

## PATTERNS OF DOUBLING (IN ALEMANNIC)

ELLEN BRANDNER (KONSTANZ)

The goal of this talk is twofold: In the first part I will give an overview about the Alemannic instances of ‘common’ doubling phenomena like *do*-insertion, doubling of the (indefinite) determiner as in “*en so en guete wii*“ (a such a good wine) among others. The second part will have closer look at two constructions: (i) plural-s doubling and (ii) doubly filled Comp.

ad (i)

Alemannic does not – in contrast to Bavarian – show Complementizer Agreement. However, there is an instance of the doubling of an affix which reminds on this construction:

- (1) Bi’s Nochbars    het’ s    brennt  
      at’s neighbours    has it    burnt

The –s (which originates probably from a genitive construction but is interpreted by the native speakers as a plural) occurs obligatorily if the noun is part of a PP but optionally if the phrase is a bare nominal construction:

- (2) (‘s) Nochbars    kummet ooh  
      neighbours    come    also

The doubled affix thus appears at the (maximal) extended projection. So it seems that Bavarian complementizer agreement and Alemannic plural-s doubling can be traced back to the same mechanism. If so, the question is why different kinds of affixes (and functional projections) are involved and whether this correlates with other properties.

ad (ii)

Another topic that will be discussed in some length is the Doubly filled Comp Filter. Contrary to common beliefs it is not the case that in the dialects under discussion the complementizer „*dass*“ generally occurs together with wh-phrases in embedded questions. Rather there seem to be co-occurrence restrictions, especially with ‘simple’ wh-phrases like „who, what, where“ etc, cf. (1 and 2). On the other hand, the more complex a wh-phrase is, the more the complementizer must occur, cf. (3):

- (3) Ich woass    it    wo    (?\**dass*)    se    sind  
      I    know    not where    that    they are  
(4) Ich woass    it    wa    (\**dass*)    se    em    gebe  
      I    know    not what    that    they him given  
(5) Es tät    mi    schointeressiere    mit wellere    Gschicht    ?\*(*dass*)    se    etzt aakummet  
      it    would    me prt interest    with which    story    that    they now arrive    (tell)

However the restriction in (3 and 4) can be ‘overridden’ if the wh-phrase is focussed, e.g. in a contrastive construction:

- (6) Mir wisset    scho    WO    dass se    aakummet    aber immer    no-it    WENN  
      we know    already    where    that they will arrive    but still    yet-not    when

This could be taken as an indication that focussed Wh-phrases target another (higher) position in an extended C-projection than simple Wh-phrases. Another possibility would be to analyze simple (monosyllabic) non-focussed Wh-phrases as having been reanalyzed in these dialects as heads which occupy the C<sup>0</sup> position and thus compete with the complementizer for the same position. That this might be true can be seen in the following example, cf (4):

- (7) Ich woass    it    wege    wa    dass der sich    so    uffregt  
      I    know    not because- what    that e    himself so    excites

Although *wa* is adjacent to the complementizer, the insertion of *dass* is possible. However, in this case *wa* is part of a complex Wh-expression ‘*wege wa*’ and thus not a possible candidate for the

reanalysis process proposed above. Whatever the exact analysis may be, the restrictions on the insertion of *dass* can give us new insights into the structure of the left periphery of the embedded clause.