguous, non-Prescriptive Infinitive utterances ranges from 26 (Kari) to 63 (Lucas). What this data does show, however, is the fact that these children do produce topicalizations and \textit{wh}-questions, and that the total numbers seem to adhere to the generalization that Root Infinitives are incompatible with \textit{wh}-questions and topicalizations in the Germanic languages, with the exception of English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI (%)</th>
<th>Topicalizations</th>
<th>Wh-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari (2;02.07)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1 (2;03.10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas 2 (2;04.02)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1 (2;04.28)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William (2;05.22)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: The distribution of topicalizations and wh-questions in the informants with a certain amount (≥10%) of Root Infinitives.

The few examples of topicalizations with non-finite verbs we do find either lack a subject, or the subject is preverbal. This is exactly what we would expect if the verb was left in the vP, (cf. previous section) and I take this as an additional indication for this. The three utterances are given in 30 (here an example from the first file of Lucas is included for illustration).

(30) a. denne lese Magnus 1 (2;03.10)
    this read.INF

b. inni sitte Lucas 1 (1;09.23)
    inside sit.INF

c. det jeg gjøre Lucas 2 (2;04.02)
    that I do.INF

However, when the verb is finite, and the subject *is* expressed, the verb has often moved past the subject

(31) a. der **datt katten** ned Ingrid 1 (2;04.28)
    there fell the-cat down
    ‘there the cat fell down’

b. her **er aent** Lucas 2 (2;04.02)
    here is other
    ‘here is (an)other (one)’
5.3.5 Modality

As reported for many languages, English being an exception (Hyams, 2012), non-finite root clauses seem to predominantly get a root modal interpretation. Examples are given in (32), with disambiguating contexts.

(32)  

a. Magnus jeg lese  
I read.INF  
‘I (want to) read’  
denne lese  
this-one read.INF  
‘this one (I want to) read’  
Investigator skal du lese eller skal pappa lese eller ...  
‘Are you gonna read, or is daddy gonna read or …’  
Magnus ja Magnus lese  
yes M. read.INF  
‘Yes M. (want to) read’  
Father skal Magnus lese?  
‘Is M. gonna read?’  
Investigator ja  
‘yes’  
Magnus ja  
‘yes’  

b. Ingrid denne  
this-one  
Mother oi skal vi se i den?  
‘wow, are we gonna have a look in this one?’  
Ingrid sitte der  
sit.INF there  
‘(I wanna) sit there’  
Mother skal du sitte på fanget?  
‘are you gonna sit on the lap?’
c. Lucas (kom jeg) vise deg (come.IMP I) show.INF you
   ‘(come, I will) show you
   Investigator ja?
   yeah?
   Lucas jeg gjøre I do.INF
   ‘I (wanna) do it’
   Investigator ja?
   Lucas jeg gjøre

d. Mother liker du kjeks eller Benedikte?
   ‘do you like cookies, B.?’
   Benedikte spise kjeks nå eat.INF cookies now
   ‘(I wanna) eat cookies now’
   Mother nei vi har ikke mere kjeks

It is however not the case that all Root Infinitives are used with a modal sense, as can be seen from the example in (33).

(33) a. ferdig lese bok nå Anne 1 (2;04;02)
    finished read.INF book now
    ‘finished reading the book now’

Because of the strict coding criteria (cf. section 4.4.4), a large portion of the verbs was not included in the analysis. Therefore I did not make a quantitative investigation of the modality of the unambiguous utterances, since there were so few, and modality is more interwoven with the lexical meaning of the verb than the other variables investigated here. Counting stative and eventive verbs would not be fruitful either, for the same reasons. Also, there is no formal restriction on stative predicates, cf. sitte ‘sit’ and være ‘be’, which both occur in Root Infinitives. Some verbs are of course also considerably more frequent than others for independent reasons.

5.4 Summary

In this chapter I have presented the data from our investigation. What they indicate, is that there seems to be a Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian, and research question 1, repeated here, is therefore answered in the affirmative.

RQ1: Is there a Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian child language?
The Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian seems to extend throughout stage III in the LARSP chart (2;0–2;6). In the transition to stage IV (2;6–3;0) the percentage of Root Infinitives in our data plummets from a mean of 26.54% to 2.08% (cf. table 9). The upper bound of the Root Infinitive stage thus seems to be sometime during stage IV, varying between individuals. More research is needed to identify the lower bounds of the Norwegian Root Infinitive stage.

In the next chapter I will answer research question 2, i.e., how Root Infinitives should be analysed.
6 Analysis

In this chapter I will answer research question 2, repeated here, with specification given as RQ2.1 and RQ2.2

RQ2: How should Root Infinitives be understood within the theoretical framework of generative minimalist syntax?

RQ2.1: To what extent do the four hypotheses outlined above (the small-clause hypothesis, the truncation hypothesis, the unique checking constraint hypothesis, and the modal drop hypothesis) give satisfactory analyses of Root Infinitives, both empirically and theoretically?

RQ2.2: Can a more satisfactory analysis of the Root Infinitive be given, based on new data from Norwegian child language?

In the following sections I review the four hypotheses of Root Infinitives outlined in research questions 2.1. I show that although all the theories have some merit, we must reject them all on empirical and/or theoretical grounds. Then I will answer research question 2.2 by proposing a fifth, new approach, based on the Minimalist Context-Linked Grammar outlined in Sigurðsson (2004, 2007, 2014b) and Sigurðsson and Maling (2008), which I argue can account for all the data presented in the previous chapter in a more satisfactory way.

6.1 Small-clause hypothesis

As mentioned in chapter 1.3.1, in the small-clause hypothesis, early child language is assumed to be deprived of functional categories, i.e., it «can be described within the limits of VP» (Platzack, 1990a, p. 17). This hypothesis makes some clear, testable predictions.

(34) a. Since there are no functional categories for tense or finiteness there should be no consistency in the use of finite/non-finite verb forms.

b. There should be no V2-effects, i.e., where the verb moves past the subject.

c. Since there is no CP to support it there should be no wh-movement.

(34c) seems to hold. In section 5.3.4 we saw that only two of the children who produced a considerable amount of Root Infinitives (≥10%), also produced wh-questions (Lucas 2 and William). As for (34a) and (34b), they are not borne out in our data. Firstly, there is a consistency in the use of finite/non-finite verb forms with regard to their placement in
relation to negation (cf. section 5.3.3 and chapter 1.2.2), and they are often used with a root modal meaning (cf. section 5.3.5 and chapter 1.2.5). Secondly, the children seem to use topicalizations in predominantly finite clauses, and when they do, when the subject is present, the verb is often raised past it (i.e., V2-effect), counter to the prediction of the small-clause hypothesis. In addition, the small-clause hypothesis has a problem with explaining why wh-questions are not incompatible with Root Infinitives in English (cf. chapter 1.2.4).

There is also a theoretical argument in favour of abandoning the small-clause hypothesis. The argument goes as follows. We know that children understand more than they produce. In the present framework, we assume functional categories to be motivated by properties in natural language and bear features that have direct consequences for the interpretation of the resulting utterance. To assume that children are deprived of functional categories is thus tantamount to saying either i) that children do not fully interpret and comprehend utterances that need higher functional projections, such as questions and tensed utterances, or ii) that children use an altogether different apparatus for producing speech on the one hand and comprehending speech on the other. The first alternative seems empirically incorrect, and the second leads to a considerably more complicated theory and is conceptually unappealing.

6.2 Truncation Hypothesis

The truncation hypothesis of Rizzi (1993/1994) is similar to the small clause hypothesis, differing only in that the syntactic structures are truncated only in some utterances, and not all. The argument is that the child’s grammar has not matured to a state where the child realizes that all clauses are CPs. Thus, the empirical and theoretical counterarguments for the small-clause hypothesis do not hold for the truncation hypothesis, since the children are able to project a full structure and thus supporting topicalizations and V2-effects, in addition to interpreting language basically in the same way that adult speakers do. They just don’t do it constantly, and when they don’t, this results in Root Infinitives and null subjects. Given the full competence hypothesis I have chosen for this thesis, and that I assume the CP-TP-vP structure to be universal (see section 1.6 and 2.2.2), there is no reason why children should truncate the structure. 24 The Truncation Hypothesis is therefore not compatible with the

---

24 Thanks to Janne B. Johannessen for pointing this out.
framework adopted here. Rather, an account that makes reference to a 2nd (or 3rd) factor explanation would be preferable.

6.3 Unique Checking Constraint

The Unique Checking Constraint hypothesis (UCC) assumes, counter to the Small Clause hypothesis and the truncation hypothesis, that children do know the functional categories of their target language(s) and are able to project full syntactic structures, and do so also in Root Infinitives. Wexler (1998) assumes that children have set the relevant parameters of their target language(s) at «the earliest observable stage», i.e., before they start to produce two-word utterances, around 18 months (Wexler, 1998, p. 25), and that they have control of many of the inflectional categories in their target language at the same time. The first is called Very Early Parameter Setting (VEPS) (Wexler, 1996, 1998), and the second is called Very Early Knowledge of Inflection (VEKI) (Wexler, 1998). Given VEPS and VEKI, the Root Infinitive stage is not a reflection of incomplete acquisition of the target language (cf. the modal drop hypotheses, sections 6.4 and 1.3.4), but, according to Wexler (1998), have maturational explanations which will become clear below (cf. section 2.2.2).

UCC claims to explain the following characteristics of the language of English speaking children in the Root Infinitive stage:

(35)  

a. They often use accusative case in subject position in general, and predominantly in Root Infinitives («her going», Wexler (1998, p. 43).

b. They often drop the subject altogether, and predominantly so in Root Infinitives (cf. our data in section 5.3.2).

c. The subject is often to the left of the negation in Root Infinitives «Mary not go», Wexler (1998, p. 43).

d. Null subject languages generally do not have a Root Infinitive stage (cf. section 1.2.1).

(35a) is taken to indicate that the subject has not been assigned nominative case by the verb, as accusative is assumed to be the default case in English. (35c) is taken to indicate that the subject has been moved out of the vP to a higher functional projection. We now turn to the UCC theory.
UCC makes use of a split Inflectional Phrase (IP, or TP in our terminology) (cf. Pollock, 1989), with separate functional Projections for subject-verb agreement (AgrP) and tense (TP). UCC builds on Chomsky’s (1995) proposal that the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) – the principle that demands that every clause have a subject – should be construed in terms of an uninterpretable D-feature \([uD]\) in \(T^o\) instead of a nominative case feature. 

Wexler’s (1998) account for Root Infinitives is as follows. There is a \([uD^{EPP}]\) feature in both \(T^o\) and Agr\(^o\)\(^25\), demanding that the subject is moved to its specifier in order to delete it. In the normal course of events, i.e., in adult English, both \([uD^{EPP}]\) features would be checked and deleted by the subject. To explain Root Infinitives, Wexler (1998) proposes that children, innately, have a constraint that disallow any feature to check and delete more than one other feature – the Unique Checking Constraint. Thus, only one of the \([uD^{EPP}]\) features in either AgrP or TP can be deleted, and one (or both) of the projections must be omitted from the syntactic derivation or else the derivation would crash because of the unchecked uninterpretable \([uD]\). Since the English 3rd person singular present -\(s\) marks both tense and agreement, the result if either TP or AgrP (or both) is omitted, is the unmarked form of the verb (‘like, eat,’ etc.). With \([uD^{EPP}]\) both AgrP and TP driving movement, the subject would still need to raise past the negation in order to check and delete it, explaining (35c).

Schütze and Wexler (1996a) and Wexler (1998) assume that the AGR-projection licenses nominative case. When it is omitted the subject receives accusative case, as this is the default. This thus explains (35a).

Given VEPS, the null subject parameter is also set at a very early age, so the null subjects in child (non-null subject) languages cannot be due to a mis-setting of the null subject parameter. Rather, Wexler (1998) proposes that null subjects in child language are i) due to a pragmatic error, as an effect of which they overgeneralize the use of topic-drop (p. 35), and ii) because «the null subjects of OI’s [Optional Infinitives, read Root Infinitives] are licensed in some way by the non-finite main verb» (p. 33), as a PRO, which is normally licensed by non-finite verbs, as in control structures (e.g. «John, tried [to PRO, sleep]»).

Since null subjects in finite clauses can only be instances of topic-drop, but null subjects in Root Infinitives can either be instances of topic-drop or PROs, the frequency of null subjects in Root Infinitives will necessarily be higher, thus explaining (35b).

\(^{25}\) For Wexler (1998) the \([uD]\) feature is «strong». I have translated the terminology to more recent minimalist terminology.
Wexler (1998) proposes for null subject languages (such as Italian and Spanish) that the Agr\(^o\) itself licenses the null subject, because Agr\(^o\) is in a sense nominal in these languages (Wexler, 1998, p. 70) – essentially, Agr\(^o\) is D, and therefore neither needs nor can be checked by the subject’s D-feature. Thereby only the \([uD]\) feature of T\(^o\) needs to be checked by the subject, and UCC is not violated in these languages, explaining (35d).

In order to explain why the child, despite UCC, sometimes produces finite clauses, Wexler (1998) proposed the principle *Minimize Violations* (MV), which demands that the speaker chooses the alternative that violates the fewest grammatical requirements. The child has the choice between violating UCC, or violating what in Wexler’s (1998) words is an «interpretable/conceptual property which requires [both] AGRS [AgrP] and TNS [TP]» (p. 65). Both alternatives are equally unpreferable and the child would vary between Root Infinitives, and finite clauses.

As mentioned in chapter 1.2.4, Root Infinitives seem to be incompatible with *wh*-questions in V2 languages (cf. our results in 5.3.4), whereas this is not the case for English. In Wexler’s (1998) account it is «a property of V2 languages that if Spec,CP is filled by some constituent [e.g., a *wh*-phrase] then C must be filled by a finite verb» (p. 38). Since the V2 parameter is set at a very early age in these languages (cf. VEPS), the child knows that the finite verb must be in C in *wh*-phrases, and therefore never produces Root Infinitive *wh*-questions.

VEPS and UCC seem to account for all the empirical facts of Root Infinitives, except their predominant root modal reading found in most languages, and the possible correlation between Root Infinitives and null subjects in finite clauses. There are however theoretical reasons for abandoning at least the UCC. The UCC involves postulating specific, universal principles of UG to explain child data. Then in principle anything could happen: «Permitting the characteristics of the child and adult processing systems to differ opens a Pandora’s box of possible processing explanations» (Crain & Thornton, 1998, p. 31). Wexler (1998) also proposes an alternative conception of UCC, where the D-feature of the subject is also uninterpretable, bolstering the claim with the observation that children in the Root Infinitive stage often omit determiners (pp. 68-69). If this is the case, the D feature of the subject would also be deleted when checking and deleting the \([uD]\) features of either Agr\(^o\) or T\(^o\). Such an account does not only seem empirically flawed, as evident from the Root Infinitive
examples in (36) where the subjects are obviously DPs. It would also have considerable ramifications for the understanding of interpretability, interface conditions, and categorial features. If a DP has a D-feature in the capacity of being the category D°, how can a D° have an uninterpretable D-feature, and how is a D-less D° interpreted at LF? Further, given Wexler’s (1998) own Very Early Knowledge of Inflection (VEKI), where would the child get the «knowledge» that the D-feature of the subject is uninterpretable, when it cannot possibly be present in the primary linguistic data?

(36) a. den sitte der Kari
   ILM sit.INF there

   b. katten være her William
      the-cat be.INF here

   c. bebiene sove Benedikte
      the-babies sleep.INF

As outlined in section 2.2.2, I assume that there are no child specific principles of grammar. In addition to the problems of UCC outlined above, it is thus also incompatible with the theoretical framework adopted in this thesis.

6.4 Modal drop hypotheses

In our data, Root Infinitives seem to be predominantly root modal (cf. section 5.3.5). This observation seems to hold cross-linguistically, with the exception of English (cf. section 1.2.5). In addition Root Infinitives seem to be predominantly used with eventive, and not stative predicates (the eventivity constraint, Hoekstra & Hyams, 1998). This has led many scholars to propose that Root Infinitives involve dropped (or null) modal auxiliaries. I reviewed this line of hypotheses in section 1.3.4. In this section I will go into some more depth, considering two of these theories.

In addition to explaining why Root Infinitives often get a root modal interpretation, Modal drop hypotheses have the advantage of readily explaining the relative placement of the verb and the negation in our data, as this patterns as expected given a missing modal auxiliary.
A general problem with modal drop hypotheses however, is that they cannot *eo ipso* explain why Root Infinitives seem to be incompatible with *wh*-questions and topicalizations in Norwegian and other languages, as pointed out in Poeppel and Wexler (1993). If the Root Infinitive just involved a missing or silent auxiliary, we would expect it to pattern syntactically just like finite clauses with an auxiliary and allow *wh*-questions and topicalizations. The two hypotheses reviewed below, Hyams’ (2012) *Aspectual Anchoring hypothesis* and Josefsson’s (2002) account, have both found ways to explain this distributional difference between Root Infinitives and finite clauses.

### 6.4.1 Aspectual Anchoring Hypothesis


(37) Aspectual Anchoring Hypothesis (AAH)

In the absence of a tense specification, the temporal meaning of a sentence is given by its aspectual properties.

The basis of this assumption is that eventive predicates have an aspectual event variable. Hyams (2012) proposes that eventive predicates can be anchored to the speech event time either by their aspectual properties (i.e., the aspectual event variable), or through a *null modal*. This excludes stative predicates for the following reasons. Firstly, by assumption, stative predicates do not have an event variable. Secondly, while *epistemic* modality can take both eventive and stative complements, *root* modality prototypically takes eventive complements. Since children are reported to master epistemic modality around the age of 3, i.e., after or in the end of the Root Infinitive stage, they cannot use the null modal with stative predicates (cf. section 1.2.5 for examples and references).

To explain the observation that the Modal Reference Effect and the Eventivity Constraint do not hold for English, Hyams (2012) proposes an English *null do*, which is aspectually and modally neutral, whereby the eventivity constraint can be bypassed in this language. Hyams (2012) assumes that the *null modals* are non-finite, and since English modals can only be finite, a null modal is not available to the English speaking children, which bolsters the claim above. The non-finite modal also accounts for the fact that Root Infinitives seem to be incompatible with *wh*-questions and topicalizations in many languages.
Although Hyams (2012) gives a good account of the interpretation of Root Infinitives, and explains the Modal Reference Effect and the Eventivity Constraint cross-linguistically for Root Infinitives in English, Dutch, and Russian, and child bare participles in Greek, she refrains from explaining the licensing of the Root Infinitives in child languages (as pointed out by herself, Hyams, 2012). Despite this, she makes some very specific claims about the structure of Root Infinitives, e.g. that they may include null modals, and that the null modals are non-finite. She assumes that also the English null do auxiliary is non-finite. This is problematic: While it is correct that the paradigm of the verb do has a non-finite form, auxiliary do arguably does not.

(38)

b. I did learn to swim.

c. *It’s hard to do learn to swim

d. It’s hard to do it.

In addition, Hyams (2012) does not explain why Root Infinitives license subjects at all, which they presumably should not if they lack finiteness altogether.

### 6.4.2 Josefsson (2002)

Josefsson (2002) proposes an account which is similar in several ways to Hyams (2012) account. She suggests that Swedish Root Infinitives involve null auxiliaries, and that they are specifically connected to specific speech act she calls «the creative speech act» (p. 273), as well as directives. These speech acts, she argues, «do not require tense because an evaluation may take place by means of direct observation» (p. 290), as opposed to interrogatives or declaratives. Following Enç (1987), Josefsson (2002) proposes that there is a time operator in C°, which anchors the utterance to the speech event time (p. 292), which is not needed in these particular speech acts.

Josefsson (2002) adopts the Full Competence hypothesis of language acquisition (cf. section 2.2.2). She supposes that, given the Full Competence hypothesis, the reason why children allow finiteness to not be expressed in a main clause (i.e., Root Infinitives) is because it is also licit in adult Swedish, in structures such as (39)(p. 297), where the auxiliary can be
optionally omitted. In other words, there is positive evidence that finiteness is not needed for a clause to be grammatical.

(39) Jag tror att ni (har) haft nog med besvär nu
    ‘I believe that you (have) had enough with trouble now
    ‘I think that you’ve had enough trouble now’

To explain why Root Infinitives are incompatible with wh-questions and topicalizations, Josefsson proposes that the null auxiliary head has to be properly governed, i.e., stand in a spec-head relation with an agreeing head (cf. Josefsson, 1998). In the normal course of events, the finite null auxiliary would have moved to Fin° (in the split-CP model of Rizzi, 2002, see section 2.1.5), check a [f] there whereby the subject raises to Spec-FinP, establishing an agreement relation with the null auxiliary, and the null auxiliary is thus properly governed. In subject-initial clauses, the subject would move to Spec-ForceP, leaving a trace in Spec-FinP. In topicalizations and non-subject wh-questions, the topicalized element or the wh-phrase would have to be moved past the subject to Spec-ForceP, violating the Minimal Link Conditions (MLC), or Shortest Link, i.e. that shorter movement is preferred over longer movement (Chomsky, 1993, pp. 17-18). In order not to violate MLC, the finite verb is moved to Force° in order to satisfy the principle of Minimal Compliance (cf. e.g., Platzack, 2004), rendering V2. But in Root Infinitives the finite verb is the null-auxiliary, which in Spec-ForceP is not in a spec-head relation with an agreeing head, and consequently not properly governed. The structure is therefore illicit.

Although Josefsson’s (2002) account for Root Infinitives is elegant, and nicely explains the problems of Root Infinitives and wh-questions and topicalizations, some of the principles she bases her theory on does not seem able to account for the Norwegian data. For example, the licensing condition for null auxiliaries based on Josefsson (1998) presupposes the acceptability of sentences such as (39), where the auxiliary can be dropped in subordinate clauses, and the unacceptability of sentences such as (40) (1998, p. 32): with a dropped auxiliary in a matrix clause. (Andréasson, Karlsson, Magnusson, & Tingsell, 2002)

---

26 The principle of Minimal Compliance (Richards, 1998) states that if the obstacle – in this case the subject – or the specifier of the obstacle – in this case the null auxiliary – undergoes movement, a violation of MLC is avoided (Platzack, 2004, p. 195).
The argument is that finiteness can be recovered by the complementizer, and that the null auxiliary *har* is properly governed by it, whereas this possibility does not exist in the matrix clause, where there is no subjunction. But neither of these sentences is acceptable in Norwegian. In fact, finite have-omission is very specific to Swedish.

(41) Jeg tror at dere *(har) hatt nok besvær nå

According to Larsson (2009, pp. 375-376) the facts given in Josefsson (1998) are not totally representative: The auxiliary *har* can be dropped in any position with non-V2. See (42).

(42) han kanske inte (har) skrivit brevet ännu
he perhaps not (have) written the-letter yet

‘He has maybe not written the letter yet’

Clauses such as (39) are believed to the positive evidence for Root Infinitives in Swedish. But as we saw above, these structures do not exist in Norwegian, and even in Swedish they are very rare (Andréasson et al., 2002) and restricted to the auxiliary *have*. Modals are never omitted.

The discussion in this section has revealed that there are good reasons not to consider a modal drop account. There are however two points from Josefsson (1998) that I will adopt or discuss further in the next section. The first point is that Root Infinitives are due to positive evidence that Root Clauses do not need finiteness. However, I will argue that it is not optionally dropped auxiliaries in adult language that represent this input, but the Prescriptive Infinitive (see section 1.4 and 3.2). The second point is how the grammars of children allow finiteness not to be expressed. As mentioned above, Josefsson (1998) argues that children use Root Infinitives in special speech acts. The first is what she has termed a «creative speech act», which is a kind of performative. In her view «children perform the same speech act as the one in Genesis [«let there be light!] when playing. By virtue of their imaginary force, human beings, especially children, create when playing» (p. 292). The second speech act is a directive one, which in the cases where the subject is the addressee would make them Prescriptive Infinitives in the terminology used here.
6.5 A new proposal: A context-anchoring hypothesis of Root Infinitives

A common feature of most of the accounts for Root Infinitives is that Root Infinitives are assumed to be ordinary finite root clauses with something silent or missing. The small-clause hypothesis, the truncation hypothesis, and the UCC hypothesis see Root Infinitives as clauses missing functional projections relating to tense, finiteness or subject agreement. The modal drop hypotheses see Root Infinitives as finite clauses missing a (phonologically visible) modal auxiliary. In taking this view, the theories need to explain why Root Infinitives cannot do the things ordinary finite clauses can do, and as I have argued above, these accounts fall through either on empirical or theoretical grounds, or both.

As an alternative, I propose a new perspective on Root Infinitives, where Root Infinitives are viewed structurally as non-finite clauses. In taking this view, many of the empirical facts are readily explained by what we already know about non-finite clauses and by observable facts about Norwegian. Then what the theory needs to explain is why Root Infinitives can do things that ordinary non-finite clauses cannot.

I propose, similar to Josefsson (1998), that Root Infinitives are due to positive evidence in the input that root clauses do not need finiteness, and I propose that this positive evidence is supplied by the Prescriptive Infinitive. Therefore, Root Infinitives can be seen as overgeneralizations of the structure of the Prescriptive Infinitive. After all, these structures are found predominantly in child-directed speech, and would therefore be highly present in the child’s input, and I reported in section 5.1 that the children in this study seem to have acquired the Prescriptive Infinitive.

To analyse the structure of Root Infinitives, I will use the Minimalist Context-Linked Grammar outlined in Sigurðsson (2004) and subsequent. In order for this overgeneralization to work, I have to revise the analysis in Johannessen (submitted) somewhat to make it fit the chosen framework, but I will base the revised analysis on new data from adult Norwegian.

One weakness of many of the previous accounts of Root Infinitives is the lack of discussion of the notion of finiteness or the failure of not separating finiteness from tense. Before I
present my analysis I will therefore discuss finiteness, its syntactic realization in Norwegian, and how I choose to analyse it.

6.5.1 Finiteness

Finiteness can be assumed to have the function of anchoring the utterance to the speech event, primarily temporally to the speech event time – to the *temporal coordinates* of the speech event (Bianchi, 2003). Another important function typically assigned to finiteness, is the ability to license an overt subject (cf. e.g., Cowper, to appear). Both of these functions are important for the understanding of Root Infinitives. The reason why Root Infinitives have often been treated as corresponding to finite structures is presumably that they seem to be deictically anchored to the speech event, and that they often occur with overt subjects. We will therefore need to look more closely at the syntax of these two functions.

**Speech event anchoring**

Finite root clauses are deictically anchored to the speech event, whereas (adult) non-finite clauses are not. In addition to the temporal anchoring of the clause to speech event time, and possibly also spatial anchoring, the speech event also includes speech event participants, i.e., an *addressee* (the recipient) (Bianchi, 2003). These assumptions have been incorporated into the C-domain in the framework of Sigurðsson (2004, 2007, 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2014a, 2014b). This can be represented as in figure 4.

![C-domain](image)

Figure 4: Sigurðsson’s CP
In figure 4, there are addresser and addressee categories – logophoric agent (Λₐ) and logophoric patient (Λₚ) respectively. The (Fin)iteness category represents the temporal/spatial anchoring of the clause to the speech event (Sigurðsson, 2014a, p. 71).

In the following, a discussion of person feature licensing in finite root clauses is given. This is because the discussion of subject and person licensing will be important throughout this section. According to Sigurðsson (2014a) the licensing of person features happens as follows. A nominal argument (NP) – the subject – is merged in Spec-vP. This NP then enters into an agree relation with T°, which values it as either personal or non-personal (±Pn). T° enters into an agree relation with the CP where its +Pn is valued in relation to Λₐ and Λₚ in the manner outlined in (44), and the pronominal subject inherits this value. Non-personal NPs – inanimates or indefinites – get 3rd person features by default. The speech event participants Λₐ and Λₚ are logophorically identified from the context. These agreement and identification relations are shown in (43)

\[
\begin{align*}
(43) \quad \text{Context} & \quad \left[ \text{CP} \quad \{ \text{Top, } \Lambdaₐ, \Lambdaₚ \} \right] \quad \text{Fin°} \left[ \text{TP} \right. \quad \{ \pm \text{Pn} \} \left. \right] \quad \{ \text{vP, NP} \} \{ \alpha \text{Pn} \} ]
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(44) \quad \text{The computation of person, from Sigurðsson (2014b, p. 108),}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a1. \quad \text{NP}_{+ \text{Pn}} & \Rightarrow \text{NP}_{+ \text{Pn} / + \Lambdaₐ, - \Lambdaₚ} = 1\text{st person by computation} \\
a2. \quad \text{NP}_{+ \text{Pn}} & \Rightarrow \text{NP}_{+ \text{Pn} / - \Lambdaₐ, + \Lambdaₚ} = 2\text{nd person by computation} \\
a3. \quad \text{NP}_{+ \text{Pn}} & \Rightarrow \text{NP}_{+ \text{Pn} / - \Lambdaₐ, - \Lambdaₚ} = 3\text{rd person by computation} \\
b. \quad \text{NP}_{- \text{Pn}} & = 3\text{rd person by default («no person»)}
\end{align*}
\]

**Non-finite clauses**

Before we move forward to subject licensing, we should note that there are different non-finite clauses in Norwegian. We can distinguish at least between ECM structures, raising structures, and control infinitives. Examples are given in (45).

\[
(45) \quad \begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{Theo hørte [ham gråte]} \quad & \quad \text{ECM} \\
T. \quad \text{heard [him.ACC cry]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. \quad \text{Motstand, synes [å tₐ være nytteløst]} \quad & \quad \text{Raising} \\
\text{Resistance, seems [to tₐ be useless]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
c. \quad \text{Maleneₐ prøver [å PROₐ lære wolof]} \quad & \quad \text{Control}
\end{align*}
\]

81
M. tries [to PRO learn Wolof]
‘Malene is trying [to learn Wolof]’

We have already seen an ECM structure in section 1.3.1. Another one is given here as (45a). ECM structures are often assumed to be structures where the non-finite clause (within the brackets) has a vP as its highest node. There is no T° in the embedded non-finite clause which can license nominative case to the subject, whereby the subject *him* is licensed accusative case by the superordinate vP. Since there is no T° that can license the infinitive form, this is thought to be the default form (Åfarli & Eide, 2003, pp. 179-182).

In the raising construction in (45b), the subject has been raised from the non-finite clause, to the subject position in the matrix clause, as opposed to ECM structures, and, as we will see, control infinitives that license a PRO. This is because the matrix verb *synes* ‘seems’ is a raising verb. It has no theta-arguments, and because of the theta (θ) criterion («Each argument bears one and only one θ-role, and each θ-role is assigned one and only one argument» Chomsky, 1993 [1981], p.36), the subject is allowed to raise to the subject position of the matrix verb, although it has received a θ-role from the verb in the non-finite clause.

In the control infinitive, the «subject» of the non-finite clause in the brackets in (45c) is a phonologically empty PRO. The properties of PRO and how it is licensed will be discussed in the following section.

### 6.5.2 Subject licensing in finite root clauses and control infinitives

As mentioned above, finite and non-finite clauses also differ with respect to the subject requirement. Compare the examples in (46).

(46) a. *(du) kom var en tabbe
   That *(you) came was a mistake

   b. (*du) å komme var en tabbe
      *(you) to come was a mistake

The finite verb, the past tense form *kom* ‘came’, can license a subject, whereas the infinitive verb, *å komme* ‘to come’ cannot. As pointed out above, it is standardly assumed that non-finite clauses have a phonetically empty subject PRO.
The licencing of PRO has generally been taken to be due to the non-finite verbs inability to license nominative case and subject verb agreement (see e.g., Cowper, to appear), whereby a case-less (or «null-case») and silent PRO is licensed instead (e.g., Áfarli & Eide, 2003). I will not adopt this view. Instead, I assume, with e.g. Sigurðsson (2007) and Landau (2006), that the licencing of PRO is unrelated to licencing of case. One reason for this assumption, is that PRO displays case agreement in languages such as Icelandic (Sigurðsson, 1991), indicating that PRO can carry case. In the example in (48a), vanta ‘lack’ takes an accusative subject, and in (48b) the verb leiðast ‘be bored’ takes a dative subject (examples of «quirky case»), from Sigurðsson (2007). In (48), the case of the subject is visible on the quantifier (accusative alla, dative öllum).

(48) a. strákarnir vonast til að PROj vanta ekkí alla, í skólan
the-boys.NOM hope for to lack not all.ACC in the-school
‘the boys hope that not all will be absent from school’

b. strákarnir vonast til að PROj leiðast ekkí öllum, í skólan
the-boys.NOM hope for to bore not all.DAT in the-school
‘the boys hope that not all will be bored at school’

With Sigurðsson (2007), I assume that PRO is a result of the absence of speech event anchoring of the non-finite clause, since «Infinitival clauses […] do not encode the speech event, and cannot license full-fledged person agreement» (Bianchi, 2010, cf. Bianchi, 2003).

According to Sigurðsson, CP2 in figure 5 intervenes between the non-finite T° in the non-finite clause and the controller in the matrix clause (Sigurðsson, 2012a). Following the analysis given in section 6.5.1, there is therefore no agree relation between the matrix subject and the T° in non-finite clauses, and the subject cannot get its Pn-feature valued in the syntax. Because of this, the φ-featureless PRO is licensed instead.
In my analysis I propose that the Fin° is present in the non-finite CP (CP₂ in figure 5), and is the landing site for the infinitive marker å ‘to’ (K. R. Christensen, 2007). How non-finiteness is encoded in the non-finite Fin° of control infinitives is not crucial for my analysis of Root Infinitives. For concreteness, I propose that it is negatively valued for finiteness ([−f]).

As seen in examples like (49), PRO seems to have φ-features, with which a reflexive can agree.

(49) a. Jeg har sluttet å PRO: barbere meg₁
   I have stopped to PRO shave REFLECTIVE.1.SG
   ‘I have stopped shaving’

   b. Har du sluttet å PRO: barbere deg₂?
   have you stopped to PRO shave REFLECTIVE.2.SG
   ‘have you stopped shaving?’

However, we can assume that PRO itself is deprived of φ-features, or «phi-feature deficient», Sigurðsson (2007, p. 27), and inherits its person features from the controller, in

Figure 5: Malene prøver å lære wolof ‘Malene is trying to learn Wolof’
these cases the subject of the matrix clause. (However, following Sigurðsson, 2012, p. 27, control predicates are blocked from transmitting their φ-licensing properties onto the non-finite T, and further onto PRO, because of C intervening. We will come back to a possible way around this problem below.)

What happens if we sever the controller from the matrix clause, as in (50a)?

(50) a. det var lurt å PRO3 barbere seg/*meg/*deg, EXPL was smart to pro shave refl.3/1sg/2sg ‘it was a good idea to shave’

b. det var lurt at jeg3 barberte meg/*seg, EXPL was smart that I shave refl.1sg/3 ‘it was a good idea that I shaved’

c. det var lurt at du3 barberte deg/*seg, EXPL was smart that you shave refl.2sg/3 ‘it was a good idea that you shaved’

It differs from speaker to speaker to which extent the different alternatives of the example in (50a) are acceptable. To some it is only acceptable with the 3rd person reflexive, whereas for others, all three are acceptable. For the author, only 3rd and marginally 1st person reflexives are acceptable. The important point here is however that 3rd person is always possible, and seems to function as an unmarked default. This is in line with the computation of person of Sigurðsson, outlined above, and in which case we can assume that an arbitrary PRO (PROarb) has been licensed, which we get in generic versions of control infinitives (cf. example (46) above: to PROarb come was a mistake).

However, (50a) with a 3rd person reflexive, det var lurt å barbere seg, can be synonymous with (the acceptable versions of) (50b) and (50c) in all aspects relevant for this discussion. That is, the 3rd person pronoun can refer to the addressee or the addressee with the reading ‘it was a good idea of you/me to shave’. Conversely, in (50b) and (50c), the third person reflexive is sharply unacceptable. The question is, if the 3rd person is the default, where does PRO get its 1st and 2nd person features in (50a)? After all, (50a) with 1st and 2nd person reflexives is acceptable to many Norwegian speakers.
One could argue that this is some pragmatic-morphological relation, and that the person features are drawn directly from the extra-linguistic context, but then we would have to assume that this should presumably hold for all instances of person feature assignment on PRO. This cannot be true, as is evident from the Brazilian Portuguese examples below. In Brazilian Portuguese, *a gente* ‘the people’ can be used as a 1st person plural pronoun (‘we’), but gets 3rd person singular agreement, both in the verb and the reflexive (cf. Landau, 2013). In the examples in (51), both *a gente* and the 1st person plural pronoun *nós* thus refer to the same entities, but the reflexives nevertheless need to agree with the controller.

(51) a. *a gente* decidiu *se/nos* preparar
   we.3SG decided.3SG REFL.3/1.PL prepare.INF
   ‘we decided to prepare ourselves’

b. *nós* decidimos *se/nos* preparar
   we.1pl decided.1pl REFL.3/1.PL prepare.INF
   ‘we decided to prepare ourselves’

(Yuri F. Venancio, p.c.)

Another possible explanation could be that PRO in examples such as (50a) (and perhaps in general) gets its person features at PF, i.e., post-syntactically, after spell-out. This has in fact been suggested by Sigurðsson (2007) and Landau (2013). We then would have to assume a morphology that is «radically disentangled from syntax» (Sigurðsson, 2007, p. 1). After all, there seems to be no semantic difference between 1st and 3rd, and 2nd and 3rd person agreement respectively (when it is not used generically), in the example (50a).

Following the discussion in 2.1.4, we can assume that there is a «tight race» between the 3rd person and the 2nd or 1st person reflexives from the vocabulary list. Exactly how PRO can inherit the 1st and 2nd person features in (50a) is a discussion that surpasses the scope of this thesis, and I will leave it for later investigations.27 We do, for now, note that it is possible to some Norwegians.

### 6.5.3 The structure of Root Infinitives

Using the framework sketched out above, I will propose an analysis of the Root Infinitive as a non-finite clause that lacks the functional projection Fin, but still has the speech event

27 A possible explanations to how PRO can inherit the 1st and 2nd person features in (50a) could be that PF somehow allows them to be inherited directly from the speech event participants encoded in \( \Lambda_x \) and \( \Lambda_{pr} \) in the matrix clause, and that the non-finite CP only blocks agreement in the syntax.
participant features $\Lambda_A$ and $\Lambda_P$ encoded in the C-domain. The structure of Root Infinitives is thus as in Figure 6.

\[\text{Figure 6: Proposed structure of the Root Infinitive}\]

Since I further assume that this is the same structure as (both child and adult) Prescriptive Infinitives (see the discussion in section 6.5.9), we want ForceP to be present so that it can be marked as imperative. It is difficult to tell where exactly the subject is in the structure, and may in fact vary. In Figure 6 I have placed it in the base position (spec-vP).

This constellation is available in several languages. One need not go further than to European Portuguese and its inflected Infinitive. See the example in (52).

\begin{verbatim}
(52) Será difícil [eles aprovar\text{em} a proposta]
    be\_FUT.3P difficult [they approve\_INF.3PL the proposal]
    \text{‘it will be difficult (for them) to approve the proposal’}
\end{verbatim}

The subject of the non-finite clause, \textit{eles} ‘they’, is obviously overt and pronominal. I take this to indicate that $\Lambda_A$ and $\Lambda_P$ are encoded in the C-domain, but that Fin° is not.

In the following I will explain the rationale for this specific analysis, and show how it explains the data given in chapter 5: The incompatibility with \textit{wh}-questions and topicalizations, their predominant root modality, and why they have null subjects more often
than finite clauses. I argue that speech event participles must be present, (i) because it Root Infinitives can have overt, pronominal subjects, and (ii) because Root Infinitives are root clauses, and the speech act participants should be encoded like in any other root clause. I further argue that Fin° is not present in Root Infinitives, as indicated by the fact that Fin° is the landing site for the infinitive marker in control structures and other non-finite clauses (K. R. Christensen, 2007) while Root Infinitives never have an infinitive marker. As a possible explanation for why Root Infinitives do not need to be spatio-temporally anchored, I consider the proposal of Josefsson (2002).

6.5.4 Topicalization and wh-questions

If I had assumed that Root Infinitives were clauses with a missing finite auxiliary, I would have been required to give an extra analysis of why Topicalizations and wh-questions seem to be (more or less) incompatible with Root Infinitives. Since I take as a starting point that Root Infinitives are non-finite clauses, this incompatibility more or less comes for free.

*Wh*-interrogatives are only licit in finite clauses in Norwegian, as evident from the examples in (53). There is in other words no positive input supporting *wh*-questions in Root Infinitives. Such structures would involve a Force° marked [INT]errogative, with absence of the Fin° category. Evidence in favour of an [INT] Force° would require an initial *wh*-word. This is a very salient cue, which could not easily be confused with anything else. There is in other words no conceivable reason to assume Norwegian *wh*-Root Infinitives in the first place.

(53) a. I don’t know how to analyse Root Infinitives
   b. *Jeg vet ikke hvordan å analysere Rot-Infinitiver
      I know not how to analyse Root Infinitives
   c. Jeg vet ikke hvordan jeg skal analysere Rot-Infinitiver
      I know not how I should analyse Root Infinitives
      ‘I don’t know I should analyse Root Infinitives’

As for topicalizations, I argue in line with Wexler (1998) and others that they are connected to V2, which demands that a finite verb be in second place. Topicalizations would in other words be illicit in Root Clauses, since the verb there is left in vP and non-finite.
How to analyse the V2 phenomenon is a longstanding and ongoing debate that by far surpasses the scope of this thesis. Whether it is a phenomenon of narrow syntax or a PF criterion (Platzack, 2013) or something completely different will not occupy us here. We should note, however, that both Westergaard (2009, forthcoming) and Josefsson (2002) report some stray instances of wh-Root Infinitives and Root Infinitives with topicalization (see section 1.2.4), and there were a few examples of Root Infinitives with topicalization in our data as well (see section 5.3.4). Thus a universal V2 parameter or V2 by some universal principle would not capture all the data, while approaches to V2 as a number of construction specific «micro-cues» (cf. Westergaard, 2009, forthcoming) or as a PF criterion (Platzack, 2013) would be more preferable to this end.

6.5.5 Fin° and the missing infinitive marker

In our data, there is no infinitive marker å ‘to’ in Root Infinitives (cf. Appendix 12). To my knowledge, the same holds for all other languages where Root Infinitives have been reported. Since Fin° can be assumed to be the landing site for the infinitive marker (K. R. Christensen, 2007), I take this as an indication that Fin° is not present in Root Infinitives.

6.5.6 Root modality

As presented in section 5.3.5, and as has also been reported cross-linguistically (see section 1.2.5), Root Infinitives often get a root modal interpretation. Semantically, prescriptive mood and root modality are similar in that they both refer to someone’s to-do-list, to use the terminology of Portner (2007). If we assume Root Infinitives to be overgeneralisations of Prescriptive Infinitives, this modality is readily explained. Comparing Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives from our own material, and constructed imperative and root modal examples, we see that they all differ only as to who to-do-list they refer to. (54a-c) all refer to the to-do-list of the addressee, in this case mummy, (54d-e) both refer to the addresser’s to-do-list, and (54f-g) both refer to the to-do-list of a 3rd person subject, in this particular case a toy panda who is supposed to sit inside a toy excavator.

(54)  a. read this, mummy! (imperative)
  b. mamma skal lese den
      mummy shall read that-one
      ‘mummy’s gonna read that one’ (Root modal with auxiliary)
c. mamma lese den (Prescriptive Infinitive) Benedikte (2;01.06) 
mummy read.INF this
‘mummy read this!’

d. jeg skal lese denne (Root modal with auxiliary)
I shall read this-one
‘I’m gonna read this one’

e. jeg lese denne (Root Infinitive) Anne 1 (2;04.02)
I read.INF this-one
‘I (am gonna) read this one’

f. den skal sitte der Root modal with auxiliary
that-one shall sit there
‘that one’s gonna sit there’

g. den sitte der Root Infinitive Kari (2;02.07)
that-one sit.INF there
‘that one (is gonna) sit there’

Given the similar interpretations of many root infinitives and corresponding examples with auxiliaries, a modal drop account is perhaps not too far-fetched. However, we find the same similarity between root infinitives and adult non-finite clauses. Compare (55a) and (55b), which to the author are synonymous in all respects relevant for this discussion.28

(55) a. Morten bestemte seg for å PRO lese ei bok
M. decided refl to PRO read a book
‘Morten decided to read a book’

b. Morten bestemte seg for at han skulle lese ei bok
M. decided refl for that he should read a book
‘Morten decided that he should read a book’

---

28 Examples such as (i) are acceptable in the same meaning in some context, with a «future present» reading. This is however besides the point here, since this is neither a discussion of the future present, nor a discussion of the present tense in child language.

i) Morten bestemte seg for at han (først) leser ei bok (, og så går en tur)
M. decided refl for that he (first) reads a book (and then takes a stroll)
‘M. decided that he would (first) read a book, (and then take a stroll)’
The *skulle* ‘should’ here, is the past tense form of the present form *skal* in the examples in (54b,d,f), but to my knowledge, no one has proposed that there are dropped modals in constructions such as (55a).

Examples such as (55a) have made scholars propose that infinitives in general are not *tenseless* although they lack finiteness, as noted by Stowell (1982) who writes that «the tense of *to-* infinitives is that of a possible future» (p. 562) relative to the matrix verb, and proposes that they may have a tense operator. Building on the observation of Stowell (1982) and others, Wurmbrand (2014) proposes that these infinitives have a future modal operator above the infinitive vP. Johannesen adopts this proposal as an analysis of the Prescriptive Infinitive. The exact representation of this is not pivotal for the discussion here. The main proposal is that the infinitives in (56) have some structural properties in common that make future and modal.

(56)  

a. jeg lese denne  

I read.INF this-one  

‘I (am gonna) read this one’

b. mamma lese den  

mummy read.INF this  

‘mummy read this!’

c. Morten bestemte seg for å PRO lese ei bok  

M. decided REFL.3 for to PRO read a book  

‘Morten decided to read a book’

To explain the modal interpretation Root Infinitives often get, I propose that there is a future modal operator related to some infinitive constructions. An indication of this is the examples in (56). For specificity we can adopt the hypothesis of Wurmbrand (2014), that there is a future modal operator in these non-finite clauses, and further, that it is situated somewhere in the T-domain. This specific future modal infinitive is selected by the Root Infinitive CP.

---

29 If the matrix verb of (55b) had been present tense, the auxiliary in the example would be *skal* as in the examples in (54).

i) Morten bestemmer seg for å PRO lese ei bok  

M. decides REFL.3 for that he shall read a book  

‘M. decides (for himself) that he will read a book’
This theory adopts some of the points from the modal drop hypotheses, especially Josefsson (2002) in proposing a functional future modal category in these constructions. The main difference (except that I don’t propose that Root Infinitives are finite) is that my proposal is more flexible: Root Infinitives are distinguished from finite root clauses by the absence of the Fin° category, and from other non-finite clauses by the presence of Λ_A and Λ_P. In other words, contrary to Josefsson (2002), modality is dependent on the «Root Infinitivity», but not vice versa. Therefore, the non-modal examples of Root Infinitives (see section 5.3.5) are not counterexamples to my analysis, but could be seen as overgeneralizations of Root Infinitives without the future modal operator.\(^{30}\)

6.5.7 Fin° and the absence of speech event anchoring

In section 6.5.1, I argued that Fin° is responsible for the spatio-temporal anchoring of the clause to the speech event. Here I argue that Root Infinitives have no Fin°, and thereby the spatio-temporal coordinates of the speech act are not encoded. Since Root Infinitives are root clauses, the question of why the Fin° head can be omitted should be addressed.

A possible explanation has been proposed by Josefsson (2002). According to her, Root Infinitives are either directive (i.e., prescriptive) or «creative» (a special kind of performative) speech acts. In the present analysis, all Root Infinitives that are directive speech acts with the addressees as subjects are coded as Prescriptive Infinitives. Although the exact speech act classification of Root Infinitives can be discussed, it is clear that most of them have a world-to-word direction of fit, to use the terminology of Searle (1976). I.e., a part of their illocutionary point – their «purpose» – is «to get the world to match the words» (Searle, 1976, p. 3), as opposed to declaratives, which have a word-to-world direction of fit, i.e., as part of their illocutionary point to get «the words […] to match the world» (Searle, 1976, p. 3). For brevity, I will use the world-to-word speech act, to refer to the different speech acts in Josefsson (2002) in the remainder of this thesis.

The argument in Josefsson (2002) is that world-to-word speech acts need not be spatio-temporally anchored to the speech event, because they can be evaluated by direct observation (cf. section 6.4.2). Their felicity condition is, according to Josefsson, that they «[create or change] a state of affair in the direction intended by the speaker» (Josefsson,

\(^{30}\) In Josefsson (2002), 63 out of 383 (16%) of the Root Infinitives were not in Auxiliary contexts (the data included possible Prescriptive Infinitives).
2002, p. 291), and that they are not truth conditional, like declaratives. This has some resonance in the proposal in Cowper (to appear). In her proposal, there is a division between, in her terms, a proposition and a bare event. The latter only needs to be «sensorily perceived», while the former «can be cognitively evaluated as true or false». Further, while the feature responsible for the anchoring to speech event time (Fin° in our framework), is hierarchically dependent on the clause being a («cowperian») proposition in a feature geometry of dependency relations, the feature responsible for subject licensing and subject-verb agreement (ΛA and ΛP in our framework) crucially is not. 31

In other words, world-to-word speech acts need not be «cognitively evaluated true or false», as declaratives do. They need only be «sensorily perceived», in the «change [in] a stage of affair in the direction intended by the speaker» (Josefsson, 2002), i.e., they are not («cowperian») propositions.

As mentioned in section 5.3.5, I found good reason not to count the amount of eventive and stative verbs in our data, but if, in later investigations, a so-called Eventivity Constraint (cf. section 1.2.5, 1.3.4, and 6.4) were to be found also for Norwegian, i.e., that there were un-proportionally less stative verbs in Root Infinitives than in finite clauses, this would not be unexpected given the world-to-word speech acts hypothesis of Root Infinitives. The argument goes as follows. The world-to-word speech act analysis means that the predicates of the Root Infinitives must be such that an actor is able to change the state of affairs. This excludes many stative predicates, as in the fictive Root Infinitive and imperative in (57).

(57) a. ? han tønge hjelp
    he need.INF help
    = I oblige him to need help

b. ?? need help, you!

The world-to-word speech act hypothesis perhaps seems ad hoc since we have no other structures apart from Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives in the language where this has an effect (unless we take imperatives to lack finiteness as well, as proposed by Platzack & Rosengren, 1997). We will therefore only note here that this is a possible explanation to

---

31 According to Cowper (to appear) the exact feature hierarchies can differ between languages. The hierarchy referred to here is for English, but I assume it to hold for Norwegian as well.
why Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives may lack the category $\text{Fin}^\circ$ but still occur as root clauses.

6.5.8 The subject of Root Infinitives

From the discussion in section 6.5.2 a remaining question is what the subjects (and null subjects) of Root Infinitives really are. As we saw in section 5.3.2, Root Infinitives often have null subjects. But the null subject cannot be PRO. Firstly, I regard PRO as a reference variable, following Sigurðsson (2007, p. 21). In Root Infinitives there are no superordinate clauses with a constituent that PRO can refer to. A possibility is that there is an arbitrary PRO in Root Infinitives, as in the impersonal control infinitive in (46): *to come $\text{PRO}_{\text{arb}}$ was a mistake.* But PRO in control infinitives is not interchangeable with an overt subject, as is evident from (58), but in Root Infinitives the subjects often are overt.

(58) **Ragni begynte å *Ragni/*hun/PRO**  
     Ragni started to **R./she/PRO**  
     ‘Ragni started *Ragni/*she/PRO to play the flute’

In my proposal for the structure of Root Infinitives (see section 6.5.3), I argued that Root Infinitives are clauses that lacks the $\text{Fin}^\circ$ category but have the speech participant categories $\Lambda_A$ and $\Lambda_F$. As an effect of that, Root Infinitives can have over subjects (like the European Portuguese inflected infinitive in (52)). That means that the null subjects of Root Infinitives are not examples of PRO, but rather pro, or rather, I will argue, they are instances of topic-drop. As the reader familiar with Norwegian will know, topic-drop is not particularly common in Norwegian, but it does exist to some extent.

Sigurðsson and Maling (2010) proposes an account for pro-drop (and topic-drop) called the Empty Left Edge Condition (ELEC).

(59) The left edge of a clause containing a silent referential argument must be phonetically empty (in language or construction X) (Sigurðsson & Maling, 2010, p. 62)

In Norwegian Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives the left edge is maximally phonetically empty. In finite clauses, the finite verb would have moved to $\text{Fin}^\circ$, whereby the subject would move to Spec-$\text{Fin}^\circ$ to satisfy V2 as outlined in section 2.1.5. In Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives the verb is left in vP, and although we cannot pinpoint the exact location of the overt subjects, by conjecture it does not need to move,
leaving the whole CP without phonetic content, which means that topic-drop is always licit in Root Infinitives.

In our data we saw that there is a trend towards correlation between Root Infinitives in total, and null subjects in finite clauses \(p \approx 0.08\) and that this trend probably would have been significant if we had had more data, as the correlation coefficient was quite high (rho \(\approx 0.71\)). Because of the uncertainty connected to the data, any proposal as to the reason for this trend is necessarily speculative. However, a highly significant correlation was found in Danish child language by Hamann and Plunkett (1998). In my analysis, both null subjects and Root Infinitives are connected to the C-domain. Platzack (2001) singles out the C-domain as particularly difficult for early L1 learners and other groups known to have a deviant language. As discussed throughout this thesis, the C-domain makes discourse and speech event information available to the syntactic structure. This information is necessarily connected to other parts of human cognition. For example, the notion of old and new information in the syntax depends on the theory of mind: the ability to know that other people do not know the same as oneself knows. Theory of mind has been reported to not be fully developed before around the age of 5 (see e.g., Wimmer & Perner, 1983). A possible (but somewhat speculative) proposition is that, since Root Infinitives and child null subjects are connected to the C-domain, the correlation of their developmental trajectories are due to them both being connected to the development of the C-domain.

### 6.5.9 Prescriptive Infinitives

The proposed analysis of Root Infinitives is based on the Prescriptive Infinitives providing positive evidence that finiteness (or rather the Fin\(^\circ\) category) is not necessary in Root Clauses. Thus, Root Infinitives can be said to be overgeneralizations of Prescriptive Infinitives. Johannessen’s (submitted) report that Prescriptive Infinitives are used particularly in child-directed speech makes this probable. Since the cues present for standard imperatives – verbs in imperative form, clause-initially in Force\(^\circ\) – are not present in the same way in prescriptive infinitives, overgeneralization is not unexpected. Ideally then, Prescriptive Infinitives and Root Infinitives should share some structure.

The characteristics of the Norwegian Prescriptive Infinitives were given in section 3.2 and 5.1. The most salient difference between Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives, apart from the Imperative force, is that Prescriptive Infinitives do not seem to have pronominal
subjects. The reason for this, according to Johannessen (submitted), is that infinitives cannot license (structural) nominative case, and pronouns are the only words in Norwegian that are case marked.\footnote{Some Norwegian dialects still have case licensed by preposition, but this is irrelevant for this discussion, and does not apply to the dialect under investigation here.} This is visible from the example in (60a-b). The 3rd person reflexive we see in (60c), an example from our data, is due to a 3rd person being the default person (cf. computation of person from Sigurðsson, 2014a, p. 71 above).

(60) a. … Nora sitte rolig der Nora (Johannessen, submitted)
   N. sit.INF quietly there N.
   ‘Nora sit quietly there, Nora’

   b. *Hun sitte rolig der
      She.NOM sit.INF quietly there

   c. Mother: du må gå bort til Morten
      ‘you must go to M.’
      Child: ja
      ‘yes’
      Mother: Forte seg!
      hurry.INF REFL.3
      ‘hurry!’

This does not hold for the Root Infinitives in the material, where both 1st and 3rd person pronouns are used.

(61) a. jeg gjøre
      I do.INF

   b. jeg lese denne
      I read.INF this-one

   c. han sitte der
      He.NOM sit.INF there

In section 5.1 I mentioned that I did not find any Prescriptive Infinitives with 2nd person subjects in the prescriptive infinitives, as Johannessen (submitted) notes for her Norwegian Prescriptive infinitives. I will come back to this below.

In this section I have already argued in favour of the advantages of analysing Root Infinitives as overgeneralisations of Prescriptive Infinitives. In the remainder of this section, I will suggest that the restriction on the subjects in Prescriptive Infinitives is only apparent:
pronominal subjects are un-preferred in most cases by most speakers of Norwegian, but not ungrammatical. This supports the assumption that two constructions under discussion share much structure. I based this discussion in the following on new data from adult Norwegian. I will start with 1st person pronoun subjects, then proceed to 3rd person pronouns, and lastly discuss the 2nd person pronoun.

Ordinary imperatives do not take 1st person pronouns as their subjects, which is natural, as they are directed towards the addressee. This is with one important exception. In Norwegian, imperatives with the verb få ‘get, receive’ can have a 1st person subject: see the example in (62) (and cf. Faarlund, 1985; Faarlund et al., 1997, p. 589). I argue that there are good reasons for analysing the få-imperative along the same lines as the Prescriptive Infinitive. Primarily, when the subject is present in both the Prescriptive Infinitive and the få-imperative, the subject precedes the verb, whereas it follows the verb in standard imperatives (62). Secondly, whereas the negation always precedes the verb in both the Prescriptive Infinitive and the få-imperative, the negation can either precede or follow the negation in the standard imperative (63). Thirdly, the verb få is identical in the infinitive and imperative form (64). With all these facts put together, there are both morphological and syntactic indications that the få-imperative has more in common with the Prescriptive Infinitive than the standard imperative. Additionally, there is an issue with learnability.

---

33 In addition there is a special structure La oss ... ‘let’s’ (Faarlund et al., 1997, p. 589) which can have a 1st person plural object. But this 1st person plural subject must always be inclusive, i.e., both refer to the addressee and one or more addressee(s). In the example in (i), where the addressee cannot be included in the 1st person person, the 1st person plural is the object, and not the reflexive as in (ii), and the understood subject the addressee.

i. (gi deg og) la oss_incl slippe inn!
   (give you and) let us get in!
   ‘(you stop this and) let us in!"

ii. la oss_incl gå inn!
    let us go inside
    ‘let’s go inside!’

In other words, the addressee is always included in the subject in this structure, which does not make it very different from the standard imperatives, as opposed to the få-imperative.

34 In Faarlund’s (1985) analysis of the få-imperative, he points out that «until a generation or so ago, it was considered ‘child language’ [sic!]», and also notes that «at a certain stage of child language, infinitives are used with a certain jussive [prescriptive] meaning» and that «[t]hese interesting observations certainly are part of the history of få-imperatives». To Faarlund «it seems that those children […] never grew out of that habit»
Given the Prescriptive Infinitives, which we know children to master at an early age, it is
difficult to imagine how a child could acquire a få-imperative but with a standard imperative
structure with a first person subject. There are no other examples of this in the language.

(62) a. (jeg) få (*jeg) den avisa!
(I) get (I) that newspaper
‘give me that newspaper!’

b. (*du) gi (du) meg den avisa!
(you) give (you) me that newspaper
‘give me that newspaper’

c. ... Nora sitte rolig der Nora
N. sit-INF quietly there N.
‘Nora sit quietly there, Nora’

(63) a. (ikke) få (*ikke) den avisa, få den andre!
(not) get (not) that newspaper, get that other
‘don’t give me that newspaper, give me the other one!’

b. (ikke)stå (ikke) der!
(not) stand.IMP (not) there
‘don’t stand there!’

c. ikke klore da får mamma vondt!
not scratch.INF then gets mummy pain
‘don’t scratch, that’ll hurt mummy!’

d. *klore ikke da får mamma vondt!

(64) a. Ikkje få panikk!
don't get.IMP panic!
‘don’t (you) panic!’

b. Nå er det på tide å få seg noe mat
now is on time to get.INF self some food
‘now it’s time to get some food’

(pp. 152-153). Without speculating as to the genesis of the få-infinite, I am in other words not the first to
connect it to Prescriptive Infinitives and Root Infinitives. I also wish to stress that, as Johannessen (submitted)
notes, the CDPI is necessarily a very old construction (from «before 500 AD»), since it exists in all North-
Germanic languages. In other words, the structure which the få-imperative possibly was moulded after must
have existed in Norwegian several generations ago.
In Johannessen’s analysis, the 3rd person reflexive is taken to be the default. The 3rd person pronoun on the other hand, Johannessen argues, is prohibited as a subject because finiteness is needed to license nominative case, and pronouns are case marked in Norwegian. Since I have proposed that PRO is required due to lack of φ-features on the non-finite T°, and not lack of case (or presence of «null-case»), we need to find another way to explain the prohibition of 3rd person pronouns. Fortunately, this explanation is already given in the person mapping of Sigurðsson, given in (44), where we saw that 3rd person was marked for both –ΛA and –ΛP, i.e., neither addresser nor addressee. Since the subject of Prescriptive Infinitives is always the addressee, a 3rd person pronoun is *ipsos facto* excluded as a subject. The same effect is seen in right or left dislocated (vocative) referents of standard imperatives. Compare (65e-g).

(65) a. [du/dere/den/alle som har skrevet på tavla], rekk opp hånda! [You.SG./PL/one/all REL have written on the-blackboard] raise up the-hand ‘you/the one/everyone who have/has written on the blackboard, raise your hand’

b. Rekk opp hånda, [du/dere/den/alle som har skrevet på tavla]!

c. *[han/hun som har skrevet på tavla], rekk opp hånda! [he/she REL has written on the-blackboard], raise your hand! ‘he/she who has written on the blackboard, raise your hand!’

d. *rekk opp hånda, [han/hun som har skrevet på tavla]!

e. *Hei Daniel, det var dumt at han barberte seg, hi D. it was sad that he shaved REFL.3

f. Hei Daniel, det var dumt å PRO barbere seg, hi D. it was sad to PRO shave REFL.3 ‘Hi, D., it was a bad idea to shave’

g. Hei Daniel, det var dumt at du barberte deg, hi D. it was sad that you shaved REFL.2 ‘Hi, D., it was sad that you shaved’

This brings us over to the last person feature, namely the 2nd person pronoun. In chapter 5.1 I mentioned that I did not find any 2nd person subjects among the Prescriptive Infinitives of the children. The problem with this kind of negative evidence is that it takes just one example to counter it. A quick search into the Simonsen corpus, supplied not one, but *three* examples of seemingly child Prescriptive Infinitives with an overt 2nd person pronoun.
Earlier I said that children at an early age master the prescriptive infinitive to a target-like level. These examples seem to paint another picture. However, Johannessen notes that Swedish and Faroese actually do allow 2nd person subjects in Prescriptive Infinitives (see also fn. 35).

I argue that 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronouns are not prohibited, but rather that they are not preferred. Review example (50a), repeated here as (68).

(66)\textsuperscript{35}  
\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] og du lese en bok om meg
and you read.INF a book about me  
\hspace{1em} Nora (2;03)
\item[b.] du si det
you say.INF it  
\hspace{1em} Nora (2;04.10)
\item[c.] du gjøre
\hspace{1em} you do.INF  
\hspace{1em} Tomas (2;01)
\end{itemize}

As noted in the original discussion of this construction from page 85 and onwards, many Norwegians accept this construction with 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} person reflexives, although the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person reflexive seem to be the default. And in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person reflexive example, PRO can still refer to the addressee or the addressee, despite the only argument in the matrix clause being an expletive subject, which doesn’t refer to anyone. Exactly how the control relation is established in examples like (68), needs further investigation (but see fn. 27 for a possible explanation), but I will propose that the PRO in (68) and the subject of Root Infinitives and

\textsuperscript{35} There were a few other candidates as well, but I applied the same strict criteria as I applied for my data, regarding how to count finite vs. infinitive verbs. Also, in example (66c). the investigator immediately responds \textit{du røre!} ‘you stir.INF’, which, \textbf{besides being a potential Prescriptive Infinitive with a 2nd person pronoun}, can indicate that the verb in example (66c) could also be \textit{røre} ‘stir’ as it makes a minimal pair with \textit{gjøre} ‘do’ with the consonants /r/ and /j/, the last one being one of the consonants children often use before they fully master the /r/ phoneme. In this case, the verb is not in the group of verbs I consider certain. Still, two examples are more than enough to counter the generalization made based on my own data.
Prescriptive Infinitives get their person features valued in the same way. As opposed to the example in (68), the Root Infinitive and Prescriptive Infinitive have the speech event participants, \( \Lambda A \) and \( \Lambda P \) encoded in their immediate CP, and by conjecture they can have an overt subject. Since the Root Infinitives have a non-finite \( T^\circ \), as evident from the non-finite verb, we must assume that their person feature cannot be valued in the «standard» procedure presented in section 6.5.1.\(^{36}\) This means that for the control infinitive, PRO by default gets 3\(^{rd}\) person features, but in some cases can get 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) features. In the Prescriptive Infinitive and the Root Infinitive, this is the same, only with overt objects. The default is 3\(^{rd}\) person by computation, but the 3\(^{rd}\) person pronoun is illicit for the reasons given above.\(^{37}\) Therefore a lexical DP is inserted instead. However, the subject can sometimes be a 2\(^{nd}\) person pronoun (as in Swedish, and possibly for some Norwegian speakers, cf. fn. 35). If the kind of control seen in (68), and by conjecture also in Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives, is a PF phenomenon, as proposed by Sigurðsson (2007) and Sigurðsson (2007), then this kind of variation between individuals and closely related languages is not unexpected.

The analysis can be summarised as in table 14.

---

### a. Root Infinitives (RIs) and Prescriptive Infinitives (PIs) are infinitival clauses that have encoded the speech act participants in the C-domain (\( \Lambda A \) and \( \Lambda P \)).

### b. Because of (a), RIs and PIs can have overt subject, (i.e., does not require PRO).

### c. Since the \( T^\circ \) of RIs and PIs is non-finite, person feature assignment to the subject can not be done in the same manner as in finite clauses, whereby 3\(^{rd}\) person is used as default.

### d. Since the third person pronoun is marked –\( \Lambda A \) and –\( \Lambda P \) it is illicit as the subject of PIs, since the subjects of PIs always refer to the addressee (+AP) (except for the \( fá \)-imperative). Therefore, a lexical DP is inserted instead.

### e. Since the subject is not necessarily the addressee in Root Infinitives, 3\(^{rd}\) person pronoun is not illicit in RIs.

### f. As we saw in examples like (68) (control infinitives with impersonal superordinate

---

\(^{36}\) This is opposed to the European Portuguese inflected infinitive, where \( T^\circ \) obviously does inherit the person features from its immediate CP, as evident on the person agreement on the European Portuguese inflected infinitive. See example (52).

\(^{37}\) Why the adult \( fá \)-imperative seems to always get 1\(^{st}\) person subjects (cf. the examples in (62)) needs further investigation. However, the subject is not very often overt in the \( fá \)-imperative.
clauses), although 3rd person reflexive is preferred by default, 1st and 2nd person reflexive are also acceptable.

g. RIs and PIs are assigned person features in the same ways as in examples like (68), i.e., 1st and 2nd person pronouns are un-preferred, but not ruled out.

Table 14: Summary of the analysis of the person feature lisencing of Root Infinitives and Prescriptive Infinitives

6.5.10 Conclusion of the section

In this section I have proposed an analysis of Root Infinitives and of Prescriptive Infinitives and argued that the former is induced by latter, which gives positive evidence that such specific non-finite structures are licit as root clauses. In section 2.2 I outlined an approach to the study of language acquisition where the difference between adult and child language is construed as incomplete (interpretation of the) input (2nd factor), and immature principles not specific to language (3rd factor). In this account I have sought to give an analysis of Root Infinitives exclusively based on 2nd factor explanations.

If the Root Infinitives are overgeneralizations induced by Prescriptive Infinitives, as suggested here, the decline of Root Infinitives, which probably happens in the age span 2;6 to 3;0, has the same explanation as any overgeneralization. The child learns that this special finiteness category is reserved for Prescriptive Infinitives. Also, as mentioned in section 3.2, Johannessen (submitted) notes that the Prescriptive Infinitive is generally reserved for special pragmatic contexts: «They are used in a very limited pragmatic context of a pleasant atmosphere by adults towards very young children, or towards pets or adults» (Johannessen, submitted). With time, the child somehow understands the limited pragmatic use of the Prescriptive Infinitive, which for children perhaps become limited to speech towards dolls and pets, since they hardly can be said to use child-directed speech themselves.

6.6 Root Infinitives and SLI

In this chapter I will try to answer research question 3, repeated here.

3. What impact will the analysis put forward in this thesis have on Root Infinitives as a diagnostic marker for Specific Language Impairment, in particular within the N-LARSP scheme?
A question that needs to be addressed before we can embark on research question 3, is whether Root Infinitives in SLI should be seen as delayed Root Infinitive stage as found in TD children and in my data, or a deviance (i.e. whether they behave differently). Bjerkan (2000) studied verb morphology in Norwegian SLI children using an experimental method, using the past tense elicited production test of Ragnarsdottir et al. (1999), which again is based on the methodology of the *wug*-test of Berko (1958), only with actual verbs instead of nonce words. She found that the SLI children’s errors were not a lack of finite morphology, but rather that they used the wrong inflections (using other paradigms, the present tense form, or non-target verbs). These findings do not immediately seem to support a delay hypothesis.

Studying Swedish SLI children, using spontaneous speech, Hansson, Nettelbladt, and Leonard (2000) found that «[t]he majority of the errors of the children with SLI […] were production of the infinitive» (p. 856), viz. the opposite of Bjerkan (2000). There is of course no a priori reason to exclude the possibility that these are language-specific differences between Norwegian and Swedish. This is however made highly unlikely by the fact that Swedish and Norwegian are so closely related that they are mutually understandable. I argue instead that the different methodologies are revealing to the question at hand. As I reported in section 5.3.5 and cross-linguistically, Root Infinitives seem to be predominantly used with a root modal meaning. In a spontaneous speech study, such as that of Hansson et al. (2000), the use of Root Infinitives to express some kind of root modality is available to the subjects. In the elicited production test of Bjerkan (2000), the stimuli was given as: «this is a man who knows how to VERB. He is VERBing. He did the same thing yesterday. What did he do yesterday?» (p. 66, cf the *wug*-test in section 4.1.2), whereby the expected response from the child is «he VERBed». These situations do not make the possibility of uttering a Root Infinitive, *qua* their root modal use, available for the child. This can indicate that a delay theory is correct after all, although more research is needed to verify this.

In this thesis I have argued that non-finiteness in Root Infinitives is not due to a deviant morphology, but that they have a syntactic structure of their own and a special (modal) use. In light of this we must conclude that Root Infinitives can only be used as a clinical marker for SLI with tests that encourage the use of Root Infinitive, e.g., all tests that rely on spontaneous speech, such as LARSP, but not necessarily tests that rely on elicited production, such as Hanne Gram Simonsen and Bjerkan (1998).
7 Conclusion and suggestions for further research

7.1 Choice of theoretical framework

The choice of framework of any study can be seen as an intellectual exercise or a personal preference (e.g., how well one by accumulated experience in scientific work finds that the framework meets one’s expectations of scientific explanation and description). As such the choice of framework should not need to be justified beyond the reasons just mentioned. I will however try to justify my choice of framework in this thesis, and why I think it is particularly apt in describing my data.

I have chosen to analyse Root Infinitives in Norwegian within the framework of generative grammar. Particularly I have chosen to follow a strong version of the minimalist program (cf. sections 1.6 and 2.2). By making it possible to atomize the functions of finiteness as features and functional categories (cf. section 6.5), the generative framework has enabled me to make a specific analysis of the Root Infinitive (and the Prescriptive Infinitive) that is falsifiable within the same theoretical framework. Further it has enabled me to draw generalizations across different structures (the Root Infinitive and the Prescriptive Infinitive), and derive their differences based on their shared structure. This would not have been possible if I had used a pre-theoretic notion of «analogy» or «overgeneralization». In building on existing theories and analysis of finiteness, and proposing quite specific explanations, this work is accumulative in a way a pre-theoretic explanation could never have been.

Whether other frameworks could have provided a similarly satisfying explanation, will have to be the objective of the proponents of those theories.

7.2 Conclusion

In the beginning of this thesis I set up three main research questions, repeated here.

1. Is there a Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian child language?
2. How should Root Infinitives be understood within the theoretical framework of generative minimalist syntax?
2.1 To what extent do the four hypotheses outlined above (the small-clause hypothesis, the truncation hypothesis, the unique checking constraint hypothesis, and the modal drop hypothesis) give satisfactory analyses of Root Infinitives, both empirically and theoretically?

2.2 Can a more satisfactory analysis of the Root Infinitive be given, based on new data from Norwegian child language?

3. What impact will the analysis put forward in this thesis have on Root Infinitives as a diagnostic marker for Specific Language Impairment, in particular within the N-LARSP scheme?

In chapter 5 I showed empirically that there indeed does seem to be a Root Infinitive stage in Norwegian child language, thus answering research question 1.

In section 6.1–6.4 I reviewed the four hypotheses mentioned in research question 2.1. I concluded that none of them were completely satisfying, either empirically or theoretically or both. In section 6.5 I proposed a new analysis of Root Infinitives, within the Minimalist Context-Linked Grammar outlined in Sigurðsson (2004) and subsequent. I have proposed an analysis that explains Root Infinitives without the use of child specific grammatical processes. Instead I argue that Root Infinitives are a result of positive evidence that root clauses don’t necessarily need finiteness, given by the Prescriptive Infinitives that are often used in child-directed speech (Johannessen, submitted). I have also argued, despite their differences, that Prescriptive Infinitives and Root Infinitives share much of the same structure.

Research question 3 was addressed in section 6.6, where I noted that the findings in this thesis, as well as my analysis, in light of two different studies of Root Infinitives in SLI children, seem to support a view where Root Infinitives in SLI are seen as a delayed, rather than deviant part of their language. This would however need further investigation of Root Infinitives in SLI children to be verified.

7.3 The limitations of this thesis

Children acquiring any language have to learn many different language-specific rules and restrictions, many of which are interwoven. Very probably this also holds for the Root Infinitives. Unfortunately, the frames of a master’s thesis have limited me to looking at Root
Infinitives and their characteristics in isolation. The nature of many of the adjacent phenomena that inevitably influence the Root Infinitives, such as V2 phenomena and pro- or topic-drop, are still being debated in the literature. This means that the analysis given in this thesis is at best a part of the picture. However, I would like to stress again the accumulative nature of this research, mentioned above. I will point out some possible roads ahead in the next section.

7.4 Further research

This thesis has made use of spontaneous speech, which has the advantage of enabling the researcher to investigate many different variables, such as null subjects, negation, wh-questions, and topicalizations. This is also the disadvantage of spontaneous speech: that other variables cannot be controlled for. An obvious next step is to utilize experimental methods, such as elicited production, to control for other variables, which otherwise influence each other.

In my analysis, I have assumed that the Prescriptive Infinitives in Norwegian have an important effect on child language acquisition. The frames of an MA thesis have inhibited me from investigating the frequency of Prescriptive Infinitives in the input of children acquiring Norwegian. That would be an obvious next step in the further investigation of Prescriptive Infinitives. Not just in Norwegian, but also in other languages that have Prescriptive Infinitives, especially those that also have Root Infinitives to find out whether my account is eligible cross-linguistically.

Regarding Root Infinitives in SLI, the possibility of drawing conclusions was limited by the fact that this thesis was based on typically developing language. Further investigations of Root Infinitives in SLI should be done with the same scrutiny on spontaneous speech from SLI children, as has been done in this and similar studies on TD children.

Lastly, the morphology of the dialect studied here has made it impossible to look at many variables, because the present and the infinitive form of the verb in many cases are so similar, being distinguished only by an /r/, which in addition is hard for children to pronounce. A similar study could profitably be performed in a dialect where the infinitive and the present form are less similar, so that fewer verbs would have to be excluded.
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Appendix 1  Verbs with tone accent 1 in present tense
(T1 verbs)

bære  ‘carry’
brenne  ‘burn’
dette  ‘fall’
finne  ‘find’
grave  ‘dig’
henge  ‘hang’
hjelpe  ‘help’
komme  ‘come’
legg  ‘lay’
lese  ‘read’
sette  ‘put’
sitte  ‘sit’
sove  ‘sleep’
spise  ‘eat’
trenge  ‘need’
Appendix 2  The N-LARSP chart


**Norsk LARSP (N-LARSP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navn:</th>
<th>Alder:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fødselsdato:</th>
<th>Terapeut:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opptaksdato:</th>
<th>Kommentarer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Analyserbare ytringer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uforståelig</th>
<th>Ufullstendig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avvikende</td>
<td>Tvetydig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Repetisjoner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Analyserbare ytringer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totalt antall ytringer</th>
<th>MLU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivå 1 0;9-1;6</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Andre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setning</th>
<th>Frase</th>
<th>Ord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spørsmål</th>
<th>Imperativ</th>
<th>Utsagn</th>
<th>Sammen-setninger</th>
<th>buyning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nivå 2 1;6-2;0 | S | V | QX | V | Adv | Vx | Neg | SV | VO | VX | AdvX | SVO | SVAdv | VSA | NegX | Det+N | N+Gen | DemPron | PersPron | NN | Gen | Def.sg |
|----------------|---|---|----|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-------|--------|-----|-----|--------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivå 3 2;0-2;6</th>
<th>VS(X)</th>
<th>QVS</th>
<th>VauxSVO</th>
<th>VO(X)</th>
<th>VAdv</th>
<th>SVNegO</th>
<th>OVS</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>kopula</th>
<th>V-refleksiv</th>
<th>Vaux</th>
<th>VN</th>
<th>AdvN</th>
<th>Pres</th>
<th>Def.Pl.</th>
<th>Adj.agr</th>
<th>NNN</th>
<th>Perf.Part</th>
<th>Pret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivå 4 2;6-3;0</th>
<th>QVX</th>
<th>VSO</th>
<th>QVO</th>
<th>VauxSVX</th>
<th>QVX</th>
<th>VSO</th>
<th>QVO</th>
<th>VauxSVX</th>
<th>Koord</th>
<th>Konj</th>
<th>Relativ</th>
<th>SVOO</th>
<th>N-def+Pron</th>
<th>Splitta frase</th>
<th>NNN</th>
<th>Perf.Part</th>
<th>Pret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Nivå 5 3;0-3;6 | QVSO | QVSAadv | QVSGen | VauxSVX | QVSO | QVSAAdv | QVSGen | VauxSVX | VAdvAdv | Utbrytning | Presentering | Gjentatt subjekt | |
|----------------|------|--------|--------|---------|------|--------|--------|---------|--------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-----|----------|------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivå 6 3;6-4;6</th>
<th>Sub</th>
<th>Passiv (bli)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivå 7 4;6 +</th>
<th>Diskurs</th>
<th>Inniledere: Vok</th>
<th>Konj</th>
<th>Sub</th>
<th>Syntaktisk forståelse</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Rest | Rest |
Appendix 3   The electronic application form

Invitasjon til å delta i undersøkelse om grammatikkutvikling hos norske barn

Lenke til invitasjonsbrev

Lenke til prosjektets hjemmeside

Kontakt oss på:
norsk-larsp@iln.uio.no

Du må fylle ut ett skjema for hvert barn du vil melde på.

**Barnets fødselsdato**

**Barnets kjønn**

- Gutt
- Jente

**Fars høyeste utdannelse**

- Grunnskole
- Videregående skole
- Treårig høyskole-/universitetsutdannelse
- Femårig høyskole-/universitetsutdannelse eller mer

**Mors høyeste utdannelse**

- Grunnskole
- Videregående skole
- Treårig høyskole-/universitetsutdannelse
- Femårig høyskole-/universitetsutdannelse eller mer

**Fars dialektbakgrunn**

- Østlandsk
- Sørlandsk
- Vestlandsk
- Trøndersk
- Nordnorsk
- Annet

**Mors dialektbakgrunn**

- Østlandsk
- Sørlandsk
- Vestlandsk
- Trøndersk
- Nordnorsk
- Annet

**Jeg kan kontaktes på følgende e-postadresse:**
Jeg kan kontaktes på følgende telefonnummer:
Invitational letter to the parents

Grammatikkutvikling hos norske barn
Et forskningsprosjekt ved Universitetet i Oslo

Til foreldre eller foresatte:

Vi henvender oss til dere i forbindelse med en undersøkelse av norske barns språkutvikling som vi trenger deres hjelp til. Undersøkelsen foregår ved Institutt for lingvistiske og nordiske studier, Universitetet i Oslo.

Vi ønsker å undersøke språktilegnelse hos barn mellom ett og fem år. Vi vil samle inn forskningsmateriale til undersøkelsen ved å gjøre lydopptak av barn i lekesituasjoner i deres eget hjem sammen med en forelder. For de fleste barna vil vi gjøre lydopptak to ganger, med seks måneders mellomrom. Hver opptaksrunde vil vare i max én time. Første gangen vil være i løpet av juni, og andre gangen i løpet av desember.

Det vil ikke ha noen konsekvens i forhold til barnehagen om dere ikke ønsker at barnet deres skal delta.

Formål

Undersøkelsen vil danne grunnlag for den norske tilpasningen av LARSP (Language Assessment Remediation and Screening Procedure) ved å kartlegge språkutvikling hos enspråklige barn med normale kognitive ferdigheter. Vi får dermed et uvurderlig verktøy for å diagnostisere barn med språkvansker så tidlig som mulig, og gjøre det lettere for barnehagepedagoger/logopeder å gi rett behandling. Kunnskapen denne undersøkelsen bringer til veie, kan også brukes i forskning på tilegelse av språk hos flerspråklige barn, og til å finne ut hvordan denne skiller seg fra språktilegelse hos enspråklige barn.
Du kan lese mer om LARSP og prosjektet her:
http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/tjenester/kunnskap/sprak/sprakvansker/kartlegging/larsp/

**Vinn et gavekort**
Vi kan dessverre ikke betale for deltakelse i prosjektet. Men alle som deltar i undersøkelsen vil kunne bli med på trekning av 2 universalgavekort med verdi 2000 kroner.

**Kriterier**
Barnet og begge foreldre må ha norsk som morsmål. Dette er for å eliminere faktorer hvor barnets tilgjengeliv av norsk kan være påvirket av en annen samtidig språktilegnelse. I tillegg må det verken foreligge psykiske utviklingshemninger av noe slag, eller prematurt utviklingsforløp. Til sist er det viktig at barnet befinner seg i alderen 6 måneder til 5 år.

Deltakelsen er helt frivillig, og det er mulig å trekke seg når som helst. I det tilfellet vil alle innsamlede data og personopplysninger bli slettet.

**Hvordan ta kontakt?**
Dersom dere er interesserte i å delta i undersøkelsen bes fylle ut nettskjemaet på følgende internettadresse:

https://nettskjema.uio.no/answer/larsp.html

På dette skjemaet ber vi dere om å oppgi kontaktinformasjon, og noen opplysninger om barnets og deres bakgrunn.

**Hva vil skje med personopplysningene?**

**Hilsen**

Bror-Magnus Sviland Strand  
Morten Aase Løver  
Ingeborg Ribu, Forskningsassistent  
prof. Kristian Emil Kristoffersen  
prof. Hanne Gram Simonsen, prosjektleder
Samtykkeerklæring til forskningsprosjektet

"Undersøkelse av grammatiske ferdigheter hos barn"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hva innebærer deltakelse i studien?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deltakelse i denne studien innebærer at vi får ta opptak av deg og ditt barn i opp til en time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Dataene vil bli kodet og koblingsnøkkelen vil bli lagret på en passordbeskyttet server som bare prosjektgruppa har tilgang til.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alle navn i opptaket vil bli sensurerte, og dere vil ikke kunne gjenkjennes i publikasjoner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frivillig deltakelse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker ditt samtykke, vil alle opplysninger om deg og ditt barn, samt alle innsamlede data, bli slettet fra prosjektet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og samtykker i at det kan gjøres lydopptak av mitt barn under de forutsetninger som er beskrevet over.

__________________________________________________________________________________________________

(Signert av prosjekt deltaker, dato og sted)
## Appendix 6  Legend: Transcription tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§u, +u</td>
<td>Incomprehensible/unclear (independent and dependent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#, ##, ####</td>
<td>Short, medium long, and long pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+r</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+z</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+t</td>
<td>Restart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+x</td>
<td>Non-norm form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§n</td>
<td>Sensitive material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§o</td>
<td>Onomatopoeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+v</td>
<td>Whispering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>Interrupted utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Interrupted word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+e</td>
<td>Echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 0</td>
<td>Accent tone 1, accent tone 2, and ambiguous accent tone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 7  Number of ambiguous utterances in the data for each child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of ambiguous utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kari (2;02.07)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnus 1 (2;03.10)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emil 1 (2;03.29)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne 1 (2;04.02)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucas 2 (2;04.02)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid 1 (2;04.28)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William (2;05.22)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td>Oskar (2;06.04)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markus (2;08.06)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linnea (2;09.15)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnus 2 (2;09.22)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sofie (2;09.28)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emil 2 (2;10.02)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid 2 (2;10.28)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne 2 (2;11.17)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8  List of ambiguous utterances in the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(Age)</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:06:01.446</td>
<td>nei # ikke snakke bebien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:06:04.857</td>
<td>bebien ikke snakke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:07:40.256</td>
<td>traktor # kjøre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:08:19.430</td>
<td>ødrikke vann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:09:09.661</td>
<td>§n (name2) +u 2sprekte ballong sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:09:12.961</td>
<td>+u (vil kke det) ha den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:09:50.581</td>
<td>ta på bleia sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:09:54.764</td>
<td>bebien ikke snakke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:10:52.927</td>
<td>+u (oioi) # skifte bleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:11:05.969</td>
<td>tissle bleie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:11:09.32</td>
<td>tissa bleie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:12:30.205</td>
<td>+u krangle de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:13:25.281</td>
<td>ta det dyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:13:31.561</td>
<td>+u (oioi) # skifte bleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:13:56.168</td>
<td>Kjøre klærne min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:14:51.548</td>
<td>+u krangle de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:14:54.874</td>
<td>mamma +u (tatt) ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:15:56.168</td>
<td>kjøre klærne min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:16:03.401</td>
<td>tissle bleie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:17:12.061</td>
<td>+u (oioi) # skifte bleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:17:39.816</td>
<td>låne denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:18:19.020</td>
<td>+u (oioi) # skifte bleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:18:44.261</td>
<td>oie ikke +u 1dette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:20:06.129</td>
<td>+u (ta av) ta av denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:20:50.179</td>
<td>se mer ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:20:52.057</td>
<td>se mer ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:21:16.882</td>
<td>se mer ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:21:42.902</td>
<td>+u (jeg vil) lukke igjen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:22:35.215</td>
<td>ta på bleie si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:23:11.158</td>
<td>ee 0spise meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:23:13.498</td>
<td>ikke 0spise meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:23:26.743</td>
<td>+u 0spise meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:23:28.631</td>
<td>se mer ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:23:46.995</td>
<td>hoppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:24:11.161</td>
<td>låne denne §u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:24:14.714</td>
<td>+r lâ- låne denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:24:17.969</td>
<td>låne denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:24:26.260</td>
<td>ikke låne denne, låne denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:25:04.224</td>
<td>bytte vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:25:22.760</td>
<td>bytte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:25:26.606</td>
<td>gravemaskinen # det ## bytte vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:25:34.367</td>
<td>sånn # bytte vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:26:18.652</td>
<td>+e (2sove n) på traktorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:27:18.164</td>
<td>ikke ha den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:28:51.698</td>
<td>sitt der 2sove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:30:22.790</td>
<td>§u øhenge sånn # +u denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:32:38.250</td>
<td>og jeg +u (høre til)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:33:07.966</td>
<td>gå §u på §u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:33:44.068</td>
<td>ikke +u les bok denne !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:34:18.115</td>
<td>§u mamma 0lese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:37:48.232</td>
<td>mamma se +u mere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2.01.06)</td>
<td>00:39:23.221</td>
<td>basse borte # gjemme seg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:40:42.787 2lese ma…
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:40:55.095 §u 2lese den
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:41:17.413 se +u hvor pusekatt
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:42:56.906 fanget min 0lese manman min
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:43:02.876 der er §u der er §u
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:43:31.668 ferdig ### 0lese denne boka
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:44:09.990 ma lese mamman min
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:44:58.667 §u 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:45:20.489 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:05.558 bla litt meg
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:14.625 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:21.551 2spise §u
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:35.160 2spise §u
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:41.016 bla den
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:42.592 2lese den
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:46:58.667 0lese +u bok
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:48:00.307 §u 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:48:21.551 Øspise §n (child)
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:48:35.160 0lese §u
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:48:41.016 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:48:58.667 §u 2lese den
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:49:41.016 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:50:03.488 0lese §u
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:50:09.990 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:50:40.990 2male
Benedikte (2.01.06) 00:51:01.582 0lese §u
Kari (2.02.07) 00:10:59.809 peke
Kari (2.02.07) 00:15:16.737 1komme ut §u der
Kari (2.02.07) 00:21:17.450 jeg fisk
Kari (2.02.07) 00:26:44.884 jeg fiska
Kari (2.02.07) 00:30:21.038 se +u boj i hu
Kari (2.02.07) 00:31:20.578 han bade den
Kari (2.02.07) 00:31:23.381 +u den stå der
Kari (2.02.07) 00:31:33.603 han bade
Kari (2.02.07) 00:31:39.926 han bade båten sin
Kari (2.02.07) 00:31:43.078 han bade båten sin
Kari (2.02.07) 00:31:52.461 prøve igjen
Kari (2.02.07) 00:35:35.965 §u gjer
Kari (2.02.07) 00:40:14.125 ha gjemt seg
Kari (2.02.07) 00:41:31.491 ha gjem-... zur
Kari (2.02.07) 00:41:33.676 ha gjemt seg
Kari (2.02.07) 00:44:00.527 mamma gjemme seg
Kari (2.02.07) 00:48:28.322 prøve +t mamma prøve den
Magnus 1 (2.03.10) 00:01:30.970 +u (ha lite tossen [klossen] ha lite tossen [klossen])
Magnus 1 (2.03.10) 00:02:16.484 +r (boj [bor] i) bo-....
Magnus 1 (2.03.10) 00:02:27.486 boj i lu-....
Magnus 1 (2.03.10) 00:03:34.956 §u kjøye
Magnus 1 (2.03.10) 00:06:11.185 denne +u tar ut
Magnus 1 (2.03.10) 00:06:13.595 denne +u tar ut
ta den

stå oppi der

ypper

pappa også lese

ligge oppi loftet

stå stå

bygge tårn

putte oppi der

mormor laga

grave i sanda

også pusle den
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:22:09.126 pusle stor hesten
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:22:14.606 puste # ape
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:22:22.138 +z de- +z de- prøve +r de- der
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:25:38.149 +u (den er) ## opp ned
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:27:13.247 pusle flodhesten
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:27:26.351 pusle prinsessen
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:28:47.962 +u 2sitte på igjen der
Magnus 1 (2:03.10) 00:29:37.300 +u (jeg ferd-) +z (jeg ferd-) rydde mer

Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:00:26.925 jeg skal ## det er dame
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:01:13.239 se han spise
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:01:15.499 han spise en gulrot
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:02:29.227 +r jeg ee jeg prompa
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:03:11.550 den kræsjet
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:03:15.130 den kræsjet med gravemaskinen
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:03:37.230 han kjøre
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:06:13.184 sitte samme med hest på fredag
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:06:44.580 +u (jeg må ta på jeg sette på traktoren)
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:06:52.273 jeg hoppe høyet
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:07:40.192 nå +u kræsje gravemaskinen med traktoren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:08:07.571 nå pennen kjøre
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:08:11.946 og med
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:10:01.346 jøt +z nå quy med ungdomen
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:10:23.118 han kræsja med gravemaskinen
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:11:43.777 det er pusekatten
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:11:49.545 nei det er hund
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:11:56.311 nei det er fugl
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:12:03.975 det +u si han
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:12:43.477 han vil +z nå quy med deg
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:13:46.087 det er meg
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:13:53.321 det er du og meg
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:14:09.244 der sitte med gravemaskinen
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:14:47.136 nå kjøre han
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:15:14.261 den kræsja med traktoren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:15:20.623 den kræsja med traktoren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:16:41.886 han kræsjet med ...
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:17:19.351 den lukke dora på den og
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:17:55.547 han kræsja med deg
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:18:00.867 den kræsja sammen med ## +r med deg
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:20:36.326 han hete tiger
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:22:00.883 han skal +z han skal sjunk
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:22:29.179 nei han sitte fast
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:22:48.045 hva spise han ?
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:22:51.622 hva ... han spise ikke sånn
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:22:57.270 han spise ikke sånn
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:23:01.941 han spise bare sånn
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:23:11.894 det er en # panda
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:24:20.925 også kjøre han
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:24:55.870 bytte med dinosauren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:25:21.777 nå +u kører han på deg
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:25:25.466 der komme bilveier
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:26:05.469 nå kjøre han
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:26:37.699 den kræsje med traktoren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:27:14.380 ja ## +u (og så) helle ut han den sanda
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:27:25.641 +z på ## helle den på drammen
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:27:40.179 han kræsja med traktoren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:28:01.255 han kræsjet med traktoren
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:29:21.200 traktoren klare å løfte traktoren opp
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:00:31.111 det er trollet
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:04:53.520 han stange trollet ned
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:05:00.406 +u bukke bruse stange trollet ned
Emil 1 (2:03.29) 00:05:10.099 +u (det er) baby-bukke bruse
det er store bukke bruse
og det er lille bukke bruse
men den... da gå han videre
det er lille bukke bruse
det er største bukke bruse
da stanga trollet ned
hva hvis # trollet stanga ned mens han går opp # mens han stanga trollet men # han skal +u stukket mens han løper
§u bukkene bruse stanga ned
da # dra han til seters
da si bukkene bruse bare kom da sa trollet
den... da gå han videre
det er trollet som # +f (hva er det som tramper på min bro)
det er lille bukkene bruse
han som stange han
han stange trollet ned på det
han ligne på kaptein sabeltann
han ligne på pinky og
han ligne på pinky og
§u ta med §u
sånn nå komme dere
det er ihvertfall # dama
den §u +u komme ikke ut
(2:04.02) 00:08:59.190 甜甜tu se ná
Anne (2:04.02) 00:09:22.884 jeg tu ha +u flere biler
Anne (2:04.02) 00:11:59.425 bil +u skal odelagt
Anne (2:04.02) 00:12:02.640 +u hjulet odelagt ná
Anne (2:04.02) 00:12:06.273 +u hjulet odelagt ná
Anne (2:04.02) 00:12:09.509 +u bilen odelagt
Anne (2:04.02) 00:12:44.785 toget må ikke tu
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:17.990 +u (den skal) der
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:19.987 +u (den skal) der
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:48.914 ikke +u ñn (child) ha tu
Anne (2:04.02) 00:19:20.508 jeg rydde
Anne (2:04.02) 00:19:48.705 ñn (Child) kan tu
Anne (2:04.02) 00:20:46.044 tu den er min
Anne (2:04.02) 00:22:38.961 kæsje bilen
Anne (2:04.02) 00:24:12.048 se !
Anne (2:04.02) 00:24:18.568 +u (ná jeg 2lese)
Anne (2:04.02) 00:25:58.449 det er tu
Anne (2:04.02) 00:26:18.232 ñn (investigator) +u kan få den ná
Anne (2:04.02) 00:26:30.347 jeg kan ñv
Anne (2:04.02) 00:28:04.820 det er tu
Anne (2:04.02) 00:28:27.938 ñn (investigator) ta på
Anne (2:04.02) 00:29:06.354 +z (tu) jeg +u (kan lag kjempehøyt)
Anne (2:04.02) 00:00:46.852 ha bukke-bruse ...
Anne (2:04.02) 00:01:44.125 jeg ñu 2lese bok
Anne (2:04.02) 00:06:19.470 +u (2fanne der)
Anne (2:04.02) 00:06:38.260 ñn (Child) bake
Anne (2:04.02) 00:06:39.934 det ñn (Child) bake
Anne (2:04.02) 00:06:42.053 det ñn (Child) bake
Anne (2:04.02) 00:06:44.407 det ñn (Child) bake
Anne (2:04.02) 00:10:38.874 krasje bilen
Anne (2:04.02) 00:10:46.501 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:10:48.890 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:10:50.590 kjøre på det her
Anne (2:04.02) 00:10:54.992 kjøre på
Anne (2:04.02) 00:10:56.711 kjøre på ñn (investigator)
Anne (2:04.02) 00:11:02.591 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:11:52.131 bare kjøre bilen
Anne (2:04.02) 00:11:57.383 bare kjøre bilen
Anne (2:04.02) 00:13:00.925 +u (bil kan) kjøre begge to ná
Anne (2:04.02) 00:14:48.550 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:14:58.138 +u kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:00.552 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:04.297 kjøre der
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:13.006 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:16:18.335 ñu kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:17:34.955 jeg kjøre på
Anne (2:04.02) 00:17:41.137 ñu ferdig kjøre vognan
Anne (2:04.02) 00:17:49.700 +u (baby kan få vannet)
Anne (2:04.02) 00:17:53.300 +u (baby kan få vannet)
Anne (2:04.02) 00:18:27.020 ñn (Child) ñu gjøre det
Anne (2:04.02) 00:22:58.840 se ñu
Anne (2:04.02) 00:23:01.330 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:23:02.270 kjøre
Anne (2:04.02) 00:25:40.914 +u (det er) # pusekatt på
Anne (2:04.02) 00:26:10.761 jeg ñu fikse den
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:01:56.603 +u (er gravemaskin)
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:01:58.166 og musa +u er oppå gravemaskinen
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:02:30.792 jeg kjøre på foten
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:02:34.567 jeg kjøre kjøre +u traktor
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:02:39.451 jeg kjøre den hodet
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:02:43.380 jeg kjøre den på hodet
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:03:14.164 ja jeg +u reparere
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:04:51.757 nå 0komme traktoren
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:05:14.896 nå §n (inv) +u kjøre
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:05:01.000 jeg +x reppe [reparere] den
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:05:48.358 hm va kke §u på traktoren
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:06:10.481 +u (jeg ha den å låne)
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:06:32.533 nei reparere gravemaskinen
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:07:31.593 nå §u (inv) +u kjøre 
éi
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:07:41.798 nå §u +u kjøre ånei
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:08:27.727 §u +u reparer
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:08:33.814 §u +u reparere 
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:09:23.915 §n (inv) +u kjøre 
éi
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:09:41.463 og jeg lage det gravemaskiner
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:09:54.370 oi den +t §n (inv) lage den
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:10:12.535 og +r (den gra-) ## den 0grava
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:11:31.938 ikke det se på n
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:12:24.723 jeg og reparere
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:13:14.716 §u 1komme traktor
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:13:38.928 dette bare §u ikke ble redd for n
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:14:23.915 §u §n (investigator) lov å reparere
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:14:23.915 §u §n (investigator) lov å reparere
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:18:20.065 hente §u ...
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:18:23.086 hente ...
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:19:49.884 nå ha jeg ikke her
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:20:05.207 letter §u aken
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:21:06.872 må jeg §u ...
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:21:35.634 jeg §u +u sjekke
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:21:39.013 jeg sjekke
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:23:47.034 +u (jeg redder deg)
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:24:36.106 der +1 0brenne
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:24:39.882 der +1 brenn §I
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:25:08.225 ringe tamasann [brannmann sam]
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:27:06.054 lage opp igjen
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:28:48.511 kan ...
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:29:18.359 bygge opp igjen
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:29:54.444 ygge [bygge] opp igjen
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:30:51.988 +u (og 0lese bok)
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:00:05.015 ikke se på bukke bruse
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:00:10.294 se på annet
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:01:37.583 se på aent bok
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:02:02.990 jeg 0spise mat
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:03:38.179 +u (jeg vil) leke den
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:04:19.345 oi +u trille den
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:05:38.646 oi den virke ikke
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:05:50.265 §u §n (investigator) lov å reparere
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:09:39.657 bare trille runt
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:10:59.539 jeg +u (klare få ut)
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:11:09.487 klare få n ut
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:11:10.614 klare få n ut
Lucas (2:04.02) 00:11:35.314 lukke gjen den
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:11:51.520 jeg må §u
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:15:35.558 +u (bli så redd)
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:15:38.869 +u (bli så redd)
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:17:04.198 tante §n (name) bo der
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:17:15.815 tante §n (name) bo der
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:18:14.976 den snu den veien
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:18:45.699 den 0sitte oppå den
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:19:28.182 §u ta løven nå
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:20:45.850 +u (det) brant i traktoren min
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:23:03.162 ja jeg +x tøla [søla] foten min
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:24:39.762 jeg vise deg
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:26:05.701 jeg +x 0blåse [blåse]
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:27:13.230 +u (kom jeg) vise deg
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:28:22.267 jeg ringe
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:28:45.850 +u (det) brant i traktoren min
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:28:59.527 ringe brannmann sam
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:29:09.236 ringe oppå +u (den her)
Lucas (2;04.02) 00:29:50.934 +x dæ brenner

Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:00:47.441 §u 2sitte der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:00:54.471 han gå trappa
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:01:01.855 han gå trappa
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:01:05.440 ee da gå trappa §u
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:01:46.104 vaske den gravemaskin
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:03:23.464 han gå trappa
ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:03:26.219 han gå trappa
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:03:30.587 han gå 2sitte der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:04:10.751 §u 0sitte der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:04:18.644 jeg +u kjører +u mer
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:04:39.890 og han gå trappa
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:04:50.040 ja gå trappa # kjøre # hund # sitte
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:04:56.319 og jeg +u gå der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:05:22.98 +u (jeg vil finne) skjeen
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:06:09.234 jeg §u # er pappa sin
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:06:31.270 +u (jeg tar og spise jente)
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:07:00.454 §u gå
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:07:07.194 jeg ha en hund
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:09:02.378 leke
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:09:17.481 den gå der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:11:30.813 der løve +u 1sitter
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:12:19.598 ha flere
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:12:54.221 +u (den må ut)
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:13:57.164 ja # katten min # 0dette +u ned
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:14:05.032 jeg gå der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:14:06.906 gå der
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:14:58.270 ja tiit [tigergutt] # 0spise
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:15:19.819 kjøre det traktoren
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:15:34.390 §u tiggut [tigergutt] 2spise
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:15:40.493 mate tiit [tigergutt]
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:15:44.933 mat tiit [tigergutt]
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:15:57.797 han 0dette ned
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:16:02.730 §u er morten sin
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:16:20.935 §u er +x din
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:17:13.870 +u (det er mu [ku])
Ingrid 1 (2;04.28) 00:17:45.216 +z elg +u (det er en elg) +r elg på +u (der)
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:02:03.995 +u (der er det)
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:02:09.040 +u der også # må vi spise
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:04:00.214 bo trollet der?
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:06:16.754 den +u bo der
den +u bo der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:08:51.126 +u pappa 1bære
den bæsje
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:10:45.381 +e (virke ikke)
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:14:45.050 og den bæsje
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:14:47.991 den bæsje
gå der
gå der
den gå der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:30:12.032 se!
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) 00:32:53.432 det stå der
William (2:05.22) 00:03:55.045 +u se!
William (2:05.22) 00:04:27.975 det stå der
William (2:05.22) 00:05:58.343 ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:06:01.879 +u sjekke bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:06:05.399 sjekke bæsj
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:08:25.642 +u sjekke bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:08:43.017 reven +u sitte fast
William (2:05.22) 00:08:51.628 se +u 2sitte fast
William (2:05.22) 00:09:12.154 n gå ned
William (2:05.22) 00:09:15.706 gå opp
William (2:05.22) 00:09:53.278 og kræsje
William (2:05.22) 00:09:54.710 de kræsje
William (2:05.22) 00:09:58.271 kjøre
William (2:05.22) 00:10:00.323 kjøre
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:10:29.624 nei ikke ødelegge traktoren
William (2:05.22) 00:11:29.643 kjøre +u bil
William (2:05.22) 00:12:12.308 +u klarte det
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:12:17.401 den kjøre oppe +r oppe
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:13:10.363 og +u grave hadet
William (2:05.22) 00:13:16.891 kjøre gravemaskin
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:13:28.919 +i # kjøre
William (2:05.22) 00:13:37.405 kjøre den # hadet
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:13:53.676 kjøre opp der
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:13:56.323 han putte opp der
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:14:28.401 +u +u borte kjør
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:14:31.724 klar +r klar kjøre lastebilen
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:14:52.781 kjøre tilbake
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:14:54.411 kjøre tilbake
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:14:56.733 kjøre tilbake
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:14:59.150 kjøre tilbake
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:15:01.936 kjøre tilbake
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:15:12.308 +u klarte det
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:15:17.336 og +u grave hadet
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:15:42.771 der +u er katt
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:16:18.809 katten kjøre
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:16:39.652 kjør tilbake
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:16:42.291 +u kjør tilbake lastebilen
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:17:15.846 han kjøre
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:18:17.333 det 0sitte fast
døde ha på bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:18:48.190 gå
William (2:05.22) 00:19:00.985 kjøre
William (2:05.22) 00:19:03.798 +u kjøre
William (2:05.22) 00:19:07.040 kjøre tilbake lastebilen +u
William (2:05.22) 00:19:41.857 kjøre tilbake
William (2:05.22) 00:19:45.540 kjøre tilbake
William (2:05.22) 00:19:48.190 gå
William (2:05.22) 00:20:00.914 opp løve +u (kan se)
William (2:05.22) 00:20:03.931 de oppe løve +u (kan se)
William (2:05.22) 00:20:37.489 han §u ble +x leemme
William (2:05.22) 00:21:33.689 katten få +x leemme (være med)
William (2:05.22) 00:21:35.635 den få +x jemme (være med) kaffe
William (2:05.22) 00:21:40.564 +u han få +x jemme (være med) hesten
William (2:05.22) 00:21:42.925 få +x jemme (være med) kaffe
William (2:05.22) 00:21:57.198 +u hun ### +r +u (å flytte) å flytte mann under panda # hun
William (2:05.22) 00:22:06.001 få +x jemme (være med) +z p-løven
William (2:05.22) 00:22:09.524 få +x jemme (være med) løven
William (2:05.22) 00:22:41.143 få +x jemme (være med) +z p-løven
William (2:05.22) 00:22:45.723 der +u (være her)
William (2:05.22) 00:23:24.727 eehm bygge bane
William (2:05.22) 00:23:41.854 tiger væ
William (2:05.22) 00:24:02.217 +u hete tiger
William (2:05.22) 00:24:14.133 +u han (være her)
William (2:05.22) 00:24:25.723 der +u (være her)
William (2:05.22) 00:25:24.727 eehm bygge bane
William (2:05.22) 00:26:37.991 +x lemme (være med) sau
William (2:05.22) 00:26:41.143 få +x lemme (være med)
William (2:05.22) 00:27:00.804 +u (litt oppe banen ## hoppe opp sånn # opp sånn kanskje)
William (2:05.22) 00:27:47.242 §u var det ?
William (2:05.22) 00:31:18.820 +u klart det
William (2:05.22) 00:32:54.539 den ha bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:35:27.343 §u ha bleie
William (2:05.22) 00:33:06.929 ku ha den
William (2:05.22) 00:33:10.102 ha denne
William (2:05.22) 00:33:11.946 ku ha denne
Will
William (2:05.22) 00:38:58.134 +e +u synger
William (2:05.22) 00:39:26.678 +u fant det
William (2:05.22) 00:41:37.900 og +u (gjør) sånn
William (2:05.22) 00:41:50.713 jeg banke
William (2:05.22) 00:41:55.401 det banke
William (2:05.22) 00:44:41.082 +u (og her var +v det ...)
William (2:05.22) 00:50:09.597 +u var skummel
William (2:05.22) 00:50:20.407 +u (pappa se) !
William (2:05.22) 00:50:21.450 +u og banke
William (2:05.22) 00:51:47.974 kjøre
William (2:05.22) 00:51:48.850 båten kjøre
William (2:05.22) 00:51:53.457 den 0sitte fast
William (2:05.22) 00:52:08.197 klare §u
William (2:05.22) 00:54:46.641 +x (hvor er) # den
William (2:05.22) 00:56:11.214 og rydde den
William (2:05.22) 00:56:15.652 rydde
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:20:39.380 hm? få opp
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:20:42.770 kanskje vi kan ...
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:21:33.090 øi §u den kommer
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:21:38.740 jeg vise deg
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:21:46.420 det gikk
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:22:00.570 §u kommer gravemaskinen
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:22:01.820 +u (ehm kommer sånn)
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:22:04.400 nå kommer §u og vise deg
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:22:17.660 §u kommer deg
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:22:19.219 her går det...
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:22:26.668 jeg +u ha det på plaster ### ja
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:03:11.475 da trollet si §u sånn
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:04:36.648 ja jeg så §u baby
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:05:54.711 den fly
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:06:18.460 §u her komme +u inni sånn
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:07:03.854 (jeg har en) du har en...
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:07:42.757 +r (jeg fikk ikke §u den)
Oskar (2;06.04) 00:08:27.364 hva heten den der?
Markus (2;08.06) 00:04:06.915 løve som jeg får §u da
Markus (2;08.06) 00:06:10.634 også ha den sånt
Markus (2;08.06) 00:06:25.370 da blir han §u
Markus (2;08.06) 00:07:03.854 ee +z (jeg har en) du har en...
Markus (2;08.06) 00:07:42.757 +r (jeg fikk ikke §u den)
Markus (2;08.06) 00:07:43.720 men han klare å si unnskyld til elgen
Markus (2;08.06) 00:08:19.012 jaha ha du en ting til?
Markus (2;08.06) 00:08:49.800 fordi jeg fikk ikke §u den
Markus (2;08.06) 00:08:55.501 jeg fikk ikke §u den
Markus (2;08.06) 00:09:25.668 han heter...
Markus (2;08.06) 00:13:58.882 den kan §u
Markus (2;08.06) 00:14:11.900 da den øsøve §u
Markus (2;08.06) 00:14:17.696 §u den blir trøtt
Markus (2;08.06) 00:14:39.180 der er ...
Markus (2;08.06) 00:15:16.962 hva heten den mannen?
Markus (2;08.06) 00:15:16.962 den ha på paraply
Markus (2;08.06) 00:15:29.031 han bare økomme se der
Markus (2;08.06) 00:15:29.031 +u (jeg tror det)
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:03:56.638 +u (også skal jeg gi iskrem til mammaen min)
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:06:16.456 +u hopper
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:06:31.366 leke med de
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:08:17.532 hvorfor ta du den?
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:10:16.267 hoppe løveunge
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:12:28.370 mamma jeg spille musikk
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:14:02.381 og der bo h. +z han
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:16:04.925 jeg ha kakett ditt
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:18:59.310 +u (hun bor...)
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:23:07.554 kanskje vi ta den?
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:00:09.840 hva heten hun?
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:11:57.848 au jeg øsittes fast
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:22:32.265 den heter §u
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:26:40.219 nå +u må jeg prøve å øve §u
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:27:29.196 §u holder den her
Linnea (2;09.15) 00:27:42.451 §u løfte
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) 00:17:25.685 nå hjelpa jeg toby
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:17:29.331 ha på +u seg en hatt
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:17:54.733 du regne på du også
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:20:00.388 han ha stygge tenner
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:20:27.128 +u (det er) sau
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:30:24.559 noen kjøre den
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:31:11.623 +u (da bare han) kjører traktoren på plass
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:31:52.334 nei jeg mista ut +u trakt....
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:32:44.978 da bare +u tar den # der inn
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:33:26.381 nei jeg mista kattepusen igjen
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:35:03.826 åh han må gå ette -... +t nei den 0sitte f...+t du # +t §u få det!
Magnus 2 (2:09.22) 00:38:32.623 jeg kle av

Sofie (2:09.28) 00:11:14.108 +s (sove lille §u)
Sofie (2:09.28) 00:12:13.310 her 0finner +u steffany den
Sofie (2:09.28) 00:12:38.094 ee jeg 0legger på mitt rom
Sofie (2:09.28) 00:13:24.194 det gå ikke an
Sofie (2:09.28) 00:14:21.427 ee leke

Sofie (2:09.28) 00:03:46.870 og jeg få litt drikke av mammaen min

Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:11:17.978 +u (da blir gravemaskinen redd)
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:12:31.563 +u (jeg vet ikke)
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:12:36.630 kjøre traktoren sin
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:12:51.300 §u traktoren så alle kan ake på snøen
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:12:58.006 han åpne dørene
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:13:04.494 og steng +u den igjen
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:13:27.822 kjør- ...
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:13:29.478 han kjør ...
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:14:13.626 nå +z (kjører han) kjøre gravemaskinen §u
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:14:41.660 mamma ## mamma vi +u fortell om bukkene bruse ## nå !
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:16:05.977 den ha +z bæsj- # tissa
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:16:56.660 for han syns at løven # og elgen # og +u kattepusen syns +z (at de)
Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:17:35.940 jeg hete §n (Child)

Emil 2 (2;10.02) 00:17:44.541 vil hjem §u

Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:00:09.834 ha på sann
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:00:39.701 den ha brun sann
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:01:03.452 +r (mamma ha) mamma ha brun
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:01:35.080 mm og brukte jeg hjerte
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:01:43.502 dame ha jeg
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:04:27.170 kaste hun
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:05:34.073 du må +u grave lykketrollen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:05:43.061 jeg må kaste den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:06:27.699 da grava på den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:06:36.902 +u (de 2grave)
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:06:56.081 mistet den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:07:32.240 hun blinke
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:07:33.790 +r hun hun kaste sånn
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:01.897 hun må bu-
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:11.574 hun blinke
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:14.094 hun blinke
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:10:31.875 har ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:12:12.084 +u (jeg vil) kjøre
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:12:19.289 +u tatt der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:12:52.598 +u +z (ble de) hun bi [bli] stor
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:13:39.964 §u 2djave [grave]
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:14:49.712 den 0spise gress
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:15:53.490 ja panda ## like hun gress
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:15:59.978 nei hun like kke n
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:16:15.622 hun 0bise [spise] kjøtt
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:31.297 hun smile
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:51.137 nei bare kjøre på morten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:18:42.942 men det gå kke an bli hun lei seg
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:19:19.144 jeg få +x mokka [smokken] etterpå
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:19:39.242 bygge den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:20:12.220 +r hun hun grava
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:21:35.953 det brukt gravemaskinen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:25:11.016 ta på tigeren
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:25:16.641 det ta på n
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:25:18.726 ta på tigeren
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:25:54.038 jeg skifte på han
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:26:03.881 jeg klare skifte på tigern
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:26:56.476 få beinet ut der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:27:26.059 jeg ha barnehagebleie
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:27:34.021 og ikke jeg skifte på bleie på hun
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:27:51.139 ha du mere bleier?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:27:57.738 jeg vil +z ha feste §u ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:28:19.823 +r (bruke jeg) bruke jeg nattbleie på natta
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:28:25.606 ikke ta på s- ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:29:08.580 jeg ta på den bleia
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:30:07.229 vi Øtrenge kke mere
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:00:00.000 +u (du må) lese med troll
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:01:57.451 hun tame poteten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:02:38.885 hun 2lage på sann grønnsaker
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:02:44.806 hun 2lage grønnsak- ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:04:01.962 +r hun hun sprute på mons
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:04:25.343 +r hun +r hun mons sprute på mona
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:05:23.464 +r hun hun rører
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:05:53.447 tom ikke røre
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:06:06.355 hun +x dri [driver] med å henter den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:06:17.460 hun kasta
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:07:34.422 hun kasta
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:07:46.304 hun kasta på golvet
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:15.688 hun hun skyle poteten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:19.693 hun pappa pappa til mons hun skyle poteten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:28.105 neste side dra
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:08:59.985 +u biser
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:11:18.372 ikke ta skoa mine
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:12:24.120 smake pepperkake
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:13:25.808 ha på den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:13:30.399 må ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:13:39.456 +u skal hun ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:14:00.922 hun ha to utebleie
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:14:56.770 +u skal hun ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:15:00.249 du ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:15:23.093 ohjelpe ta på siden
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:15:56.905 +z ta på en gang til
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:16:01.914 du må ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:16:36.468 ta på den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:16:57.485 jeg vise til morten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:12.770 +z (jeg skal) morten ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:14.924 §u ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:17.162 §u skal du ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:37.258 hun ha bàsja
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:45.470 +z jeg skal +u skal på egen du
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) 00:17:46.830 §u tørk +u tørk +u tørk +u tørk +u tørk
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:12:35.196 nei jeg tro jeg må ta +r de de her
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:12:39.835 ja jeg tro jeg få leker
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:13:04.788 du på at den har sånn kant ?
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:14:04.086 §u må jeg at du må # passe her
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:14:22.030 se du at den har sånn kant ?
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:14:32.977 dette tro jeg passe her
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:14:50.312 §u skal +u skal på egen
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:15:06.703 hva stå det her ?
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:15:45.770 +z jeg skal morten ta på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:17:06.014 du klare ta du §u §n (child)
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:17:37.258 hun ha bàsja
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:17:45.470 +z jeg skal +u skal på egen
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:19:12.770 +z jeg skal morten ta på egen
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på bleie
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:19:22.030 se du at den har sånn kant ?
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:19:38.947 §u må jeg at du må # passe her
jeg vil gjøre ... +t holde den
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:20:36.266 §u skal +u skal på bleie
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
den +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:20:38.595 §u skal +u skal på bleie
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:20:48.513 hun bo oppå tre
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:21:27.150 jeg klare ikke åpne
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:26:32.018 +r den den sitte fast
can du §u
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:28:01.808 jeg vil gjøre ... +t holde den
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:40:46.257 §u jeg klare det
da +u bli jeg ## fire år
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:42:12.525 §u jeg klare det
da +u bli jeg ## fire år
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:42:21.897 §u skal +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:42:23.628 §u skal +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:42:51.297 §u skal +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:42:54.863 §u skal +u skal på egen
Anne 2 (2;11.17) 00:42:54.863 hill +u skal på egen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2</td>
<td>00:43:07.086</td>
<td>og da bli jeg tre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2</td>
<td>00:43:10.559</td>
<td>og bli jeg tre år</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2</td>
<td>00:43:33.791</td>
<td>passe sånn da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2</td>
<td>00:43:41.439</td>
<td>§u den passe hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2</td>
<td>00:45:11.616</td>
<td>og den passe sånn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9  Prescriptive Infinitives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Prescriptive Infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:11:56.738</td>
<td>2finne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:17:30.662</td>
<td>2helpe meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:22:37.214</td>
<td>2hjelpe meg # ta på bleie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:30:53.071</td>
<td>2hjelpe meg gravemaskinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:32:30.280</td>
<td>2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:32:34.695</td>
<td>2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:40:52.794</td>
<td>2ele den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:41:23.488</td>
<td>2ele mamma pusekatt ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:41:33.792</td>
<td>2ele mamma min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:43:58.102</td>
<td>2ele den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:44:01.950</td>
<td>+z le- mamma 2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:44:05.450</td>
<td>mamma 2ele din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:45:26.312</td>
<td>mamma 2ele litt der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:46:46.008</td>
<td>2ele n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:46:47.904</td>
<td>2ele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:49:21.663</td>
<td>mamma 2ele mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:49:56.848</td>
<td>2ele n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:50:00.775</td>
<td>2ele n litt litt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:53:18.291</td>
<td>ikke 2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:53:34.347</td>
<td>2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:53:42.763</td>
<td>2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:56:32.882</td>
<td>2ele i denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:56:36.025</td>
<td>neit 2ele denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III 00:57:47.819</td>
<td>2ele denne ee litt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III 00:21:23.085</td>
<td>pappa 2hjelpe meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:13:54.420</td>
<td>pappa 2ele den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:14:00.678</td>
<td>+r lese 2ele elling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:21:16.905</td>
<td>pappa 2bære den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:21:25.955</td>
<td>pappa 2bære den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:22:39.884</td>
<td>1sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:22:56.395</td>
<td>2sette på igjen ## der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:23:00.257</td>
<td>den 2sitte passe de der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:23:07.410</td>
<td>2sitte passe de der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:23:29.412</td>
<td>2sitte på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:23:45.457</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:23:51.940</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:24:04.604</td>
<td>pappa 2hjelpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:24:49.130</td>
<td>också # denne bare 1sitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:26:54.381</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:27:46.698</td>
<td>og 2sitte på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:27:56.827</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:28:45.614</td>
<td>2sitte på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:28:50.243</td>
<td>2sitte igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:04.359</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:06.747</td>
<td>denne 2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:08.000</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:15.816</td>
<td>2sette há [på] der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:17.632</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:20.110</td>
<td>2sette på</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:22.336</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III 00:29:22.638</td>
<td>2sette på igjen der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III 00:00:15.991</td>
<td>2ele</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:03:45.307</td>
<td>sitte §n (Investigator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:07:02.185</td>
<td>§n (investigator) åpen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:04:16.160</td>
<td>§n (investigator) 2komme 2sitte ned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:37.197</td>
<td>nei §n (investigator) # ikke gjøre det §n (investigator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:14:04.758</td>
<td>2hjelpe meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2;04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:00:11.452</td>
<td>lese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnea</td>
<td>(2;09.15)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:24:05.670</td>
<td>ehm 2hjelpe med den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:10:48.060</td>
<td>sove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:10:52.876</td>
<td>sove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:11:12.735</td>
<td>sove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:27:06.398</td>
<td>hjelpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:28:41.588</td>
<td>sitte rett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10  List of unambiguous Root Particlpes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(age)</th>
<th>stage</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>VOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:17:44.040</td>
<td>ikke sett det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:48:02.89</td>
<td>gravemaskin gjemt seg 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:23:38.965</td>
<td>ee tatt av den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 1</td>
<td>(2;03.29)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:43.541</td>
<td>jeg sett sånn før</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 1</td>
<td>(2;03.29)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:46.606</td>
<td>+z (jeg sett på fer-) jeg sett på det ferie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:39.989</td>
<td>se +z ($n (Child) fà) $n (Child) fått +u (egen bok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:47.514</td>
<td>$n (Child) fått +u (egen bok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:50.575</td>
<td>$n (Child) fått +u (egen bok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>(2;06.04)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:14:50.700</td>
<td>hm +r (jeg sett den) jeg sett den og §o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:15:13.544</td>
<td>tenkt på det da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11  List of unambiguous finite utterances

Repetitions are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:11:32.838</td>
<td>den har bæsj-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:41.609</td>
<td>+u de er venner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:18:32.469</td>
<td>l'sitte fast?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:27:58.833</td>
<td>åh den +r har +u har sånne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:28:25.867 | leker gravema- ...
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:28:38.323 | l'henker halen sin |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:29:26.786 | l'henker |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:29:28.284 | 2'henker n |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:29:40.963 | henger n opp |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:35:31.121 | her ## gjemmer seg |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:38:25.558 | oi slo hodet sitt |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:39:45.537 | eple er der |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:41:09.873 | her er pusekatt |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:46:19.355 | der 2spiser |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:51:07.741 | +z elsk- oi §n (cat) er der |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:55:46.531 | pappa gjør |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:56:10.796 | mamma 1kommer +u du? |
| Benedikte | (2;01.06)   | III   | 00:56:28.848 | 2'henker n |

| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:13:59.746 | bjørnen er stor |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:14:03.605 | er kjempestor |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:15:11.102 | prinsessa prøver |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:20:36.868 | er skillpadda |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:22:59.668 | den som 1'henge fast |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:31:08.777 | oi ## datt |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:31:35.793 | han bader |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:33:40.862 | jeg +u fant det |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:33:56.846 | han gjør det |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:34:39.812 | han 1'spiser mat |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:34:54.687 | er sulten |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:35:38.780 | pusekatt er der |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:37:18.217 | den 1'henge fast |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:37:47.186 | han 1'sover |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:37:52.233 | er kjempetrott |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:37:54.351 | har smukk |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:42:24.403 | den er +u fin |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:42:25.633 | er kjempefin |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:43:00.458 | +u den 1'spise mat |
| Kari      | (2;02.07)   | III   | 00:45:13.489 | mamma er der |

| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:02:23.218 | boj +r i- # +r i- # inni huset |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:02:32.021 | boj +r i # i huset |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:02:40.216 | kommej inn |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:02:41.830 | 1komme inn |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:04:36.857 | denne ødelagt den er lett ødelagt |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:05:47.312 | kjøjej der borte |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:05:50.560 | kjøjej der borte |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:15:34.206 | kastej |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:15:37.116 | +r (jeg e-) jeg elskjej +r ka- kaste |
| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10)   | III   | 00:17:48.783 | +r is is er tom |
Emil 1 (2;03.10) III 00:19:14.389 det er pappa
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:00:40.501 jeg sitjer
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:00:42.289 jeg sitsjer den
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:02:02.783 sitsjer der
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:03:51.702 +u falt ned
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:07:54.350 +u han er inni sofaen
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:09:37.823 den er for stor
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:10:57.481 bor inni +r bro broa
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:12:12.142 den er ødelagt
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:16:43.381 jeg har oransje # tube
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:16:53.510 det er min
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:19:13.889 vil ikke mer
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:19:15.560 vil ikke mer
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:19:30.997 ee løve +u er der
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:19:40.247 den er løve
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:19:45.791 den bare 1siter å passe §u
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:20:37.956 skal vi 2grave i stor sandkassa
 Magnus 1 (2;03.10) III 00:21:35.516 denne også er stor

Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:28:42.115 +r nei +r nei nei så må han kjøre vekk
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:28:49.426 så +r så må han kjøre ...
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:28:49.426 da må han si nei
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:30:00.993 er det bare min §u ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:30:11.274 er det noen ... morten ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:30:14.363 er det flere noen leker ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:00:09.606 jeg skal finne
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:00:38.289 hva gjør han ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:01:48.437 jeg veit ikke
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:02:32.503 hva gjør han ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:03:26.371 var det han ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:04:48.391 var det bukkenes bruse ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:05:27.527 hva gjør han ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:05:45.834 han skal kjøre med trollet
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:13.309 da stanga trollet +t da blir # trollet stanga ned
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:27.626 nå tar jeg sa trollet
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:34.979 ja det sier han
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:36.850 også # bare kom da sa trollet
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:41.195 ja det sier han
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:44.876 da s- ... da sa +r sa +r sa trollet hvem §y (er det som tramper på min bro) ?

Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:07:54.513 det sier trollet
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:08:09.258 jeg veit ikke
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:08:11.538 hva gjør han ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:08:47.582 han er sinna på ham
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:11:25.930 kan jeg også ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:11:45.138 jeg kan ikke synge jeg
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:12:07.378 hva ønsker du ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:12:17.021 nei du +u ønsker seg sånn
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:13:30.738 nå må han bite deg
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:14:25.875 jeg er veldig glad ee ee sjokolade jeg
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:14:40.817 kan du bli med meg ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:14:46.344 kan du bli med meg ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:14:49.693 har du også ... skal jeg løfte denne ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:15:03.253 kan de være med meg ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:15:09.779 kan jeg ta med +z disse +z disse de lekene ned ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:15:39.730 §u mamma # kan du bære den der
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:15:42.604 +r (kan jeg) +r (kan jeg) kan jeg gå alene ?
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:16:00.619 nei jeg skal gå først
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:16:04.883 jeg kan ikke ta med sykkelen ned
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:16:21.750 du kan ... du skal gå etter meg
 Emil 1 (2;03.29) III 00:16:21.751 så kommer du etter meg og mammaen min
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Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:16:33.605 ja du må # gå først
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:16:36.498 +r så kommer .... da må du # komme # der
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:16:36.499 også står jeg ned der
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:16:36.499 og da må du vente på meg komme ned
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:17:26.791 kan du lukke det ?
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:17:31.799 hvor er manne ?
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:17:36.721 jeg finner ikke mannen
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:17:43.407 +r (jeg finn-) jeg finner ikke mannen jeg
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:18:10.657 +u kan ... han ... kan han spise +u mat ?
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:18:19.179 kan han spise mat ?
Anne 1 (2:03.29) III 00:19:16.172 kan du lukke den ?

Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:07.065 §n (child) er på her
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:08.907 §n (child) er oppå her §n (investigator)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:17.729 ja jeg ser
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:21.546 §n (child) ser
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:29.908 jeg kan se
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:31.654 ja jeg kan ta
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:00:53.989 §n (Child) har fant den
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:01:05.680 §n (Child) måtte 2finne gravemaskin
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:01:38.418 hvor er # her ?
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:01:49.339 jeg kan se nå
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:01:51.628 ja jeg kan se
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:02:31.904 kan panda bjørn +u kan stå der
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:02:38.263 hesten +u kan stå her
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:02:59.564 er det her ?
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:04:45.782 sånn §n (child) må hente garasjen
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:05:29.938 traktoren +u kan kjøre der
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:05:39.319 gravemaskin +u kan kjøre §u
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:06:10.470 gravemaskin kan der §n (investigator)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:07:41.563 jeg +u ville ha den nå
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:08:50.205 jeg kan kaste +u ballen [baken] ### her
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:09:26.110 jeg må ha +u flere biler
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:09:32.643 jeg må ha +u flere
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:10:10.334 §n (investigator) skal +u fikse den
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:10:30.433 da er blå
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:10:41.116 biler kan kjøre da
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:11:05.265 +u jeg kan ha flere biler
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:11:26.393 §n (Child) har lagd den
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:11:33.717 +u jeg har lagd den §n (investigator)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:11:38.927 nei den er min
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:11:44.979 §n (investigator) må ikke ødelagte bilen
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:12:12.649 +u bilen er ødelagt
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:14:04.735 ja jeg kan leke den
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:14:28.727 nei det er min
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:14:43.527 ja jeg ser
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:15:05.613 §n (Child) ha lagd den §n (investigator)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:15:27.650 nei det er min
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:19:30.654 sånn +u jeg kan kjøre nå
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:22:47.051 §n (Child) kan gjøre nå ?
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:23:32.313 jeg må 2finne +u boka
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:23:52.876 kansje må §n (child) lese +u for §n (investigator)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:23:57.272 jeg får plass
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:24:44.890 vi kan +u (gjøre båten)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:24:49.046 vi kan gjøre båten
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:26:24.071 jeg kan få +u (egen bok)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:27:02.632 ja jeg ser
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:27:20.420 jeg må ha +u (egen bok)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:27:23.184 §n (investigator) jeg må ha +u (egen bok)
Anne 1 (2:04.02) III 00:27:44.388 +r jeg # jeg er ferdig lese bok §n (investigator)
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:28:38.768 se # jeg har fått §u
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:28:55.909 er det denne
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:29:12.650 §n (child) kan # lage kjempehøyt nå
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:29:47.107 du skal få §u
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:00:02.166 §n (Child) kan få egen is
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:00:15.213 §n (investigator) ha fått bukke bruse nå
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:00:24.880 jeg må finne bukke-bruse
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:00:28.220 §n (Child) må finne bukke-bruse
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:00:32.618 §n (Child) kan gjøre nå ?
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:02:45.938 §n (Child) +u kan se
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:02:47.926 §n (Child) kan se nå
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:03:17.770 l sitte
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:03:31.971 §n (Child) kan finne bukke-bruse
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:03:48.099 jeg ## skal # lese
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:05:07.476 §n (Child) kan gjøre nå ?
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:06:33.262 §n (Child) kan gjøre nå
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:06:53.383 §n (Child) har fant den
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:07:40.953 det er §n (Child) sin ball
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:07:57.000 +u (det er) min ball
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:08:15.778 §n (Child) må finne ballen
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:08:25.027 hvor er §u
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:09:21.612 jeg er +u kokke-§n (Child)
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:09:50.416 +z §u §n (Child) var kke langt oppi himmelen
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:09:58.140 §n (Child) var oppå her
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:10:26.663 jeg tror §n (Child) sin bil
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:12:15.674 jeg tror ikke §n (name1) sin bil
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:13:14.183 bil kan kjøre begge
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:13:18.423 bil kan kjøre begge nå
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:14:22.202 det er det
dette er det anne l(2:04.02) III 00:14:26.410
dette er det
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:14:45.748 bil kan kjøre +u nå
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:15:01.325 det er min
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:15:27.560 nei §n (Child) må finne # noe leke
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:15:34.076 §n (Child) må finne noe leke
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:16:20.591 jeg skal kjøre på §n (investigator)
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:17:26.762 §n (Child) kan kjøre
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:18:33.170 §n (Child) må finne §u
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:20:31.795 den er min
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:22:01.100 det +x æke [er ikke] tog
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:22:14.037 hva sier toget ?
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:22:54.551 hva sier §n (investigator)
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:24:33.417 +r (jeg ha ikke) jeg har ikke å 2finne noen leke
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:24:48.336 +r (§n (Child) må) §n (Child) må lese
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:24:54.350 se # hva er §u ?
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:25:17.904 den er min
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:26:14.841 §n (Child) bare må fikse den
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:26:34.502 jeg # må # fikse
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:27:06.957 ble ikke lei seg
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:27:15.781 kan få mat
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:27:18.659 kan få en mat
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:27:30.899 §n (Child) kan lage mat med # §n (investigator) med mus
Anne l (2:04.02) III 00:28:22.419 må la tå [stål der ] +u denne

Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:00:23.110 den er rød
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:02:20.870 er bare meg
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:02:23.871 nei det er bare meg §u
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:02:59.324 nei er bare traktoren
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:03:05.306 ha den +u datt nede der
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:04:07.091 her er aent
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:04:12.341 er aent # gravemaskin
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:04:49.077 det lgrave
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:07:50.904 den er ferdig
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:10:43.461 den er ferdig
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:10:50.420 nei jeg veter ikke hvor ikke bestefar
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:11:17.836 oi hva er det
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:12:27.482 vil reparere
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:14:24.055 det lgraver ned elgen
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:15:53.946 og §n (investigator) er kjempeskummelt
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:17:09.930 den må +u (ha smukken sin)
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:19:34.921 §l uæ der det 1graver ned elgen
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:22:10.522 haj [har] ingen mer
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:22:14.074 haj [har] +z ingen ikke mer
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:22:17.803 det var to hunder
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:22:53.235 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:23:21.885 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:23:39.289 æh det 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:24:07.362 der 0brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:24:14.962 §l uæ der det 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:25:27.819 kanskje vikkej [virker]
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:25:32.480 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:25:52.508 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:26:27.757 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:26:56.703 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:27:03.802 kanskje vikkej [virker]
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:27:09.740 +u der vikkej [virker]
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:27:40.520 +s der vi der det 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:30:44.519 jeg vil leke den
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:30:48.639 hvor er lastebilen?
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:30:53.649 ja nei vi veter ikke hvor lastebilen +z mi- min
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:37:45.337 det er min +u nå
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:37:47.833 er min bil
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:38:14.423 hva er det?
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:38:54.880 ja men jeg må flere brikker
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:39:21.182 == e jeg og vil prøv
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:39:26.835 det er kke inni §u
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:39:32.485 hvor er den?
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:39:39.373 jeg fant
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:41:38.746 går ikke inn her
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:49:28.183 jeg må
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:49:33.856 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:54:08.351 hallo der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:55:27.333 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:55:56.078 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:56:24.288 +x dæ 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:02.480 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:22.747 og der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:25.125 det der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:28.044 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:34.158 jeg går +e (en gang)
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:36.806 jeg går +e (en gang)
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:57:44.128 går brannmann
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:58:14.427 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:58:28.294 jeg går +e (en gang)
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:58:58.183 der 1brenner
Lucas (2:04.02) III 00:29:48.356 jeg går +e (en gang)

Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:01:20.741 jeg kjører traktoren
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:02:14.005 det der er gravemaskin
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:02:32.471 det er morten der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:03:00.717 +r (er gravemaskin) [§n]
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:03:08.751 er gravemaskin
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:03:42.249 ja # 1sitte
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:04:14.835 jeg kjører +u mer
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:04:34.777 det er en gravemaskin
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:05:13.928 jeg har flere leker
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:05:38.994 kan han få skje ?
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:06:21.139 han må ha §u
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:07:36.408 det er tit [tigergutt]
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:07:40.811 det er æsjehale
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:08:02.184 det er hest
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:08:49.088 ødelegge
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:10:57.037 jeg # 1sitte der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:11:52.189 er gravemaskin
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:12:12.442 er traktor
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:13:03.288 jente # sitte gravemaskinen der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:13:38.089 +r jeg jeg ha +z bl - og jeg ha ødelegge
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:13:49.907 der dat katten ned
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:14:23.710 jeg er i # # tørste
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:14:23.710 er tit [tigergutt]
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:15:09.164 er tit [tigergutt] der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:18:09.928 det er morten sin
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:19:36.135 det er blå
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:19:39.470 det er blå der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:20:00.079 der er grønn
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:20:16.493 jeg kjører denne
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:03:14.181 er trollet
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:07:06.914 jeg 1sitte der
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:08:49.088 pappa 1bærer +u sånn
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:09:30.162 jeg #synger papegøye
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:10:17.536 er morten sin vann
Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:10:21.902 og det er baby

Ingrid 1 (2:04.28) III 00:13:52.231 også er de i boken
William (2:05.22) III 00:03:19.522 han vil ha melk
William (2:05.22) III 00:05:48.307 nei katten er det
William (2:05.22) III 00:06:43.269 her er rumpa
William (2:05.22) III 00:09:03.712 åh satte foten
William (2:05.22) III 00:09:44.076 den er ødelagt
William (2:05.22) III 00:10:05.072 +u nå må kjøre mannen
William (2:05.22) III 00:10:13.635 er trapp
William (2:05.22) III 00:10:15.063 er trapp
William (2:05.22) III 00:10:16.738 er trapp
William (2:05.22) III 00:10:18.257 er trapp
William (2:05.22) III 00:10:52.215 det er gravemaskin og
William (2:05.22) III 00:11:10.259 der er trapp
William (2:05.22) III 00:11:12.063 der er trapp
William (2:05.22) III 00:12:00.974 den klarte det
William (2:05.22) III 00:12:34.054 katten vil ikke
William (2:05.22) III 00:13:33.002 nå skal kjøre
William (2:05.22) III 00:15:39.315 der er katten
William (2:05.22) III 00:15:40.975 der er katten
William (2:05.22) III 00:18:19.451 den vil ikke
William (2:05.22) III 00:18:21.821 vil ikke
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:01:35.750</td>
<td>jeg går ned på vannet 2ligger dyreparken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:01:00.561</td>
<td>+x (klør kke [klarer ikke])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:23:24.080</td>
<td>+z (jeg vet §u...) og der +r ligg- 2ligger dyreparken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:19:54.747</td>
<td>var det på løve der ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:21:50.324</td>
<td>den kjører</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:22:49.529</td>
<td>+r (her kommer) her Ikommer bil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:24:12.804</td>
<td>var det på en volvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:24:48.268</td>
<td>hvor er mere ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:24:49.982</td>
<td>der er den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:26:27.672</td>
<td>er det +e kart ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:27:24.393</td>
<td>den er bedre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:35:33.133</td>
<td>er gravemaskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:38:09.758</td>
<td>det er en båt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:38:17.071</td>
<td>jeg klarte det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:39:21.141</td>
<td>klarte det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:40:02.616</td>
<td>der klarte det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:40:40.078</td>
<td>den er ødelagt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:40:54.530</td>
<td>jeg klarte det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:41:02.180</td>
<td>jeg klarte det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:41:10.160</td>
<td>må 2finne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:47:06.270</td>
<td>ikke må vise §u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:51:16.818</td>
<td>+x (klør kke [klarer ikke])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:52:00.453</td>
<td>jeg klarte det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:57:37.066</td>
<td>det var bedre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:10:49.647</td>
<td>der 1komme beinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:11:59.090</td>
<td>det er sann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:12:52.990</td>
<td>kan jeg danse med den ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:13:53.990</td>
<td>+r (her kommer) her Ikommer bil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:14:31.260</td>
<td>den kjører</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:14:39.640</td>
<td>var det på 1øve der ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:15:11.240</td>
<td>heter ... spiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:16:15.280</td>
<td>elefant var ## her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:16:19.680</td>
<td>her var elefant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:16:26.390</td>
<td>var det den ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:16:29.390</td>
<td>§u en ... var det eh elefant der ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:16:43.760</td>
<td>var det 1øve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:16:48.300</td>
<td>den spiser +r en +r en +ren var det en baby ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:17:02.020</td>
<td>der 1kommer det traktor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:17:11.317</td>
<td>ehm vet ikke inne her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:17:21.010</td>
<td>panda er inne her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:17:29.620</td>
<td>+z (jeg vet §u...) og der +r ligg- 2ligger dyreparken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:18:04.560</td>
<td>bare panda kommer sammen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:18:54.460</td>
<td>hva er dette ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:19:41.950</td>
<td>den sier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:19:50.147</td>
<td>hva # det het ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:20:09.440</td>
<td>jeg har +u (pusekatten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:22:26.305</td>
<td>jeg har tre traktor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:22:49.133</td>
<td>får ikke opp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:23:24.080</td>
<td>var det magi ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:00:05.337</td>
<td>jeg hørte ikke om bukkene bruse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:00:14.232</td>
<td>der går +u ikke mus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oskar    | 00:00:18.075 | nå kommer fi-...
| Oskar    | 00:00:26.582 | jeg går ned det |
| Oskar    | 00:00:50.787 | gravemaskinen +r (heter kranbil) heter kranbilen |
| Oskar    | 00:01:00.561 | kanskje vi skal +u bruke den nå |
| Oskar    | 00:01:14.978 | nei jeg vil sitte her |
| Oskar    | 00:01:21.618 | +u ned 1kommer bukkene bruse ned på vannet |
| Oskar    | 00:01:35.750 | dette er mus |
| Oskar    | 00:01:38.455 | her går en mus |
| Oskar    | 00:01:54.340 | er det trollet ? |
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:01:59.849 den mannen som kjører den bitt- ... +t kjører gravemaskinen de kan kjøre noen store gravemaskiner
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:04:27.202 +t (den har) den har traktorlyd
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:04:33.445 så +z (den kan s-) den skal pumpe den der
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:04:38.413 den skal pumpe den
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:04:40.040 den skal pumpe
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:04:42.625 +z (den) +z (den) men gravemaskinen skal ta han ned
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:05:21.566 +z (mot-) der var motoren # som kan ... +z (mot-) der var motoren # som kan...
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:05:25.760 sauen åpner gravemaskinen sin
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:05:54.272 ja jeg vet ikke hva den heter
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:01.693 +t (men den e-) den # er traktor
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:07.162 den sier §o
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:13.900 +t det +t det er et blad
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:17.916 som han kan spise
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:23.624 da blir han ikke noe sulten
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:36.931 +z (også) men hvor er løveungen din ?
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:50.376 den var jo veldig fin
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:53.143 og den var en løveunge
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:06:55.246 den var en løveunge
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:07:14.464 +t (han kan) han kan bombe han
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:08:07.203 her vil du se +t (at du) at du har noe annet ?
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:08:30.112 den kan +u stå
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:08:32.678 den kan ikke +u stå
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:08:36.815 den var og spiste gress
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:08:43.047 den sa §o
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:08:45.184 den kan si §o
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:05.394 her er han mannen
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:08.650 +t (skal) skal vi se i den døren også ?
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:17.518 han heter ## §u
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:30.651 han heter ### en annen mann
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:46.088 den bor i et annet hus ?
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:51.955 også er det en elg som er elget sitt hus
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:09:57.157 vil du se at det er §u
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:10:22.180 den er litt ødelagt
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:10:30.316 +t (nå) nå skal han bombe traktoren oppi der
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:10:52.566 har dere noen leker her ?
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:10:59.123 har du bare løveungen med ?
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:11:04.498 den 1sitter og 2sover hjemme hos oss
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:11:12.764 og den får du ikke tak i
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:11:22.338 den leker ikke sann
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:11:24.984 den leker ikke sann
Markus (2:08.06) IV 00:11:49.311 +z (jeg) +t (det v-) det var elgen som bomba seg
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:12:21.483 jeg vet ikke
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:12:46.833 den er ### svart
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:12:57.824 det går an å ta den opp
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:13:02.589 det går an å ta den opp
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:13:05.344 det går an å ta n opp
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:13:45.440 den kan kjøre
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:13:50.060 den skal kjøre på §u
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:13:52.150 og den skal kjøre på §u
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:09.694 +r da da blir n troll
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:15.382 den blir troll
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:21.845 skal den soves
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:30.994 +r den +r den den traktoren mista det der
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:36.276 det er en # ødelagt n
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:47.137 ja den vil ikke bli ødelagt
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:14:55.664 den vil kke nå
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:15:06.345 ee ## inni mannen kan vi se
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:15:13.055 det er en annen mann
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:15:31.030 jeg vet ikke +u hvem han heter
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:16:18.985 han fikk vondt
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:16:43.177 kan du ta n opp?
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:16:47.594 +r (også kan) +r også også kan den bombes her # på
gulvet også blir den redd
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:17:01.430 +z (den skal) den # elgen skal bombe han på gulvet
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:17:10.416 da må de hente traktoren
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:00:36.500 den jeg vil se på
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:01:44.714 +r da # da kan trolle bunke han i vannet
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:02:08.868 der kan han spise gress
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:02:12.545 skal jeg vise den?
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:02:15.192 skal jeg lese om den?
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:02:22.223 det er bukken-bruse som går over §u her
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:02:26.784 de skal til seters og gjøre seg feite
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:02:48.086 +z (den bukken-) da kom den # mellomste bukkene-
brusen
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:03:38.829 det var §u og der var han
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:03:44.840 +r det ee det er en rør mann
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:03:53.436 den annen nese har han
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:04:12.199 ja +r også også sier det trollet +f (hva er det som
tramper på min bru)
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:05:16.611 jeg vet ikke
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:06:39.178 ee står
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:06:46.324 ja da får han vann
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:08:02.615 da kunne jeg ikke ha på # bleiebukse
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:11:55.753 det var den der
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:12:16.450 nå kommer jeg og I spise deg
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:12:32.545 den var sint
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:16:31.300 han ## jeg vet ikke hvor han +r han ...
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:16:36.537 han ## jeg vet ikke hvor han gjer
Markus (2;08.06) IV 00:18:17.394 der var den bittelige reven som er litt lei

Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:00:13.568 den bor
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:00:15.300 hvor bor hun?
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:00:42.238 smokken min skal gjemme meg oppi der
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:00:56.287 jeg skal vise dere
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:02:42.335 nå jeg vil +r (jeg må) jeg må gjemme meg
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:03:15.124 vil du ha kaffe?
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:04:07.598 hvem vil ha is?
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:05:54.396 jeg må leke
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:06:53.102 du er syk
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:07:05.200 han er også +u syk
Linnea (2;09.15) IV 00:07:19.004 nei +r jeg er syk
er du klar?

den heter friken kanin

kan du hjelpe med den?

jeg skal leke med det sjø

skal ri på hesten

jeg skal ringe pappaen min

jeg skal leke med det sjø

jeg skal ri på hesten

jeg skal ringe

den er til ... må +r må ha de +r de her

nei # jeg må leke med den

§o han ble bleie

§o han ble bleie

jeg må leke med den

det er her

først er det til mamma

jeg må sove litt

jeg vil ha ... jeg la en smokk oppi der

og han vil ha også is

vil du ha ?

vil du også is ?

det er barba

og der er barba

hun kan lage min bok

han klapper

vi kan lese annen bok

vil lese den

hvor bor den ?

mamma vil du ha også is ?

jeg vil ha +z i- (mer is)

jeg vil ha mer is

jeg vil være oppe

jeg vil ha smokka med meg inn i senga min

har du ?

nei # det er bare lilleøster min

nå har jeg gjemt meg

nå har jeg gjemt meg

+r (den heter) ... kanskje den heter mann

og han er +r lille mellom og han er mellom og han er +r mellom og han er mellom og han er mellom og hun er stor

det er bakke

det er lei seg

jeg vil leke med de

jeg er min

gjørte der

glemte den

hun hete dame

den er grønn

ikke den er ingen

det er grønn

den er grønn

ikke den er ingen

kan du løfte opp der ?

det er koseklumpen min ?

+u hvorfor heter den det ?

han er helt sint

han er det

da drar han §u

han solte +u gjennom vognen hans

han har sitte fast han også

og da kan ikke james være med
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:11:48.714  så nei men james er oppi her
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:02.363  ja han har to st. ### +r han han har to stykker
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:07.234  han har to stykker
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:18.592  det er ikk- +t det er ikke §u +t +r han han kan ikke være med heller
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:30.482  inns- +t hvis han kan være med
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:45.896  +r men men han kan ikke være med
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:50.545  mighty mac kan være §u oppi §u
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:55.090  mighty mac kan være med
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:57.614  den kan det
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:12:59.069  han kan det
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:13:18.735  og nå er det en ring
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:13:54.812  +r hva hva er det?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:14:06.328  kan du hente noe flere tog?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:14:15.257  det der er ikke en ...
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:14:34.999  eh det er diesel
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:14:43.392  og hvem er det da?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:14:46.270  hvem er det da?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:14:57.815  eh det er ### en- +t hva står det der?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:15:06.059  der står det persey sin vogn
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:15:19.025  der er ### persey sin kullvogn
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:15:36.102  eh jeg har # og leka der
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:16:24.016  +r den den store grisen hadde lagt seg ute
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:16:34.221  han kan ikke sove ute
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:16:46.604  eh kan jeg få den?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:16:54.196  ja hva er det?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:17:01.964  kan du si det?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:17:18.351  du skal si det
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:17:32.783  også regnet det ikke noe på han
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:17:40.576  nå er han våt
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:18:29.959  da regnet det på han
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:18:37.231  så vil han ikke opp der
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:19:02.995  han # gjorde noe ting
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:19:27.292  hva er det oppi der?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:19:33.567  er du morten?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:19:39.261  og kan du ta bort
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:19:42.499  er det thomas?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:19:51.011  det er en tiger
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:20:06.692  ja hvor er +r (hvor er) tennene da?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:20:17.733  eh # har du mere oppi der?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:20:59.765  han ligger der
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:30:37.622  det er sånn der kjører traktoren
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:30:48.288  han skal grave han
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:30:55.931  han skal grave den her forsiktig
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:06.478  det her er så fint
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:09.709  det her er så fint
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:16.268  og jeg kjører der på plass
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:23.533  går det an?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:40.243  nei hvor er +r (hvor er) ferien da?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:45.433  kanske den er under den der plastelinaen?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:31:58.898  hva skjer da?
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:32:12.976  det var et uhell
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:32:39.073  å nei ### +r den +r den den vil ikke opp
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:32:51.384  nei ++r den +r den den vil opp
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:32:57.951  ja da må du +u dytte +u inn
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:33:13.318  han må grave kattepusen
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:33:18.184  han må være helt forsiktig
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:34:02.195  han må ### dra kattepusen oppover
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:34:26.752  her er kattevennene hans
Magnus 2  (2;09.22) IV  00:34:34.253  det der er en kattepus
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:35:52.579 hva s-... +t hva har skjedd med traktoren din da?
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:36:05.073 eh kan du ta den eh... +t jeg kan løfte de der stakene inn der # plass
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:36:48.437 eh eh eh nå er alle dyra borte
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:37:03.581 er det mer oppi sekken din?
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:37:09.591 +r han han må +t han har tissa
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:37:27.736 nei det går ikke an
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:37:49.542 kan du prøve?
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:38:17.647 da må den gå på forbi
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:39:13.031 han må stå på den
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:39:17.406 også graver han tigeren bort
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:40:31.909 +r nei nei ### den må ta stakene inn på plass
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:40:38.600 hva er det?
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:41:02.525 den der er rompa
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:41:06.211 au # spurte han
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:41:11.834 han må kjøre traktoren # +r det +r det det der går ikke an
Magnus 2 (2;09.22) IV 00:41:59.024 er det

Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:10:45.548 skal sove
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:11:05.714 her kan den sove
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:11:07.981 kan sove ## der
e
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:11:22.281 alle +r kan # +r kan kan få sove i min seng
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:11:57.753 jeg 1kommer snart
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:12:11.845 dette var med
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:12:45.877 +u men vil du se?
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:12:51.423 vil du se?
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:14:02.604 ee ## nei pappaen min kjører hjertet mitt dunker
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:14:28.381 hjertet mitt dunker
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:14:31.265 hjertet mitt dunker
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:14:36.539 hjertet mitt dunker
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:14:44.712 +z §u vil du høre?
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:15:14.498 også ha jeg sminka meg
e
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:15:16.913 jeg hadde sminka +r meg meg hos ragna
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:15:22.509 også ble jeg rosa og lilla
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:15:32.308 ee i går var jeg i barnehagen min
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:15:42.187 ee jeg lekte litt og så # kom mammæn min og henta meg
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:15:51.191 +x mm +z (også kom) # +r også også blei jeg hjem også spiste jeg frokost
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:16:08.319 ja jeg vet ikke helt hva jeg gjorde meg
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:16:18.066 ee ja vil du kaste ball med meg?
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:16:24.480 er det så Fin° ball?
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:16:41.667 i går gjorde vi det
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:16:55.270 er det din tur
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:17:00.888 +r det det gikk ikke an
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:17:06.568 §l nå er det rita sin tur
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:17:16.140 §l der er den
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:17:46.877 jeg kan kaste langt
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:17:17.349 der er den
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:17:34.292 der er trollet
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:30:00.818 da blir hun lei seg
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:30:07.480 noen har slått han
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:30:16.456 de ble lei seg og
Sofie (2;09.28) IV 00:30:49.300 mamma kan jeg få litt drikke?
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:04:49.945 vil du +z ha også ha litt saft?
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:06:08.857 ee jeg vet ikke
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:08:00.913 jeg vet ikke
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:08:03.245 du kan lese
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:08:06.620 jeg vet ikke
doget er hunden
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:09:16.697 det er i musebyen
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:10:44.142 jeg 2drikker
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:10:46.066 se nå hva jeg 1drikker nå
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:11:21.572 ee vet ikke
Sofie (2:09.28) IV 00:11:36.498 hun [hund?] kan sleike han

Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:04:41.559 men vi mangler en šu som skal være der
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:11:29.866 nei den er bare +u dum
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:11:31.940 og nå kommer løven
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:11:34.307 og dragen # spiser den opp
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:12:13.784 det å gå an å opne dørene -ne
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:12:41.054 da kjører han selv og så
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:12:46.830 han kan +r kjøre +z en +z kjøre alle ...
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:13:35.104 han bor i jorda med gravemaskinen
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:14:34.431 hva er det?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:14:53.975 nei han kan ikke stå
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:15:09.440 men jeg klarer ikke det.
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:15:46.190 +u men jeg klarer ikke
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:15:50.386 hvor er halen til tigeren?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:15:56.595 hvor er halen til tigeren?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:16:33.153 all dyrene må sove
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:16:42.860 nå må de gå hjem - ...
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:16:44.810 nå må kattepusen gå hjem og sove i senga si
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:16:52.762 nei for alle dyrne de er skum- ...
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:17:20.624 jeg må gå hjem
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:17:26.230 bor i rau fossen
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:17:48.965 nei # han er mamma
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:17:53.052 nei nå 1faller mamma
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:17:58.840 nå er jeg våt
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:18:42.154 hesten ligner litt nesten på elgen
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:19:05.227 mamma skal vi åpne den?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:19:26.233 den er ingen ting
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:19:46.034 jeg vil ta opp den
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:20:50.905 +u da var trollet sint
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:20:55.257 men da må vi bla her
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:03:44.670 kommer trollet
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:03:34.223 nå skal vi lese den
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:03:42.670 mamma # nå er trollet der
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:03:53.450 +u hva sier den?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:04:07.400 da ble bukkene bruse også litt sint
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:04:17.715 de er kke venner
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:05:33.979 Øsitter han +u (oppå broen)
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:05:48.204 +v (jeg veit ikke)
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:06.617 nei jeg veit ikke
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:09.860 +z hva ## hvor er trollet?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:15.402 hvor er trollet?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:22.439 hvor er den?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:26.456 nei jeg +r veit veit ikke
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:30.471 nei hvor er den?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:36.406 hvor er den?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:06:49.151 jeg vet ikke
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:07:37.143 jeg klarte det
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:07:51.601 mamma har du kjøpt # melk?
Emil 2 (2:10.02) IV 00:07:55.820 kan jeg få melk?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:07:58.538 mamma # kan jeg få melk?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:10:52.725 mamma hvor er katten?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:10:55.010 hvor er katt?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:11:08.147 mamma hvor er den?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:11:14.422 ligg i pandabjørnen oppå den?
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:11:21.102 hvor er den da?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:11:38.400 hvor er den da?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:11:44.230 hvor er den?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:12:21.843 nei han må ikke det
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:12:33.130 jeg ønsker meg de til jul
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:12:51.864 men det er mine leiker
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:13:00.232 hvor er løven min?
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:13:24.459 jeg mätte se om løven er i senga mine
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:13:28.489 mm skal vi se der?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:13:39.071 mamma skal se om løven er i senga dine
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:13:52.466 da må jeg åpne +u (presangen) min
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:15:03.460 og jeg skal prøve lynet mcqueen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:15:23.446 kanske han virker
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:15:31.709 nei han virker ikke
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:15:59.313 nei ## virker ikke
Ingrid 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:16:18.643 det var dumt
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:16:20.596 mamma det var kjempedumt
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:16:23.756 vi kan ikke bruke den da
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:16:53.029 §l jeg vil kjøre på togstasjonen
Emil 2 (2;10.02) IV 00:17:24.768 hva heter farmor?

Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:00:03.826 mamma har
duke® rød grønn og det er gul
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:00:22.198 nei det er rød det her
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:00:26.860 nei det er rosa det
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:00:43.077 den har jeg laget # det her
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:01:29.891 mhm tok jeg kakeform
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:01:50.981 +r (det er) det er mann og det er dame
dette er kke traktor
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:02:19.169 det er sirkel
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:02:24.699 nei det er sirkel
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:24.205 den henger fast
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:48.159 hva var det
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:15.406 han skal +x bi 2grave på der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:44.511 hun må kjøre på sofaen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:51.275 hun 1grave på sofaen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:11.720 må 2finne noe 2grave med
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:15.325 jeg vil 2finne noe b- ...
dette er kke traktor
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:23.347 dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:29.213 nei +r (det er) det er et lykketroll
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:36.658 jeg må kaste n
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:39.601 jeg må 2grave den lykketroll
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:50.022 hun 2sitte
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:52.363 hun +x l [vil] 2sitte
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:54.737 hun +x l [vil] 2sitte der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:57.256 +u skal 2sitte
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:59.197 hun vil 2sitte
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:06:24.944 var det din?
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:06:44.522 det er blomst
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:07:06.149 hun må 2grave
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:07:24.042 den er ute
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:07:27.581 ja hun går ut og kaste der
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:07:53.872 +r hun +r hun må 2grave
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:07:59.635 hun må 2grave på golvet
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:18.220 er det gravemaskin?
dette er kke traktor
dette er 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:21.631 er det rød?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:24.014 hun må 2grave der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:25.918 hun må stå
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:59.863 +x ta [skal] vi ha sau ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:04.649 ja nei det er hund
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:08.655 nei +r (det er) det er ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:12.550 nei +r (det er) +r det det er fugl det
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:30.912 er det kråke ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:36.532 hai har du hai ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:45.331 er det dinosaur ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:56.659 hun 1spiser hun deg ²ø
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:10:26.108 nei det er voftten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:10:30.880 hva det har ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:10:48.597 nei +r (det er) det er en bjørn
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:10:52.627 du har kke bjørn ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:10:57.598 åja hadde tiger
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:11:00.441 nei det er løve det
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:11:24.338 her er pusekatten er kke skummel
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:11:30.879 bare bare dinosaurus er skummel
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:11:34.391 og den er skummel
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:11:36.696 +r (den er) den er ikke glad
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:11:54.063 hun gjør sann
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:12:07.869 +r hun +r (hun vil) +r (hun vil) kjøre
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:12:28.233 +r ka- katten vil kjøre
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:12:38.595 hun er ferdig 2grave
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:00.821 nei hun er stor
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:04.212 +r hun hun er stor
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:06.237 hun har sann bein # og hale
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:13.133 +z hu- der er stor hals
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:17.533 det er haka
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:20.686 er det haka øyne
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:29.484 der er halser
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:05.179 andre er redde
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:07.232 sann hun datt
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:10.279 hun datt
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:16.151 hun 1bisej [spiser] sann gress
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:22.709 det er deilig
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:26.186 +x s 1finne gress
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:40.846 det er gressen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:02.371 det er bare løven
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:16.819 nei ikke hunde 1bise [spise] gress
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:22.195 hunde 1bise [spise] sann
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:24.720 hunde 1bise [spise] gress
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:30.146 hunde 1bise [spise] sann melk
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:39.812 hun 1bisej [spise] melk
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:15:48.519 nei hun 1bisej [spise] sann broskive
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:05.782 hun liker +u det broskive
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:18.318 løven 1bisej [spise] kjøtt
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:32.267 det er brun kjøtt
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:01.879 det er mann
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:04.008 +u den skal sitte her
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:10.337 han 1driver og 2graver
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:46.729 du må ikke kjøre på han
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:57.950 er du redd ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:02.126 +z (du e-) du blir sint
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:08.320 +r (er kke) er kke du sint ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:18.987 tut tut vi kjører på deg tut tut
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:25.577 hun må sitte
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:39.755 +u vi må ikke kjøre på han
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:50.307 det er bjørn det er teddy bjørn
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:54.363 det er isbjørn
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Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:18:57.403  det er isebjørn
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:19:10.370  sa må du må gå hjem etterpå
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:19:15.509  kan jeg få +x mokka [smokken] etterpå?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:19:51.647  den må jeg oppå der den også
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:19:58.974  oi ## er det is?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:06.941  +r (hun 1 sitter) +r (hun 1 sitter hun) hun sitter mannen
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:17.865  vil du smake pizzaen?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:23.072  vil du smake?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:36.243  er det morten sin?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:44.835  er det morten sin?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:54.593  der det er morten sin
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:20:57.797  er det morten sin?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:21:02.980  og det er mamma sin
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:21:26.800  det er soppel
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:21:40.116  +r du du det er andre gravemaskin
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:21:47.186  +r (det er) det er blå gravemaskin
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:21:52.962  +r (det er) +x (det er b-) det er mange gravemaskiner
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:22:16.040  jeg vil ha eske
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:22:40.641  det er pizza
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:22:41.962  er det pizzaen?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:22:45.969  her er pizza til morten sin
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:22:58.936  +r (det er) +r (det er) det er oransj
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:23:27.895  vi trenger ikke gaffel
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:23:30.463  nei +z vi du trenger ikke gaffel
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:23:42.281  +r den den det er kke +u (drikken)
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:23:47.909  ja # +r det og det har mere vann der
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:23:53.512  er det mamma sin?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:23:57.735  nei +r (det er ikke) det er ikke din
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:24:03.559  nei det er mamma sin
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:24:05.674  det er din
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:24:35.312  er rosa det
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:24:48.511  det er rosa
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:01.005  det er kke flere
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:19.872  jeg skal vise deg
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:35.600  da må han ta på n
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:38.322  vi skal ta på barnehagebleie
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:41.513  vi skal skal ta på barnehage- +x den -bleie
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:44.174  kan du 2hhelpe hun?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:46.575  jeg trur jeg er ferdig bøsje
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:57.252  hun ska ta på n
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:25:59.772  jeg klarer
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:26:07.163  jeg skal skifte på tigeren
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:26:10.389  ja jeg skal skifte šu
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:26:22.906  mm har det bleie?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:26:26.363  vil du ta på bleie?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:26:48.297  og må over rumpa
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:28:44.879  skal vi ta på bleien?
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:28:50.381  det er barnehagebleie
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:28:53.494  det må ta på over beinet
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:29:15.335  hun må ha bleie
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:29:27.039  må ikke ta av
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:29:38.822  det er jeg
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:29:47.492  vi klarer
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:29:55.647  nå har kke du mere bleier
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:30:11.207  det er kke mere
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:00:03.101  der er vi her se der šu!
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:00:09.800  det var bukke bruse
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:00:19.673  det var bukke bruse
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:00:45.298  +z (jeg jo) +z (jeg ha ma-) jeg har jente
Ingrid 2  (2;10.08)  IV  00:01:07.382  hun er sintValue: 164
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:01:11.855 +r hun +r hun +r hun hun er sint
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:01:21.232 jo hun sier nei
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:01:53.299 +r hun +r hun hun er glad
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:02:17.391 +r (det er) det er mons
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:02:20.016 det er mona
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:02:21.680 +u (her er) mona og det er mons
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:02:30.342 de er for hjelpe til +u leike bordet
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:00.440 det er potet
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:05.264 det er gorot [gulrot]
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:30.013 er det det?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:43.902 er det suppe?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:49.099 det er suppe
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:03:50.820 det er pannen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:07.881 ja nei mona er slem
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:13.593 +z (jeg må ikke) +z (jeg må lære) jeg må si og lære mere
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:20.140 må ikke sprute mer
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:34.304 +z (sier hun) hun løper med poteten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:04:44.159 nei ## hun er glad
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:07.726 hun 1 sitte oppå mons
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:12.742 hun 1 sitte oppå mona
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:30.596 +z (hvis hun §u så ikk-) hun fikk ikke mona
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:35.765 det satt ikke en sann der så +z ha- +z hu- +u (kan der sånn) ikke der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:47.812 nei # du ikke rører med den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:05:56.167 du må ikke røre
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:06:11.452 +z hun de er på golvet
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:06:26.050 nei # det er hunden
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:07:11.418 +u hun ringer
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:06.243 hun gjør 2biten
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:33.053 hun datt
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:08:56.986 de 1biser [spiser]
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:01.770 de 1biser [spiser] grønnsaker
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:06.998 +z b- +r de de 1drikker
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:09.306 det er jeg der
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:42.910 de er julenissen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:09:47.294 nei det er julenisse
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:10:51.298 +z (du må ikke julenissen ta) +u og du må ikke julenissen ikke ta den av
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:12:00.529 hun har # +u sann genser
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:12:07.376 den er rød
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:12:18.006 hun har sånn ...
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:31.837 +x (hun) at hun skal +r ha ha på den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:43.690 og hun skal ta på den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:13:53.667 vil du holde den?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:05.434 hun må jeg legge oppå kassa
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:08.817 må jeg legge oppå kassa
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:18.423 det er min
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:30.326 +u men du skal ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:35.649 men mamma vil +x ho- hjelpe meg
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:14:45.277 den skal jeg ta # §u
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:05.589 vil du hjelpe meg?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:09.737 vil du hjelpe meg?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:20.512 du må ta på egen
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:25.030 og den du må ta på den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:30.441 du må ta på # den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:33.306 +z vi du må ta den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:16:38.605 du må ta på denne
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:05.125 skal vi ta på en gang til?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:08.107 ja og du må ta på egen
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Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:21.281 da må +r (gjøre vi) +r gjøre vi sånn
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:17:56.279 må du 2holde den
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:18:01.800 jå jeg har den er §u
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:20:17.271 har det bleien ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:20:29.405 +x ta [skal] vi ta på den ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10.08) IV 00:20:40.855 det er julius
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:02.788 ja # det er du
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:04.436 så jeg er bare to år og
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:11.997 den må pass-+t den må passe sånn tro jeg
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:16.040 den # +u tro jeg # må passe sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:25.408 §o +u dobbel ### ja ### den må ha den +u sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:42.875 skal vi se
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:45.827 nei du kan ikke ødelegge den
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:12:49.596 nei jeg kan bruke den på nytt igjen
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:13:11.419 og da må vi ### sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:13:45.514 det tror jeg +e (er voksendrik)
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:13:48.656 jeg tror +e (det er voksendrik)
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:13:51.232 det tror jeg +e (er voksendrik)
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:13:57.886 og den må det ...) den må passe # her
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:14:18.605 og da må han +e (delte i to) sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:14:29.860 skal vi se
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:15:02.481 jeg var i +u oslo i går
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:20:30.445 det +r det er vannet til trollet det
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:21:24.130 jeg må ha en bein
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:21:26.804 jeg må ha en bein
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:21:31.165 ja # han må komme ut
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:21:48.719 den sier det
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:22:27.967 komme jeg og tar deg
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:24:43.433 nei det var ikke
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:26:08.080 +r (jeg vil) jeg vil sitte
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:26:11.072 +r (jeg vil) jeg vil
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:26:16.885 kan jeg sånn ?
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:26:42.990 kan du ?
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:27:02.374 kan jeg sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:27:06.148 kan jeg sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:27:17.940 §l der var blåbær
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:27:20.164 der var det blåbær
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:27:41.041 kan jeg ta +t kan jeg ta blåbær oppi der
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:27:53.429 kan jeg putte blåbær oppi der ?
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:28:05.211 +r (jeg vil # stå der) jeg vil stå der
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:28:10.007 jeg vil sitte der
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:28:16.068 kan jeg sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:28:17.761 han gjør # sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:28:35.902 jeg vil kke sitte her
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:29:06.131 kan ikke du det også ?
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:29:14.468 gjo-+t det må jeg +u (sånn lyd sånn)
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:29:28.811 er det julenisse ?
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:40:18.239 da må gjøre
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:40:21.552 nei # da må jeg §u +t jeg må pusle denne
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:40:35.936 skal vi ta av de
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:40:39.866 nei du kan ikke blande
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:40:43.712 jeg kan blande
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:43:02.196 og jeg er jo to år
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:43:35.560 den må passe sånn
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:43:39.255 den må passe her
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:43:52.135 §u og den skal der
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:44:08.120 jeg så det
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:44:09.678 men jeg så ikke det
An 2 (2;11.17) IV 00:44:13.803 jeg så ikke # +r ikke det
hvor skal den?
og den må passe hit
den var veldig rar den
ja den var jo veldig rar
men den er jo ikke rar
nei du er ikke rar
ingen er rar +r rar
den må passe sann
skal den passe sånn?
det er kaldt å være sånn
kan den være sånn?
## Appendix 12  List of unambiguous Root Infinitives

Repetitions are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:57.864</td>
<td>2drikke vann bebien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:08:24.914</td>
<td>ikke 2drikke vann bebien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:14:17.279</td>
<td>ikke 2spise meg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:16:34.005</td>
<td>2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:16:44.323</td>
<td>2sitte +u der stolen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:17:02.836</td>
<td>2sitte oppå se sett # # han</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:17:15.051</td>
<td>2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:17:34.503</td>
<td>2sitte denne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:17:37.728</td>
<td>2sette fast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:07.487</td>
<td>2sove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:09.568</td>
<td>2sove pusekatt §o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:14.659</td>
<td>oi 2sover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:39.329</td>
<td>ikke 2sette denne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:41.540</td>
<td>2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:28:29.425</td>
<td>§n (cat) ikke 2sitte # hale sin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:02.182</td>
<td>mennen +z (0sitter og) # oi # 2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:10.750</td>
<td>+r s- 2sitte der # siden av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:59.370</td>
<td>+r +x duppon [duploen] +x duppon [duploen] +x da +z (2sitter her) +z der 2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:30:15.580</td>
<td>henger n denne # hånda si # her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:30:35.783</td>
<td>2sitte rolig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:30:44.933</td>
<td>2sitte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:30:47.785</td>
<td>+x duppo [duplo] 2sitte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:31:01.476</td>
<td>2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:31:32.065</td>
<td>ikke 2spisa meg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:31:34.758</td>
<td>+z ikke §n (cat) ikke 2spise meg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:33:33.309</td>
<td>2lese bok denne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:36:28.640</td>
<td>2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:40:07.744</td>
<td>2lese denne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:43:17.634</td>
<td>2sitte teppen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:47:32.971</td>
<td>2spise kjeks nå</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:49:39.971</td>
<td>2lese den til deg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:49:42.639</td>
<td>2lese den til deg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:50:13.492</td>
<td>2lese det det der</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:53:02.576</td>
<td>2finne bok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:54:03.284</td>
<td>2holde denne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:54:25.852</td>
<td>2lese meg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:54:32.986</td>
<td>nei meg 2lese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:54:44.425</td>
<td>2holde denne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:55:53.372</td>
<td>2lese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:58:18.931</td>
<td>bebiene 2sove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:58:22.480</td>
<td>2sove han bebien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:58:42.798</td>
<td>denne bebiene +u den 2sove litt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte (2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:58:47.518</td>
<td>bebiene +u den 2sove litt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:14:05.760</td>
<td>den 2sitte der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:34:52.368</td>
<td>2spise mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:37:14.622</td>
<td>den 2henge fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:38:53.442</td>
<td>den +u 2grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2;02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:38:55.644</td>
<td>den 2grave +u (det der)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:01:55.822</td>
<td>2dave [grave]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:01:57.230</td>
<td>2dave [grave] ute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:01:59.420</td>
<td>vi 2dave [grave] # inni der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:02:02.199</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>+r da ee 2dave [grave] inne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:04:99.338</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>2dave [grave] hjemme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00:54.620</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>jeg 2lese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00:56.390</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>denne 2lese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:01:03.000</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>ja §n (Child) 2lese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:16:24.907</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>vi 2grave hjemme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:16:27.490</td>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>vi 2grave hjemme på vålerenga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:03.191</td>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>ja jeg 2lese denne +u for 2lese §n (instructor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:16.353</td>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>nå jeg +u 2lese for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:05:00.268</td>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>ferdig 2lese bok nå</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:06:16.897</td>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>oi jeg 2finne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:06:22.370</td>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>2finne der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:05:59.423</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>jeg gjøre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:06:02.882</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>det jeg gjøre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:08:59.369</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>jeg gjøre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:09:37.542</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>men det være der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:10:09.870</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>2grave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:11:13.231</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>jeg 2grave lastebilen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:41.675</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>jeg gjøre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:27:17.857</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>jeg gjøre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:29:14.139</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>2ligge oppå den her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:29:25.178</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>nei ee jeg gjøre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:10:49.337</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:10:51.436</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>jeg 2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:10:53.489</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>jeg 2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:10:58.640</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>2sitte der elg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:11:59.128</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:14:39.587</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>han 1spise +r (han spise) +r (han spise) +r (han spise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:15:54.433</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>han 2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00:20.010</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>2sette der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:05:27.669</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>2sette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:05:29.895</td>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>2sette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:12:29.161</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>katten 2sitte oppe der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:14:13.263</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>katten være der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:14:15.157</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>katten være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:19:36.080</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>+r kua kua være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:19:38.880</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:04.080</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>tiger være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:05.640</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:51.202</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>der være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:58.556</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2sitte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:24:59.672</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2sitte au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:25:43.449</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2sitte der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:26:06.869</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2sitte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:38:25.848</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:38:26.790</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>den være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:38:55.210</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2synger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:40:06.110</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>den være her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:17:34.876</td>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>den 2ligge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:08:02.244</td>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>den 2sitte her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:09:24.240</td>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>ehm # ehm 2spise +r 2spise ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:12:56.528</td>
<td>Linnea</td>
<td>han 2spise deg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:16:37.809</td>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>nei # nei # han 2sove inne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:39:51.185</td>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>være skummelt # +r det det der</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:16:35.920</td>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>2sove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:16:41.831</td>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>2sove ja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:18:29.125</td>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>nei # vi 2sove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:04:21.895</td>
<td>hun 2grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:06:49.825</td>
<td>jeg 2grave i blomsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:06:58.169</td>
<td>2grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:13:42.356</td>
<td>han 2djave [grave]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:14:30.255</td>
<td>+x e 2finne gress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:14:55.162</td>
<td>+r hun- hunde 2spise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:21:14.113</td>
<td>jeg ikke 2finne pizzaen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:21:37.709</td>
<td>det 2grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:05:19.046</td>
<td>hun ha sånn og gjøre røre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:13:52.003</td>
<td>2hjelpe ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13 Null subject clauses

Repetitions are included.

Null subjects in Root Infinitives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2:04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>(age)</td>
<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2:05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>(2:06.04)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2:10.02)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2:10.02)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2:10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2:10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2:10.08)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Null subjects in finite clauses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:41.609</td>
<td>+u de er venner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:18:32.469</td>
<td>1sitte fast ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:28:25.867</td>
<td>leker gravema- ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:28:38.323</td>
<td>1henger halen sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:26.786</td>
<td>1henger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:28.284</td>
<td>2henger n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:40.963</td>
<td>henger n opp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:31:50.000</td>
<td>gjemmer seg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:35:31.121</td>
<td>her ## gjemmer seg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:38:25.558</td>
<td>oit slo hodet sitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2:01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:46:19.355</td>
<td>der 2spiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:14:03.605</td>
<td>er kjempestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:20:36.868</td>
<td>er skillpadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:34:54.687</td>
<td>er sulten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:37:52.233</td>
<td>er kjempetrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:37:54.351</td>
<td>har smukk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari</td>
<td>(2:02.07)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:42:25.633</td>
<td>er kjempefin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:02:23.218</td>
<td>boj +r i- # +r i- # inni huset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:02:32.021</td>
<td>boj +r i # i huset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:02:40.216</td>
<td>kommej inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:02:41.830</td>
<td>lake komme inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:47.312</td>
<td>kjoej der borte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:50.560</td>
<td>kjoej der borte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:15:34.206</td>
<td>kastej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:02:78.73</td>
<td>lsitte der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:03:51.702</td>
<td>+u falt ned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:10:57.481</td>
<td>bor inni +r bro broa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:19:13.889</td>
<td>vil ikke mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2:03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:19:15.560</td>
<td>vil ikke mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 1</td>
<td>(2:03.29)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:03:00.590</td>
<td>kan kjøre +u helt over veien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 1</td>
<td>(2:03.29)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:06:41.222</td>
<td>veit ikke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 1</td>
<td>(2:03.29)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:13:00.526</td>
<td>han ... vet ikke han sier # jeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 1</td>
<td>(2:03.29)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:19:43.267</td>
<td>det er ... veit ikke hva heter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:10:30.433</td>
<td>da er blå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:17:770</td>
<td>lsitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:27:06.957</td>
<td>ble ikke lei seg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:27:15.781</td>
<td>kan få mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:27:18.659</td>
<td>kan få en mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:28:22.419</td>
<td>må la nå [stå] der +u denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:7:482</td>
<td>er bare meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:59.324</td>
<td>nei er bare trakten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:14:49.077</td>
<td>det 1grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2:04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:27.482</td>
<td>vil reparere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Segment</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:22:10.522</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>haj [har] ingen mer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:22:14.074</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>haj [har] +z ingen ikke mer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:22:53.235</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:23:21.885</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:24:07.362</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:24:07.362</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:24:23.590</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>og der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:24:52.508</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:25:27.819</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>+z +u (nei det ring-) der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:25:32.480</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:25:56.703</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:26:16.454</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>kanskje vikkej [virker]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:26:21.601</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>+u der vikkej [virker]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:04:40.832</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:13:38.746</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>går ikke inn her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:24:33.856</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:24:48.938</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>hallo der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucs</td>
<td>00:25:27.733</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:25:56.703</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:26:24.288</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>+x dæ 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:27:02.480</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:27:22.747</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>og der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:27:28.044</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:28:14.427</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>00:28:58.183</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:03:00.717</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>+r (er gravemaskin) [§n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:03:08.751</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er gravemaskin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:03:42.249</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>ja # 1sitte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:08:48.521</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er hest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:09:40.241</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er dyr ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:11:52.189</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er gravemaskin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:12:12.442</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er traktor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:14:23.710</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er tiit [tigergutt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>00:10:17.536</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er morten sin vann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:09:03.712</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>åh satte foten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:10:13.635</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er trapp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:10:15.063</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er trapp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:10:16.738</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er trappa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:10:18.257</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>er trapp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:13:33.002</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>nå skal kjøre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:39:21.141</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>klarte det</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:40:02.616</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>der klarte det</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:41:10.160</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>må 2finne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:47:06.270</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>ikke må vise §u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>00:51:16.818</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>+x (klalel kke [klarer ikke])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:15:11.240</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>heter ... spiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:17:11.317</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>ehm vet ikke inne her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:22:49.133</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>får ikke opp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:04:26.459</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>her inni +t her +u 1sitter inni boka der</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:06:36.526</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>her 2kommej §o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oskar</td>
<td>00:09:24.240</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>her 1komme sånne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnea</td>
<td>00:14:08.222</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>skal ri på hesten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnea</td>
<td>00:06:18.026</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>vil lese den</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnea</td>
<td>00:24:33.963</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>glemte den</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>00:41:59.024</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>er det</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>00:10:45.548</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>skal sove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>00:11:07.981</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>kan sove ## der</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>00:11:22.281</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>er dyra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age (m/d)</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>00:11:21.572</td>
<td>ee vet ikke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2;10.02)</td>
<td>00:17:26.230</td>
<td>bor i raufossen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2;10.02)</td>
<td>00:15:59.313</td>
<td>nei ## virker ikke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:05:11.720</td>
<td>må 2finne noe 2grave med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:05:57.256</td>
<td>+u skal 2sitte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:10:57.598</td>
<td>åja hadde tiger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:14:26.186</td>
<td>+x s 1finne gress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:24:35.312</td>
<td>er rosa det</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:26:48.297</td>
<td>og må over rumpa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:28:53.494</td>
<td>det må ta på over beinet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:29:27.039</td>
<td>må ikke ta av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10.08)</td>
<td>00:04:20.140</td>
<td>må kke sprute mer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 2</td>
<td>(2;11.17)</td>
<td>00:40:18.239</td>
<td>da må gjøre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 14 Negations

### Finite verb + negation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(Age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 1</td>
<td>(2;03.10)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:19:13.889</td>
<td>vil ikke mer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:11:44.979</td>
<td>§n (investigator) må ikke ødelagte bilen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:09:50.416</td>
<td>+ṣ §u §n (Child) var kke langt oppi himmelen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:12:15.674</td>
<td>jeg tror ikke §n (name) sin bil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:22:01.100</td>
<td>det +x øke [er ikke] tog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:33.417</td>
<td>+r (jeg ha ikke) jeg har ikke å finne noen leke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:11:39.913</td>
<td>og da kan ikke James være med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:12:18.592</td>
<td>det er ikke +t det er ikke §u +t +r han kan ikke være med han heller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:14:15.257</td>
<td>det der er ikke en ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:16:34.221</td>
<td>han kan ikke sove ute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:17:32.783</td>
<td>også regner det ikke noe på han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:18:37.231</td>
<td>så vil han ikke opp der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:32:39.073</td>
<td>å nei §§r den +r den den vil ikke opp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnus 2</td>
<td>(2;09.22)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:37:27.736</td>
<td>nei det går ikke an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:16:08.319</td>
<td>ja jeg vet ikke helt hva jeg gjorde mere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:17:00.888</td>
<td>+r det det gikk ikke an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:06:08.857</td>
<td>ee jeg vet ikke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie</td>
<td>(2;09.28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:08:00.913</td>
<td>jeg vet ikke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2;10.02)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:14:53.975</td>
<td>nei han kan ikke stå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2;10.02)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:15:09.440</td>
<td>men jeg klarer ikke det.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2;10.02)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:15:46.190</td>
<td>+u men jeg klarer ikke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil 2</td>
<td>(2;10.02)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:04:07.400</td>
<td>da ble bukkene bruse også litt sint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:04:17.715 de er kke venner
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:05:48.204 +v (jeg veit ikke)
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:06:26.456 nei jeg +r veit veit ikke
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:06:49.151 jeg vet ikke
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:12:21.843 nei han må ikke det
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:15:31.709 nei han virker ikke
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:15:59.313 nei ++ virker ikke
Emil 2 (2;10:02) IV 00:16:23.756 vi kan ikke bruke den da

Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:05:23.347 dette er kke traktor
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:10:52.627 du har kke bjørn ?
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:11:24.338 her er pusekatten er kke skummel
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:11:36.696 +r (den er) den er ikke glad
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:17:46.729 du må ikke kjøre på han
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:18:39.755 +u vi må ikke kjøre på han
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:23:27.895 vi trenger ikke gaffel
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:23:30.463 nei +z vi du trenger ikke gaffel
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:24:22.881 +r den den det er kke +u (drikken)
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:23:57.735 nei +r (det er ikke) det er ikke din
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:25:01.005 det er kke flere
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:29:27.039 må ikke ta av
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:29:55.647 nå har kke du mere bleier
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:30:11.207 det er kke mere
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:04:13.593 +z (jeg må ikke) +z (jeg må lære) jeg må si og lære mere
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:04:20.140 må ikke sprute mer
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:05:30.596 +z (hvis han §u så ikk-) hun fikk ikke mona
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:05:35.765 det satt ikke en sann der så +z ha- +z hu- +u (kan der sann) ikke der
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:05:56.167 du må ikke røre
Ingrid 2 (2;10:28) IV 00:10:51.298 +z (du må ikke julenissen ta) +u og du må ikke julenissen ikke ta den av

Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:12:45.827 nei du kan ikke ødelegge den
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:24:43.433 nei det var ikke
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:28:35.902 jeg vil ikke sitte her
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:29:06.131 kan ikke du et også ?
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:40:39.866 nei du kan ikke blande
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:44:09.678 men jeg så ikke det
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:44:13.803 jeg så ikke +r ikke det
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:44:51.660 men den er jo ikke rar
Anne 2 (2;11:17) IV 00:44:57.287 nei du er ikke rar

Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:01:56.031 jeg veit ikke
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:02:07.534 nei den kan ikke kjøre
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:05:27.291 jeg veit ikke
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:06:25.160 +z (jeg fikkk) nei jeg fikkk ikke lov til jeg
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:06:41.222 veit ikke
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:07:08.487 jeg ville ikke det # hoppe høyet
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:07:17.865 da ville ikke det hoppe høyet
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:10:57.041 jeg vet ikke
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:11:34.901 jeg veit ikke elgen sier
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:12:17.590 jeg veit ikke han sier
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:13:00.526 han ... vet ikke han sier # jeg
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:13:27.531 jeg vet ikke han sier noen lyd
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:18:48.880 den ... jeg veit ikke panseren er der
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:19:43.267 det er ... veit ikke hva heter
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:20:07.577 nei det er ikke flere hunder der
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:01:48.437 jeg veit ikke
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:08:09.258 jeg veit ikke
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:11:45.138 jeg kan ikke syngje jeg
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:16:04.883 jeg kan ikke ta med sykkelen ned
Emil 1 (2;03:29) III 00:17:36.721 jeg finner ikke mann...
### Negation + finite verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(Age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Uttered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:47:06.270</td>
<td>ikke må vise §u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnea</td>
<td>(2;08.06)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:27:19.792</td>
<td>ikke den er ingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10;28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:05:47.812</td>
<td>nei # du ikke rører med den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10;28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:15:16.819</td>
<td>nei ikke hunde 1bise [spise] gress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Negation + non-finite verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(Age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Uttered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:08:24.914</td>
<td>ikke 2drikke vann bebien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:14:17.279</td>
<td>ikke 2spise meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:39.329</td>
<td>ikke 2sitte denne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:31:32.065</td>
<td>ikke 2spisa meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:31:34.758</td>
<td>+z ikke §n (cat) ikke 2spise meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 2</td>
<td>(2;10;28)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>00:21:14.113</td>
<td>jeg ikke 2finne pizzaen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 15  Negation and verb placement in stage III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite verb</th>
<th>Root Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V+neg</td>
<td>18 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg+V</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 16  Non-subject topicalizations in stage III

Emil 1 is excluded. Repetitions are included.

Finite non-subject topicalizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topicalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:29:45.468</td>
<td>så ## kasta §n (cat) å halen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:35:31.121</td>
<td>her ## gjemmer seg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:41:09.873</td>
<td>her er pusekatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedikte</td>
<td>(2;01.06)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:46:19.355</td>
<td>der 2spiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:10:30.433</td>
<td>da er blå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:23:52.876</td>
<td>kanskje må §n (child) lese +u for §n (investigator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:04:07.091</td>
<td>her er aent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:04:49.077</td>
<td>det 1grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:22:53.235</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:23:21.885</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:07.362</td>
<td>der 0brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:07.362</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:14.962</td>
<td>§l uæ der det 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:23.590</td>
<td>oi der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:52.508</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:25:27.819</td>
<td>+z +u (nei det ring-) der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:25:52.873</td>
<td>der er brenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:16.454</td>
<td>kanskje vikkej [virker]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:26:23.601</td>
<td>+u der vikkej [virker]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:33.856</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:48.938</td>
<td>hallo der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:25:25.733</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:25:56.079</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:27:02.480</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:27:28.044</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:28:14.427</td>
<td>der 1brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2;04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:13:49.907</td>
<td>der datt katten ned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid 1</td>
<td>(2;04.28)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:20:00.079</td>
<td>der er grønn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:48.307</td>
<td>nei katten er det</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:06:43.269</td>
<td>her er rumpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:10:05.072</td>
<td>+u nå må kjøre mannen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:11:10.259</td>
<td>der er trapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:11:12.063</td>
<td>der er trapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:13:33.002</td>
<td>nå skal kjøre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:15:39.315</td>
<td>der er katten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:15:40.975</td>
<td>der er katten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:35:33.133</td>
<td>der er gravemaskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:40:02.616</td>
<td>der klarte det</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-finite topicalizations

| Magnus 1  | (2;03.10) | III   | 00:00:56.390 | denne 2lese                                                                    |
| Lucas     | (2;04.02) | III   | 00:06:02.882 | det jeg gjøre                                                                  |
Appendix 17  *wh*-questions in stage III

Emil is excluded. Repetitions are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>(age)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>(2;05.22)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:48.268</td>
<td>hvor er mere ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:01:38.418</td>
<td>hvor er # her ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:00:32.618</td>
<td>§n (Child) kan gjøre nå ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:05:07.476</td>
<td>§n (Child) kan gjøre nå ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:06:33.262</td>
<td>§n (Child) kan gjøre nå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:08:25.027</td>
<td>hvor er §u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:22:14.037</td>
<td>hva sier toget ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:22:54.551</td>
<td>hva sier §n (investigator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne 1</td>
<td>(2;04.02)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>00:24:54.350</td>
<td>se # hva er §u ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>