PART III

DOUBLING IN OTHER DOMAINS
This chapter discusses various phenomena from Bodensee–Alemannic which can be subsumed under the term ‘doubling’ in the sense that one (or even more) items seems to bear superfluous or redundant information — at least if compared to the standardized languages. Classical examples are Doubly filled Comp or no-insertion. The overall question that has to be answered in light of such constructions is whether the concept of economy (of derivation) is contradicted by them or not. This is dependent on whether analyses can be provided that give on the one hand plausible scenarios how the doubling resp. violations of economy came into existence, e.g., via interference — or on the other hand show that there is no economy violation under closer scrutiny. The latter (seemingly) doubling phenomena give us interesting clues about the fine-grained structure of certain constructions. I will discuss examples which illustrate both cases.
1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will report about various doubling phenomena that are attested in the Alemannic dialect. I will adhere here to a rather broad conception of doubling, concentrating on constructions where seemingly semantically ‘superfluous’ or ‘redundant’ elements occur — in contrast to the standard(ized) languages. Typical examples for this kind of doubling are negative concord or the Doubly filled Comp. By means of illustrating and discussing some of these phenomena in more detail, I will also address the theoretical question whether these doubling phenomena violate the principle of economy.

Economy of derivation, in the sense that the grammar does not tolerate superfluous elements or steps in a derivation, is a central concept in modern generative grammar. Doubling phenomena as they occur in the dialects therefore are a challenge to this general design. The question is whether these phenomena indeed force us to deviate from this concept or whether analyses can be provided such that these constructions — despite the fact that they contain superficially unnecessary elements — nevertheless are compatible with an economical approach to the computational system of the language faculty. In recent developments of Minimalism, Chomsky (2005), there is no a priori preference for external Merge over internal Merge. That means that the insertion of an additional element is economically equivalent to movement of an element that would target the same position. This opens the way to true ‘optionality’ and we will see instances of this. One obvious case of this kind of optionality is the scope-marking construction, where either the neutral element what or a copy of it appears in the scope position and the ‘original’ element in Spec-CP of the lower clause. These constructions are equivalent with a ‘classical’ extraction structure as (1b’). This is exemplified for Alemannic in (1):

(1) a. Wa hesch (du) gseet wo-n-er ani isch?
   what have you said where-N-he towards is
   b. Wo hesch (du) gseet wo-n-er ani isch?
   where have you said where-he towards is
   b’. Wo hesch (du) gseet t dass er ani isch?
   where have you said that he towards is
   Where did you say that he has gone to?

Scope marking is found in many West-Germanic dialects, including Standard German (SG), see McDaniel (1989), Dayal (1994) for Hindi, Brandner

1The variant of Alemannic that will be described in this chapter is ‘Bodensee–Alemannic’ which is spoken around the Lake of Constance. In some cases I will also cite reference grammars which treat other variants of Alemannic. This is indicated in the text.

2Note that under Dayal’s account, where scope marking what is analyzed as a correlate, generated in the higher clause, scope marking would not be an instance of doubling at all. However, the copy variant (1b) shows that at least for German, an analysis in terms of doubling is called for.

On the other hand, it is often the case that — what seems to be doubling — is rather the filling of a syntactic slot that is present in the structure because of the structure building process. What comes immediately to mind is the doubly filled Comp Filter (of the type *I don't know [[which book that you read]] in the dialects of German(ic).

The chapter is organized as follows: In Section 2, I will present two instances of ‘morphological doubling’. These will be shown to be instances of doubling (of identical morphological material) in order to compensate a lack in the inflectional paradigm.”, i.e., where two identical inflectional elements occur twice within one (extended) projection. This is different from familiar subject–verb agreement and — in at least one case — the pattern runs counter the usual inflectional pattern. I will show that the identity of the inflectional morpheme is the result of a repair strategy. Section 3 treats *tun-*insertion, preposition doubling, and doubly filled Comp in some detail. Here we will see that *tun*-insertion is in some cases equivalent with verb-movement under an economy perspective and therefore we find again a case of true optionality. Doubly filled Comp phenomena and preposition doubling (or rather the addition of prepositional adverbs) will be shown to not contain superfluous elements; instead these elements overtly indicate positions which are necessary in the clausal architecture and which can be justified independently.

Section 4 finally will give two examples which I think are true cases of doubling violating economy. This is the insertion of relative pronouns in addition to the relative particle *wo* in certain variants of Bavarian and Alemannic. The other case is the doubling of the infinitival marker in some types of infinitival complements. In both cases, it can be shown that doubling results from the intermingling of two grammars/constructions. So we can distinguish several types or patterns of doubling with their own characteristics. The overall conclusion is that the doubling phenomena under consideration do not violate economy beside those cases which evolved from interference effects.

There are some further doubling phenomena which will not be discussed in this chapter, but which are listed here in order to illustrate the range of doubling phenomena in Alemannic.

The first one is determiner doubling as exemplified in (2):

(2) a. *en* so *en* guete Wii.
   a such a good wine

b. *er* isch wieder *de* ganz *de* Alt.
   *he* is again the completely the old (one)
   He is again (the way), he used to be.

There is no doubling of the definite determiner, (2b), as it is found in some varieties of Swiss German.
Another topic that will not be discussed here is negative concord. There are instances of it found in Alemannic, however usually only with negative quantifiers and not with the negative particle itself — as opposed to Bavarian, see Weiss (1998) for a detailed analysis:

(3) a. Es het nene nünt gea.
   it has nowhere nothing given

   b.* Es het nene nünt it gea
   it has nowhere nothing not given

Since negative concord has been treated extensively in the literature, I will add nothing further to this observation, see for a recent detailed discussion in Zeijlstra (2004). Finally, it may also be worth to note that there is no doubling of subject pronouns of the kind reported from many Dutch dialects.

2. DOUBLING OF INFLECTIONAL MORPHEMES

2.1. S-Doubling

The first case to be discussed in more detail is what I will call ‘S-doubling’. At first sight, this is a ‘normal’ plural construction with –s-inflection on the noun:

(4) a. Bi’s Nochbars goht’s zue!
   at-s neighbour-s goes it to
   There is a mess at neighbors!

b. Uff’s Müllers warte mer nümme.
   on-s Müller-s wait we no-longer
   We won’t wait for the Müller family any longer.

c. ’s Nochbars kumm-et/ *kumm-t ooh
   -s neighbour-s come-pl come-sg also
   The neighbors will come too.

However, even if it were a regular –s plural, but see later, the shape of the determiner in (a) and (b) is somehow mysterious: according to the regular inflectional patterns it should come out as –n, because the prepositions govern the dative. In (4c), it should be d’Nochbars if the construction would follow the regular declension rules. But this is not what we find. So the question is: where does this doubling of the inflectional element come from and is there a plausible scenario how it could have emerged?

The first thing to note is that s-doubling occurs only with family names and certain unique expressions like ‘the mayor’ etc., referring also to families.
Despite its restricted distribution, the construction is vital and native speakers have clear intuitions about it.

From a diachronic point of view (4) are not plural constructions at all, according to Schirmunski (1962, p. 436). Instead they are ‘frozen’ genitives with the following underlying construction:

(5) des Nachbars [PLACE, HOUSEHOLD, FAMILY]

There is an elliptical noun referring to the place or the household (including automatically several persons, cf. the plural interpretation) of the genitive marked noun. Under this perspective, –s is genitive and occurs therefore also (in a regular way) at the determiner.

However, as noted earlier, native speakers interpret the construction clearly also as a grammatical plural, as can be witnessed from the example in (4c) where singular agreement is ruled out. But singular agreement would be expected if the head of the construction were a noun like ‘family’.

The even more remarkable thing is that a noun like ‘neighbor’ does not belong to the class of nouns that has –s in its plural forms, neither in SG (cf. Nachbar-n) nor in Alemannic. As for Alemannic, this dialect does not use –s for plural formation at all, just like many other Southern German and Swiss German dialects, see Shirmunski (pp. 422ff.). This is briefly illustrated in (6):

(6) Alemannic:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a Car} & \quad \text{drei Car} \quad \text{drei Car} - \text{Ø} \\
\text{a Firm} & \quad \text{die Firma} \\
\text{b. Car} & \quad \text{drei Car-s} \\
\text{a firm} & \quad \text{die Firma-s} \\
\end{align*}
\]

These are all candidates for s-plural in SG, but as can be seen, Alemannic uses a different strategy: either no marking at all or a –ne morpheme.

Under this perspective the double occurrence of –s is even more striking, especially if we finally consider the fact that the form in (7a) — with a possibly borrowed –s plural from other cases in SG — is completely rejected. Instead, zero-marking is chosen, according to the pattern in (6).

(7) a. mit de Nochbors
     with the-dat.pl neighbour-s

b. mit de Nochbor

There is of course also the possibility that the elided noun is plural, e.g., the neighbor’s relatives or members of the family. However, this seems rather implausible, given that native speakers are not aware of the origin of the construction.
The situation is thus as follows: The original genitive has been reanalyzed as a plural but the exponent does not belong to the grammar of the language. Therefore, there is also no appropriate form of the determiner. But the D-position — as part of the extended projection of N — must be filled with overt material, nevertheless. The most plausible thing then is to 'copy' the inflectional element on the noun — which is interpreted as the element bearing the relevant grammatical information, i.e., plural — to the determiner position. And since -s is surface-identical with the diachronically 'correct' form, i.e., singular genitive, a reinterpretation of the forms in this way seems plausible. So the doubling of the inflectional morpheme is a kind of repair strategy such that the requirement of a filled D-position can be satisfied — although there is a gap in the paradigm.

The resulting pattern is somehow reminiscent of complementizer agreement in Bavarian, West Flemish, also Frisian, see Bayer (1984) for Bavarian, more recently Weiss (2005), and Haegeman (1990, 1992) for West Flemish:

(8) wenn-st moan-st …
    if-2SG think-2SG

(9) dat-st do soks net leauwe moa-st.
    that-2SG you such not believe must-2SG
...that you shouldn't believe such (a thing). (cited after Zwart 2006, p. 67)

The parallelism lies in the fact that an inflectional element is copied to another position within the same (fully extended) functional projection. Of course the difference is that the doubled -s in the constructions above fills a position which hosts inflectional material per se, i.e., the D-position, whereas the C-position in embedded clauses does not. What I am interested in is the surface identity of the inflectional morphemes that can be observed in both cases.

In a recent paper, Zwart (2006) suggests to abandon the analysis of complementizer agreement in terms of feature checking of a special C-agreement node. Instead complementizer agreement is analyzed as a purely morphological issue that came into existence via an analogical process. Referring to work by Kathol (2001) and Goeman (2000), he suggests that the agreement morpheme that occurs on the complementizer simply copies the inflection that shows up on the finite verb. Some dialects copy the forms completely from the verbal paradigm (West Flemish), whereas others rely on those forms of the

---

*I will leave out Bavarian in the following. The reason is that it has complementizer agreement in the strict sense only in second person singular. Other cases where inflection-like material is attached to the complementizer is probably more adequately analyzed as subject pronoun doubling. So I will rely on Frisian where it is clear that it is the verbal person/number inflection which occurs on the complementizer. Bavarian behaves also differently with respect to the adjacency effect to be discussed below, as an anonymous reviewer points out. It is not at all clear to me whether the complementizer agreement system in Bavarian is of the same type as the one found in Frisian, as described in Zwart (2006).*
finite verb that occurs if the verb is in inverted position (followed by a subject clitic, see later) as it is the case, e.g., in Hellendoorn Dutch. The process for the latter dialects can thus be described as an analogical extension of the following kind:

(10) kunt :: dat
     kunne :: datte

*Kunt* is the inflection type in the base position of the verb and *kunne* the one in the derived (i.e., inverted) position. Since the complementizer occurs exactly in this position, the variation in the form of the verb is mimicked by the complementizer and thus we get the four-part analogy pattern shown in (10). And this kind of mechanism I would like to suggest is at work in s-doubling too.

There is another parallel between complementizer agreement and s-doubling in that there is an adjacency effect in both cases: complementizer agreement is only possible if the (clitic) subject pronoun follows the complementizer immediately.\(^5\) This is observed by Ackema and Neeleman (2004) for Hellendoorn Dutch, as discussed in Zwart (2006, p. 67).

(11) a. Volgens miej lop-\(\varepsilon\) wiej noar ‘t park.
    according-to me walk.PL.INV we to the park
   
    b. ar-re weij noar ‘t park loop-t.
    that-PL.INV we to the park walk

   According to me, we should walk to the park.

(12) a. Volgens miej lop-\(\xi\) op den wärmsten dag
    according-to me walk-PL on the hottest day
   
    van ‘t joar ook wiej noar ‘t park.
    of the year also we to the park

\(^5\)Concerning the so-called inverted agreement pattern, this is also true at least in the Southern German dialects, as discussed in Brandner (1995). The ‘normal’ form of all plurals is –et:

(i) dass mer/ihr/die it kumm-et
    that we/you-pl/they not come-PL.

If the verb has moved to C\(^0\) and the (clitic) pronoun is following it, we get a reduced version:

(ii) denn kumm-(c)- mer
    then come we ...

However, if they are not adjacent, e.g. the pronoun is preceded by a focussing particle, then only the full version is possible:

(iii) denn kumm-et/#e nuu mir.
    then come-PL red. only us

So the different versions of the agreement morpheme cannot be attributed to the different positions, but is reducible to a phonological reduction process which is dependent on the adjacency of the pronoun — exactly as it is the case with complementizer agreement — at least in Frisian.
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Whether the effect is best described in purely syntactic terms or whether the ultimate reason has to be sought in the fact that the subject does not belong anymore to the prosodic domain of the complementizer has to remain open. What is important for the discussion here is that adjacency with the agreement triggering element is also required in –s-doubling construction, i.e., s-doubling is not possible if there is an adjective preceding the noun:

(13) a. *Bi’s neue Nochbars het’s brennt.
at new neighbours has-it burnt
b. Bi de neue Nochbar(e) het’s brennt.
at the new neighbours-(dat) has-it burnt

In this case, the ‘normal’ plural has to show up, as in (13b). In sum, we can see that –s-doubling shares some characteristics that we can find in complementizer agreement constructions. If Zwart (2006) is on the right track, we have another instance of doubling of an inflectional morpheme via analogical extension within one functional domain.

Whatever the reason maybe for the dialects in question to insist on agreement surfacing on the complementizer (or other material in C⁰, e.g., wh-phrases), the mechanism how this slot is filled seems to be regulated by ‘surface identity’ and this is a typical property of an analogical process.

2.2. Doubled Past Participle

Another type of morphological doubling is the doubling of the past participle as exemplified in (14):

(14) Er isch grad kumme gsi, no hond se ‘n
he is just come-PART be-PART then have they him
scho grfoget…
already asked-PART…
He had just arrived and he was already asked…

Which is basically never used if the –s doubling construction is possible, i.e., if only a simple noun occurs. So it seems as if the Elsewhere Principle applied. That could be taken as further indication that the process is morphological in nature.

Such an approach to morphological doubling probably presupposes a Distributed Morphology type of the architecture of the grammar. I will not take a stand here whether this is a welcome result; however it seems as if data of this kind could provide an interesting testing ground for the various theories about lexical insertion.
This is obviously an effect of the loss of the synthetic preterit in Upper German. There is no other way to express pre-preterit than to build a periphrastic preterit form of the auxiliary which therefore occurs as a participle together with the participle of the main verb. The difference to the cases discussed earlier (s-doubling and complementizer agreement) is that here, both participles build their own interpretational domain (which yields in combination a pre-preterit) and thus, there is no real doubling in the sense that one element would be superfluous. Under this view, doubling of the participle is just a consequence of the drift to analytic forms — a phenomenon that is well attested in the history of Germanic dialects. Since there is clearly no violation of economy, I will add nothing further to this.

3. SYNTACTIC DOUBLING

3.1. Tun-Insertion

3.1.1. ‘Optional’ Tun-Insertion

One of the most prominent doubling constructions in the German(ic) varieties is do-insertion (tun-insertion). Although it is often considered to be a dialectal phenomenon, it seems to be more adequate in this case to divide between spoken and written language. As is shown in Langer (2000), the ban on tun-insertion is due to stylistic, prescriptive rules rather than to differences in the grammar. For a recent overview of the occurrences of do-insertion in a South Alemannic dialect, see Schwarz (2004), on more general and historical aspects, see Langer (2000), Erb (2001) for a detailed discussion of German tun-insertion and Schütze (2004) for English.

I will confine myself to those aspects which seem relevant for the general question concerning economy, as discussed in the introduction earlier. In addition, I will illustrate some usages of tun-insertion where it obviously contributes to the (aspectual) interpretation and is thus obviously not a candidate for violating economy.

In (15), we see a typical example of tun-insertion in the Alemannic dialect.

(15) a. Die tond etz no SCHAFFE!
   they do now still work-inf
   They are still at work!

b. Die SCHAFFET etz no!
   they work now still
   They are still at work!

As indicated, it has the effect that the main verb in its base position is focussed.8 The focus position in German is a rather low position, i.e., as far to the right as

8It should be noted that tun-insertion does not necessarily have this effect.
possible. So one possible effect of *tun*-insertion is that it enables the verb to stay in its base position — a focus position per se. However, another — equally accepted — possibility is to move the lexical verb to $C^0$ and endow it with a contrastive accent, as indicated in (15b). So it seems that this is an instance of true optionality.

If we consider the (generally accepted) derivation of a V2 clause in German, it becomes obvious that optionality is even expected in this case: if there is indeed no preference for move over merge, cf. the introduction, then moving the verb from its base position to $C^0$ (internal merge) or inserting a dummy (external merge) is in fact equally costly.

The case is different, for embedded clauses. If we have a focus construction, *tun*-insertion is indeed superfluous since the verb is already in the natural focus position. This explains why *tun* basically never occurs in embedded clauses, see Schwarz (2004) and the references cited therein. The analysis of the neutral construction is directly relevant for the question whether there is V-I movement in the Germanic OV-languages — a question that is still open as an empirical issue. The fact that *tun*-insertion basically never occurs in embedded clauses would favor the view that there is no movement, cf. Haider (1993). If the verb does not move from its base position in embedded clauses (i.e., no internal merge) then the external merge of *tun* would indeed violate economy because it would comprise an extra step in the derivation. However, be it sufficient here to merely state that a closer examination of *tun*-insertion might eventually give some new arguments to settle this issue.

3.1.2. HABITUAL/PROGRESSIVE ASPECT MARKING

As has been noted in the literature, see e.g., Abraham and Fischer (1998), there are cases of *tun*-insertion in the dialects where the construction leads to a specific aspectual interpretation:

(16) dass sie etz nümme radfahre tuet.
that she now not-anymore cycling does
...that she doesn’t cycle anymore (because she is too old now).

(17) Well er it gern lese tuet.
because he not PRT read does
He doesn’t like to read.

(18) Die tond grad esse.
they do just eat-INF
They are eating (at the moment).

(16) and (17) have a habitual reading, (18) a progressive one. Because semantic content is added due to the insertion of *tun*, it is expected that *tun* can occur in embedded clauses without violating economy. And this is indeed the case, as is shown in the examples earlier. However, there is a small difference between the two cases. Whereas the constructions with the habitual reading can occur in embedded
patterns of doubling in alemannic clauses, this seems to be at least very marked in the case of the progressive one:

(19) dass se grad esse tond.
that they just eat do

The degradedness (19) can be explained rather easily since there is another possibility to express the progressive, namely with a verbal noun introduced by a preposition:

(20) Die sind grad am/ bim Esse.
they are just at-the.DAT by-the.DAT eating

This construction is only possible with pure verbs. If there are (referring) arguments within the VP,9 tun-insertion is chosen:

(21) a. * Sie sind grad am/ bim die gross Weis maie.
they are just at-the.DAT by-the.DAT the great meadow mow

b. Sie tond grad die gross Wies maie.
they do just the great meadow mow

They are mowing the great meadow.

And in this case, the embedded version with tun is fine:

(22) Ich ha gsehne dass se grad die gross Wies maie tond.
I have seen that they just the great meadow mow do

I have seen that they are mowing the great meadow.

So it seems as if the nominalized version is preferred — if it is possible — but there is no general problem with embedded progressives. We can thus conclude that the markedness of (19) is obviously not due to an inherent syntactic property but rather to the existence of a concurring construction in case of a simple verb.10

9 Alemannic does not productively make use of the so-called extended ‘rheinische Verlaufsform’ where the object of the verb can appear even as a strongly referring element, see for a recent overview van Pottelberge (2004, pp. 219ff.):

(i) er ist das Fahrad am reparieren.
he is the bicycle at-the.DAT fix(ing)

He is fixing the bicycle.

For that reason, tun-insertion is the only possibility to express progressive aspect in such cases.

10 A reviewer informs me that (19) is fine in Swiss German, provided that verb inversion has taken place:

(i) dass se grad tond esse.
that they just do eat

I did not test this variant with my informants so I cannot say whether the same effect holds.
3.1.3. **Tun As An Auxiliary**

The last occurrence of *tun*-insertion that I want to discuss here is where *tun* acts as an auxiliary in subjunctive clauses. It has been claimed in the literature, see the overview given by Schwarz (2004), that *tun* is inserted in order to avoid subjunctive inflection, be it because the forms are unfamiliar (low frequency) or because — especially with Konjunktiv I, see later — they coincide in some cases with the present indicative. First it has to be noted that subjunctive forms are used more frequently in Alemannic than in SG. Especially Konjunktiv I is very common. It is used mainly in indirect speech. In this case we see that the version where the lexical verb is inflected is even preferred over the version with *tun*:

(23) Sie hond gseet …
   a. ?? [dass se oh no kumme teiet].
   that they also PRT come do-subj
   b. [dass se oh no kämptet].
   that they also PRT come-subj

(23) would be an instance of superfluous *tun*-insertion in an embedded clause. Consider furthermore that the version in (24) is equally accepted.

(24) Sie hond gseet sie teiet oh no kumme.
    they have said they do-SUBJ also PRT come

In Alemannic, embedded V2 clauses are much more frequent than in SG, as seems to be generally the case in spoken language, see Auer (1998), especially in the context of propositional verbs. In this case then, we can attribute the insertion of the subjunctive marked *tun* to the information structural reasons discussed above and not to subjunctive marking itself. Thus, the pattern shown in (23) and (24) is conform with the earlier discussion of optional *tun*-insertion.

The case is different with Konjunktiv II which is used in irrealis contexts:

(25) Mir tätet der Kueche scho esse [wenn mir in
    we do-IRR the cake PRT eat if we him
    möge tätet].
    like do-IRR
    We would eat the cake if we would like it.

The periphrastic form is also preferred in SG — with the sole difference that the auxiliary there is the subjunctive form of *werden*, i.e., *würde*. So *tun*-insertion in this case reduces to a different choice of the auxiliary and we have a garden variety of the well-known process in the history of German that analytic forms tend to replace synthetic ones.
3.2. Doubling in Prepositional Phrases

In this section, I will discuss two instances of doubling phenomena in PPs. These will include so-called R-pronouns and preposition doubling in the context of (mainly) directional PPs.

3.2.1. R-Pronoun Doubling

(26) shows how an R-pronoun is realized in Alemannic in its most typical way:

Do ha-n-i it dra denkt.
there have-N- I not there-upon thought
I didn’t think about that.

This variant of R-pronouns is called ‘split doubling’ by Fleischer (2002), which seems to be typical for Upper German dialects. As shown in (27), the form where both pronouns are adjacent is ruled out; instead a simple form has to be used:

a.?* Mir hond etz it dodemit g’rechnet
we have now not there-there-with reckoned
[dass du kunnsch].
that you come

b.? Mir hond it demit g’rechnet [dass du kunnsch]
we have not there-with reckoned that you come
We didn’t reckon upon that that you will come.

However, the form that was judged by our informants as the most natural one in their dialect and that was given regularly as an alternative in translation tasks is shown in (28). Here the R-pronoun is replaced by a simple [P NP] construction:

[Mit dem] hommer etz it g’rechnet.
with that have-we now not reckoned
We didn’t reckon upon that.

This fits very well with the observation that in Alemannic, and for that matter also in Bavarian, see Bayer (1996), the wh-counterpart of an R-pronoun is always much less preferred. Instead again, the simple PP form is used:

(29) SG ALM (BAV)
   a. womit mit wa (with what)
   b. worauf uff wa (upon what)
   c. woran a wa (at what)

So it seems as if the syntax of R-pronouns is quite different in Alemannic than in SG. Further evidence for this comes from the following data. Consider first (30).
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(30a) illustrates again that the non-split version is basically not available, irrespective of the position. What is interesting is (30b). Here we can see that the simple form cannot occur in Spec-CP:

(30) a. ?? Dodemit ho-mer it g’rechnet.
    there-there-with have-we not reckoned

     b. * Demit ho-mer it g’rechnet
        there-with have-we not reckoned

     c. ? Do ho-mer it demit g’rechnet.
        there have-we not there-with reckoned
        We didn’t reckon upon that.

Some further instances of this are given below:

    there-on have-we not thought
    We did not think about that.

        there-of have-we nothing known
        We didn’t know anything about that.

These data suggest that the ‘inner’ d(r)- is added to the lexical core in the morphology and is thus not analyzed as a separate word. The structure of demit is [p, de-mit], i.e., an X0-category, see Oppenrieder (1991), Bayer (1996), also Brandner (1995). If this is true then the ungrammaticality of these examples finds a natural explanation: Spec-CP is not occupied by a maximal phrase and thus structure preservation is violated.11

This implies that do as in (30c) is base-generated in Spec-CP and thus acts like an expletive rather than a genuine part of an R-pronoun on the syntactic

11 The question then arises why the short form is licit in the ‘middle field’, cf. (27b). I would tentatively suggest that it is analyzed as a particle in this case. Some plausibility is given to this by the following data:

(i) Demit g’rechnet ho-mer it.
    there-with reckoned have-we not
    We didn’t reckon upon that.

    If the particle is accompanied by the non-finite verb, it can occur in Spec-CP. This is parallel to other separable particles:

(ii) a. *Vor schlug er es ihm. cf. er schlug es ihm vor
    PRT hit he it him

     b. Vorgeschlagen hat er es ihm.
        PRT-hit-INF has he it him
        He suggested it to him.
level. Evidence for this view comes from the following example:

(32) #dass er do etz ooh nünt demit afange ka.
that he there now also nothing there-with begin can
He can't do anything with it.

The sentence is grammatical, but *do* has in this case a rather strong local reading, i.e., it is a locative/temporal adverb which occurs independently from the R-pronoun. This reading is not present if *do* is in SpecCP. Instead it can refer to an abstract entity (i.e., the content of the embedded clause) — just like SG ‘simple’ R-pronouns. So it seems as if the combination of base-generated expletive *do* and particle like *d(r)+P* comes closest to the SG R-pronoun construction in syntactic terms. Recall that the genuine corresponding construction is the one with a simple PP, cf. (28).

The unavailability of the wh-forms and the reluctance in using R-pronouns together with the restrictions under which they can occur at all, suggests that R-pronoun formation is not really part of the grammar of these varieties. Instead, it seems as if forms like *damit* are imported from SG. But — for whatever reason — *d(r)* cannot ‘replace’ the argument of the preposition, as it is the case in SG. Instead *d(r)* is analyzed as belonging to the preposition at the word level. The argument itself is represented by *do* which is base-generated in Spec-CP. However, as described earlier, the preferred version is the simple one without any R-pronoun formation.

‘Doubling’ in this case then should again be considered as a kind of ‘repair strategy’, solving a problem that has its origin in the import of a construction that has phrasal status in the original language but word status in the importing language. If such an analysis can be upheld, then this is again a case where apparent doubling can be explained in different terms.

### 3.2.2. PREPOSITION DOUBLING

In this section, I will discuss a doubling construction which is also found in SG (and of course in many other dialects). These are the complex (or circum-) positions of the type seen in (33) for SG:

(33) Auf den Berg hinauf.
on the mountain dir-on

Preposition doubling of this kind seems to be much more widespread in Alemannic than in SG and — as native speakers inform us — nearly obligatory. Similar statements can be found in traditional descriptions of various dialects, e.g., the ‘Westallgäuer Mundart’ by Gruber (1989, p. 148),\(^{12}\) who writes that

\(^{12}\)This dialect belongs also to the Alemannic group.
‘the pleonastic doubling of local adverb and verb respectively preposition with local adverb are very popular, in order to make the description clearer.’ This gives us already a hint that doubling in these cases should fall rather under the heading ‘explicitness’. Some examples are given below:

Directional:

(34) Ich fahr **uff** Koostanz **uffi**.13
I drive **on** K. **on-dir**
I’ll drive to Konstanz.

(35) Stell’s **a** d’Wand **ani**.
put it **at** the wall **at-dir**
Put it against the wall.

(36) Er isch **vu** de Loater **abi** kait.
he is **from** the ladder **off** fallen
He’s fallen down from the ladder.

Locational:

(37) Es hanget **a** de Wand **(d)anne**.14
it hangs **on** the wall **on**
It is attached to the wall.

(38) Es isch **uff** de Dilli **(d)obe**.
it is **on** the attic **above** (upstairs)
It is on the attic.

(39) Es isch **im** Kelle **(d)unne**.
it is **in-the** cellar **down** (downstairs)

The important thing to note is that the directional ‘doubled’ Ps end with –i-, originating from the post-positioned deictic particle hin (i.e., **uff-hin** > **uffi**), cf. Hinderling (1980). In the locational versions, (37–39), the –e-ending is obviously only a formative.

The construction has received much attention beginning with the work by van Riemsdijk (1978), van Riemsdijk (1990, 1998), and van Riemsdijk and Huybregts

---

13According to Hinderling (1980), the –e/i-alternation can be traced back to a stage where the directional particles (hin-/her-) were attached as a suffix to the respective preposition. This yields forms like ab-hin or ab-her which surface in contemporary Alemannic (via regular phonological developments) as ab-i resp. ab-e.

14We got different judgements from our informants with respect to the form of the ‘second preposition’. Older informants insisted on the bare form, i.e., without d-, whereas for others the complex form was judged as the most natural form. At the moment, I cannot offer any explanation why there is this variation.
Subsequent work includes Koopman (2000), den Dikken (2003, 2006), see also Helmantel (2002) for an overview. Recently, Svenonius (to appear) has suggested a rather fine-grained structure for PPs that takes into account the semantic and conceptual aspects of LOCATION and DIRECTION in some detail. This is not the place to discuss these suggestions in any detail; however, as far as I can see, the constructions exemplified above cannot be integrated into these structures without problems. Turning first to the work by Koopman and den Dikken, the crucial point in their analyses is that the PP consists of several functional shells, encoding DIR, LOC, or DEIXIS. The problem is that there is only one position for the lexical preposition to be inserted and although it may move in order to get the different surface outcomes, e.g., in Dutch, I do not see how constructions like those in (37–38) could be derived in a straightforward way. Especially if we take into account that there is not real doubling of the preposition, rather that the corresponding adverb is used, see later.

Van Riemsdijk’s work of course explicitly tries to capture the doubling of the preposition. He suggests the following structure:

\[
\text{(40)}
\]

As can be seen, the complex forms \textit{hinauf} resp. \textit{uffi} are taken to be the functional close-up of the whole projection, whereas the simple preposition is analyzed as a semi-lexical head. It is this division which I would like to consider in some detail, especially the point whether the ‘post-position’ should indeed be taken as the ‘real’ functional head of the PP. In traditional grammars there is a division between simple prepositions and ‘prepositional adverbs’. An example would be German \textit{oben} which corresponds to the preposition \textit{auf}. Similarly, the prepositions combined with a directional particle (\textit{hin-auf}, resp. \textit{uff-i}) are traditionally categorized as adverbs. So the idea that we have real preposition doubling is obviously not correct. Rather, we have a preposition combined with the corresponding adverb. Already this fact casts doubt on the analysis given by van Riemsdijk. If it is an adverb, then we would expect its position to be an adjoined one, rather than the functional closing of the PP. To analyze the ‘post-position’ as an adverb, adjoined to the PP gains further plausibility by the fact that it is not always the same lexical base that we find, see example (39). Here, the locational relation is ‘in’, however the adverb specifies the location of the cellar and not the entity itself.
In order to decide whether this idea has some plausibility, it is useful to have a look at the diachronic development.

There is indeed some evidence that these adverbial elements were the predecessors of ‘real’ prepositions, cf. Baldi (1979). According to him, these adverbs (originally case endings, nouns, or particles) were attached originally to the verb. These complex verbs were able to enlarge the lexicon by using the same verbal base but lexicalizing various concepts of it (e.g., come: come around, come to, come through etc.). In a later stage, when the case endings themselves lost their range of meanings (including, for example, locative and instrumental), these elements were used to enforce the now weakened case meanings. This lead to a situation where they were also used in combination with nouns and this configuration was the basis for the development of prepositions — as they occur now in the modern languages. Baldi cites examples from Latin where we find basically the same situation as in Modern German, respectively in Alemannic:

\[(41)\] Caesar milites *trans* Rhenum *transduxit.* (Caes. BG. 1, 35)

\[C.\] soldiers across R. across-led

\[(42)\] legiones *ad* urbem *adducere* (Cic, Fam. 12,23,2)

legions to town to-lead

Baldi (1979, p. 58) claims that such a ‘over-specified, redundantly marked construction was doomed’; however, Alemannic seems to have preserved this ‘archaic’ state to a certain extent, especially if we consider the cases under (37) and (38) where no DIR is involved but rather only a locational (over-)specification. Admittedly, these cases are rare, and we do not find the near obligatoriness as with the DIR-PPs. But the important point is that under this analysis, these elements are of the category ‘adverb’ and then the ‘doubling’ is not a real doubling in the sense that there are two identical elements occurring within the same domain.

### 3.3. Doubly Filled Comp

One of the most discussed doubling phenomena occurring in South German dialects is the general violation of the Doubly filled Comp Filter. This means that wh-words in embedded interrogatives can co-occur with a complementizer, contrary to SG. This holds for Bavarian, Swiss German, Alemannic, and surely for many other dialects. It is widely believed and also sometimes explicitly stated, (e.g., Penner 1995, also Koopman 2000 for Dutch dialects) that the insertion of the complementizer is basically free and thus not subject to narrow syntax but rather to the PF component. This assumption was also the basis of the earliest treatments of this phenomenon, as its categorization as a ‘filter’ suggests.

In Bayer and Brandner (in press) we have shown that this view is not correct. The insertion of the complementizer in embedded interrogatives underlies severe restrictions.
The basic distinction should be made between word-size wh-elements (who, what, how etc.) and wh-phrases of the type which X, or internally complex wh expressions like how many etc. Whereas the former virtually never occur with a complementizer, the latter almost require it. This has been noted already in traditional grammars of various dialects. Our own investigation in Alemannic and Bavarian confirmed these observations.

Some examples are given below:

(43) I woass it wo (*dass) se sind.
   I know not where that they are
   I don’t know where they are.

(44) I woass it wa (*dass) se em gea hond.
   I know not what that they him given have
   I don’t know what they have given to him.

(45) Es tät mi interessiere mit wellere Gschicht *(dass)
   it would me interest with which story
   se etzt kummet.
   they now arrive (tell)
   I am interested in the story they will tell us.

(46) I woass it wieviel *(dass) se em gea hond.
   I know not how-much that they him given have
   I don’t know how much they have given him.

In order to account for this pattern, Bayer and Brandner suggest that word-size wh-words can have a ‘latent’ C-feature in their lexical entry which enables them to act as a wh-phrase (responsible for the typing of a clause) and as a complementizer simultaneously. They are directly merged in the C0 position and therefore doubly filled Comp is excluded.

The question then is why can SG and also e.g., Standard English do without overt complementizers in embedded questions? I cannot offer a completely satisfying answer to this question. However it seems indisputable that the DFCF is — under a diachronic perspective — a relatively late development, even in the standardized languages. So it may very well be the case that the non-insertion of a complementizer with complex wh-phrases is a kind of ‘overgeneralization’, i.e., the pattern found with simple wh-expressions is transferred to all cases. And since the specifier is always filled in these constructions (due to obligatory wh-movement) the syntactic environment gives enough information for the identification of the clausal head such that we may speak of ‘PF-dropping’

—Recall that DFCF violations occur also in dialects of English, see Henry (1995) as well as in many Romance non-standardized varieties.
in these varieties. This may also be the case with ‘preposition doubling’, as discussed in the previous section.

4. DOUBLING VIA INTERFACE

In this last section, I will discuss two cases of doubling in Alemannic which should I think in fact be analyzed as ‘redundant doubling’, i.e., one element is superfluous in the sense that it does not contribute to the syntactic well-formedness of the construction in question nor that it makes it less ambiguous, as it was the case for example with the doubled prepositions. The first case to be discussed are relative pronouns which occur in addition to the relative particle wo. The second case is the doubling of the infinitival marker.

4.1. Relative Pronouns

Alemannic – like many other dialects – uses an invariable particle to introduce relative clauses. The form of this particle is wo and it corresponds to the wh-counterpart of ‘there’, i.e., it has a locative/deictic meaning at its base. This is illustrated for accusative/nominative arguments in (47), for a dative argument in (49), and for a prepositional phrase, i.e., an oblique marking, in (50).

(47) Der Ma/ die Frau/ des Kind [wo kummen isch]/
the man the woman the child RP come is
[wo-n-I gsehne ha].
RP-N-I seen have
The man/the woman/the child who has come/who I have seen.

(48) Dem Ma [wo-n- Igholfe ha] kaasch ebbes gea.
the-DAT man RP I helped have can-you something give
You can give something to the man who I helped.

(49) Die Kind [wo se d’Schue von-ene gfunde hond]…
the children RP they the-shoes from-them found have
The children whose shoes they have found...

Note that the resumptive phrase (von-ene) in (50) is obligatory whereas in the other cases, a gap is licit, see Salzmann (2006) for a recent discussion of resumptive pronouns in Swiss German. Full Pronouns as relative pronouns are only used in so-called V2 relatives:

(50) I kenn ebber [der kunnt us Afrika] und...
I know somebody who comes from Africa and ...

Note that the two types of relative markers are in complementary distribution, i.e., a V2 relative can never be introduced by wo whereas in genuine relative clauses there is no pronoun in the ‘pure’ dialect, according to Noth (1983).
However, already Weise (1917) noted that relative pronouns can co-occur with the particle *wo* in the Southern German dialects:

(51) Der Ma [der wo ...............]
    the man Rel.-pronoun Rel.-particle

According to our informants, there is no difference in interpretation (especially concerning the restrictive/appositive interpretation — as one might expect). It is also not the case that the pronoun is used e.g., if there is a contrastive focus etc.; rather the two variants seem to be in free variation. If we consider the structure of a relative clause (where I stick here to a rather conservative analysis), it is easy to see how the additional pronoun can be integrated. Assuming that the relative particle is situated in $C^0$, the specifier is free to host an additional element. Since therefore the two elements introducing relative clause do not collide in terms of competition for a distinguished position, integrating this additional element into the clausal structure does not lead to a revision of the grammar. As such, it can be borrowed easily as it does not provoke the altering of the (sub-)system that derives relative clauses in Alemannic. If this is correct, then we have a case of doubling in the sense of redundancy.

4.2. Doubling of the Infinitival Marker

The second case I would like to discuss in the context of interference is a bit more complex. As has been noted by Müller (2000), in Swabian (which belongs to Alemannic), we encounter infinitivals of the following shape:

(52) Mir bruuchet der Bese zum d'Garage zum\textsuperscript{16}/z/Ø' fürbe].
    we need this broom for-to the garage  to wipe
    We need this broom to wipe the garage.

In this purpose clause, there can be two infinitival markers: *zum* (which is a contracted form, consisting of *zu* + *dem*) in clause initial position and a doubled form immediately preceding the infinitive. The lower marker can also occur in a reduced form (*z’*) or be zero. Since this is a purpose clause, one analysis that comes to mind is that this mimics the SG form of purpose infinitives where the infinitival marker consists of two parts (at least on a surface oriented analysis):

(53) Wir brauchen den Besen um die Garage zu kehren.
    we need this broom in order the garage to wipe

\textsuperscript{16}Müller (2000) gives examples of this form, i.e., where the introducing infinitival marker *zum* is in fact doubled, also in its phonological shape. As indicated, Swabian speakers accept in addition the reduced or even the zero form. Our informants could only have the reduced form in the second occurrence. I will assume that this is a surface variation and will ignore this difference.
If that were the case the solution would be easy; for whatever reason SG uses this complex type of infinitive, its Alemanic realization differs only in that it chooses different lexical items. It would thus involve doubling only on a morpho-phonological level in the sense that the two parts of the marker may be realized in an identical morpho-phonological shape but both are serving different demands. But this cannot be the whole story, as will become clear immediately.

This kind of doubling is found in other constructions in which SG uses a ‘simple’ zu-infinitive, e.g., the complements of propositional verbs:

(54) a. ? I han ehna grote zum sich in I have them advised to-the eachother in Radolfzell z'/Ø treffe. R. to-the/to meet I advised them to meet in R.

b. ? I han ihm verschproche zum de Rasemäher z'ruck I have him promised to-the the lawn mower back z'/Ø bringe. to bring I promised him to bring back the lawn mower.

It first should be noted that Alemanic in general prefers finite clauses under propositional verbs, see Brandner (2006). Younger speakers however accept infinitives under propositional verbs but then the result looks often as in (54). As indicated, (54) is not fully accepted by the informants, but it was offered by various speakers as a translation of a SG infinitive (under a propositional verb).

In order to understand this, it is necessary to take a closer look at the Alemanic infinitival syntax. As described in Brandner (2006), Alemanic is much more explicit in encoding of different infinitival constructions than SG. As is well known, infinitival constructions can either be bi-clausal (with a fully expanded CP-structure of the embedded clause) or mono-clausal (under so-called restructuring verbs). Alemanic uses a bare infinitive in mono-clausal structures, and preferably finite clauses under propositional verbs whereas in SG, both constructions have the same surface form, compare:

(55) a. Wosch no wo se agfange hon [die Schtross uffrissie]? (ALM)

b. Weisst du noch als sie angefangen haben [die Strasse aufzureissen] SG

(56) a. I ha-n-em verschproche dass I kumm/ ?? zum I have-him promised that I come to-the kumme/ *kumme. (ALM)
b. Ich habe ihm versprochen [zu kommen]. (SG)

I promised him to come.

Both varieties allow so-called long scrambling out of the infinitival complement:

(57) Weisst du noch als sie [die Strasse]i angefangen haben

know-you still where they the street started have

[t_i aufzureissen].

up-to-tear

I will assume without further discussion that this possibility is an indication for the mono-clausal status of the construction, see Wurmbrand (2001). This goes together with the fact that Alemannic uses a bare infinitive, i.e., the infinitival complement consists of a functionally unmarked vP with no (clause) boundary whatsoever. Since SG behaves syntactically alike, the infinitival marker in SG does obviously not head a functional (clausal) projection. From this we can conclude that the infinitival marker is not visible to the computational system and is thus most adequately analyzed as an affix in the sense of a morphological ‘inflection’, see Brandner (2006) for a detailed discussion, see also Abraham (2001).

Younger speakers tend to tolerate and use the SG infinitival marker in this construction, i.e., *uffz’risse* is a possible realization for these speakers. If it is true that this marker does not have any impact on the syntactic structure then what is at stake is the simple borrowing of a ‘word form’.

However, this still does not explain why we find doubling of the sort illustrated in (54). In order to understand this, it is necessary to look at further infinitival constructions. Alemannic differs from SG in that it has a left peripheral infinitival complementizer whose form is *zum*. It occurs preferably under nouns that can take infinitival complements:

(58) I ha koa Ziit [zum mit dir schpíle]. (ALM)

I have no time to-the with you play

(59) Ich habe keine Zeit [mit dir zu spielen]. (SG)

I have no time with you to play

I have no time to play with you.

Assuming that *zum* heads the infinitival CP, we can see that Alemannic distinguishes again overtly between the various types of infinitival complements whereas SG has in all cases invariable surface forms.

The scenario is the following: The SG construction which uses an infinitive under propositional verbs is imported into the grammar of Alemannic. However, Alemannic uses its own version of a CP-infinitival, namely that with left peripheral *zum*; if this falls together with the borrowed infinitival word form
zu+infinitive, then we get the doubled form. If an infinitival clause of the type in (58) is chosen, then we get the zero-form of the infinitive. This gives us the optionality of the infinitival marker in (60):

(60) ? I han ehna grote zum/*Ø sich in
I have them advised to-the eachother in
Radolfzell z'/Ø treffe.
R. to-the/to meet
I have advised them to meet in R.

In sum, these two cases where doubling leads to redundancy can be explained in terms of interference.

5. CONCLUSION

The overall conclusion of the examination of doubling phenomena as seemingly ‘redundant’ external merge of lexical items as they are observed in many dialects provides no evidence against the economy of derivation approach. Rather it seems as if dialects (which are always spoken languages in the sense that there is no standardized written norm) make much more use of strategies that either facilitate parsing (DO-insertion) or explicitly mark constructions e.g., via spell-out of a functional head which can in principle be predicted by the syntactic environment (preposition doubling, doubly filled comp). The two cases where there are indeed semantically vacuous elements were shown to be presumably instances of interference in the sense that lexical items are borrowed from the standard variety which are integrated into the grammar. But this is done in such a way that these items do not alter the system as a whole.
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