

## DOUBLING PHENOMENA IN SOLV JAN-OLA ÖSTMAN

This is an exploratory study of some of the possibilities there are for constituent doubling or head doubling in the Scandinavian (“Swedish”) dialect of Solv in Finland. The study is done within the realm and interests of the pan-Scandinavian projects ScanDiaSyn and NORMS and the theoretical approach used is that of Construction Grammar.

The Solv dialect is one of the two major dialects of the Solf area in Ostrobothnia, the Solf area being one of the more than 80 traditionally distinguished dialect-areas of Swedish-speaking Finland.

The version of Construction Grammar utilized builds on the initial insights of Charles Fillmore and his colleagues at UC-Berkeley, but is in several parts an extension largely developed by Mirjam Fried and Jan-Ola Östman with special emphasis not only on the usage-based nature of Construction Grammar, but focussing in particular on Fillmore’s idea that the model should as far as possible be consistent with what we know about cognition, social interaction, and cultural traditions. The acronym used for this version of Construction Grammar is CxG.

Very little has been noted about doubling phenomena in Swedish dialects. Levander (1909) refers to a set of examples from the Swedish dialect spoken in Älvdalen in Sweden, where the subject seems to be repeatable at any point that allows a Subject in a GB-tree (Henrik Rosenkvist, pers. comm.). In the CA literature on (Finland-)Swedish we find terms like tail-doubling (‘svansdubbling’) to account for the repetition of some element as a tag or right dislocation at the end of an utterance/turn/proposition. In this study I want to account systematically for doubling phenomena in one dialect.

### *Utterance-final doubling.*

Sentence/utterance-final Subject-doubling is almost a sine qua non in Solv. Dialect speakers make frequent use of pragmatic particles (i.e. utterance and discourse particles), some of which have historically developed out of repetitions of other elements in the sentence; thus, it has been found that sentence-final pronoun repetition is addressee oriented, and in some cases (almost) takes on the role of being a semantic question particle (cf. Östman 1986).

In (1) we have a neutral case of Subject-doubling, where the doubling has little if any semantic contents to add to the proposition; leaving out the utterance-final repetition would by contrast sound awkward.

- (1) An a joort he, han.  
he has done that/it, he

The forms of the pronouns show that the unstressed version is typically used sentence-internally, whereas the mid-stressed version is used sentence-finally. The 3<sup>rd</sup>sg,masc. personal pronoun in (1) only has two forms; in (2) we see that it is the mid-stressed, and not the strongly stressed version (töög) of the 2<sup>nd</sup>sg pronoun that is used. (2) – with a 2<sup>nd</sup> pronoun – is also a case where the utterance has to be interpreted as a question by the addressee.

- (2) Dö jer fråån London tö.  
you are from London you

Not only the Subject can be doubled, but also the Topicalized element, as we can see in (3), with *han* as a right-dislocated element. It is not clear whether the utterance-final pronoun can be repeated in any other than the NOM case; example (3) is not the best indicator of this, since there is a general tendency in spoken Swedish to accept what is traditionally regarded as the NOM case of 3<sup>rd</sup> pronouns also in Object positions. However, (4) does seem to indicate that it is the NOM case, and not the ACC case that will be repeated as doubled.

- (3) Biilin a vi int sitt, han.  
car-the havewe not seen it  
‘We haven’t seen the car.’

- (4) (?)Teeg a vi sitt, tö.  
 you(ACC) havewe seen you(NOM)

#### SENTENCE-INTERNAL DOUBLING

Whereas instances of utterance-final doubling have been noted – as tags, right dislocations or tails – there is no indication in the literature that sentence-internal doubling would be possible in the Finland-Swedish dialects. Thus, in addition to (1), which can be explained “away” as a case of right dislocation, we also find the following possibilities in Solv:

- (5) An a han joort he.  
 he has he done it
- (6) An a joort han he.  
 he has done he it
- (7) Biilin a han steiji täär hejla natten.  
 car-the has it(masc.) stood there all night-the

The restrictions on what is acceptable in the dialect and what is not, are not obvious. Informants indicated that (8) sounds better than (9), but neither is as acceptable as (5) and (6). Topic-doubling (cf. (3-4)) is also not as acceptable sentence-internally, although it is not totally ruled out, cf. (10-11); left dislocation is perfectly acceptable, though – and even more acceptable if a sentence-final pronoun is repeated.

- (8) ?John a han joort he.  
 John has he done it
- (9) \*John a joort han he.  
 John has done he it
- (10) Biilin a vi int han sitt.  
 car-the havewe not it(masc.) seen
- (11) \*Biilin a han vi int sitt.  
 car-the haveit(masc.) we not seen
- (12) Biilin, han a vi int sitt.  
 car-the it(masc.) havewe not seen
- (13) Biilin, han a vi int sitt, han.  
 car-the it(masc.) havewe not seen it(masc.)

In my presentation I want to (a) give a descriptive account of the restraints on sentence-final and sentence-internal Subject/Topic-doubling in Solv; (b) note the potential similarity between Subject-doubling and the double person-marking (with pronoun and person suffix – both on finite verbs and on possessed nominals) in Finnish – and thus discuss whether doubling is yet another case of a possible Finnish contact influence on the Swedish dialects in Finland; (c) discuss how doubling should and could be handled within CxG. The last task (c) is the most challenging, and an important testing ground for the CxG model. According to CxG, a construction is a form-meaning/function constellation; thus, a change (e.g., a repetition) in form should necessarily produce a change in meaning or function. Since CxG is a monostratal and non-derivational approach to language, it would not accept an account of doubling where traces play a role, nor would it accept an account where the doubled element is a repetition without meaning. One interesting question is whether doubling can be seen as a case of coercion.

The differences in meaning/function of the doubling (in terms of scope and focus) will be discussed on the basis of informants’ responses to sentences like (5-6) in comparison to their responses to sentences like (1) and *An a joort he.* – without any doubling.

#### REFERENCES

- Fillmore, Charles J., 1989. Grammatical Construction Theory and the familiar dichotomies. In *Language processing in social context*, ed. by R. Dietrich & C.F. Graumann. Amsterdam: North-Holland/Elsevier. 17-38.
- Fried, Mirjam & Jan-Ola Östman, eds., 2004. *Construction Grammar in a cross-language perspective*. [Constructional Approaches to Language 2] Amsterdam & Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins.

- Fried, Mirjam & Jan-Ola Östman, 2005. Construction Grammar and spoken language: the case of pragmatic particles. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Levander, Lars, 1909. Älvdalsmålet i Dalarna. Ordböjning och syntax. *Svenska Landsmål och svenskt folkliv*, Stockholm.
- Östman, Jan-Ola, 1986. Pragmatics as Implicit Anchoring. Unpublished PhD dissertation. UC-Berkeley, California.