

## The puzzle: Clause-internal doubling

Verb Doubling in Alemannic (Hodler, 1969; Lötscher, 1993) differs from other verb doubling phenomena in that

- the doubling of verbs takes place within a clause (no fronting/topicalization is involved)

- it is obligatory, in both main clauses (which are verb-second) and subordinate clauses (verb-final)

Four verbs do the doubling:

- |        |                        |                       |                                       |
|--------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (1) a. | <i>I gang</i>          | <i>*(ga) helfe.</i>   | <i>Obligatory doubler &lt;ga&gt;</i>  |
|        | I go.pres.1sg          | help                  |                                       |
|        | "I go help"            |                       |                                       |
| b.     | <i>I chum</i>          | <i>*(cho) helfe.</i>  | <i>Obligatory doubler &lt;cho&gt;</i> |
|        | I come.pres.1sg        | help                  |                                       |
|        | "I come help"          |                       |                                       |
| c.     | <i>I la</i>            | <i>*(lo) helfe.</i>   | <i>Obligatory doubler &lt;lo&gt;</i>  |
|        | I let.pres.1sg         | help                  |                                       |
|        | "I let (someone) help" |                       |                                       |
| d.     | <i>I fo-n</i>          | <i>*(afo) choche.</i> | <i>Obligatory doubler &lt;afo&gt;</i> |
|        | I begin.pres.1sg       | cook                  |                                       |
|        | "I start cooking"      |                       |                                       |

van Riemsdijk (2002) attests a similar phenomenon in West Flemish, and Winford (1990:127) in Caribbean English Creole.

The <ga> ("go") doubler can also occur under modals, auxiliaries, and an open class of motion verbs.

- |        |                       |                         |                                 |
|--------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (2) a. | <i>I sot</i>          | <i>*(ga) helfe.</i>     | <i>modal + &lt;ga&gt;</i>       |
|        | I should.pres.1sg     | help                    |                                 |
|        | "I should go help"    |                         |                                 |
| b.     | <i>I bia</i>          | <i>*(ga) helfe.</i>     | <i>aux + &lt;ga&gt;</i>         |
|        | I aux.pres.1sg        | help                    |                                 |
|        | "I went to help"      |                         |                                 |
| c.     | <i>I renn</i>         | <i>ahi *(ga) luaga.</i> | <i>&lt;run&gt; + &lt;ga&gt;</i> |
|        | I run.pres.1sg        | there see               |                                 |
|        | "I run there to look" |                         |                                 |

## Analysis as a spelled-out V-to-T(-to-C) chain

By taking the verb double *ga* of (1) to be a spelled-out trace of a V-to-T(-to-C) head-movement chain, the distribution in main clauses ((1), Verb-second) and embedded clauses ((2), Verb-final) is correctly predicted.

- (3) a.  $[CP [C \textit{dass}] [TP i [T \textit{gang}]_i] [VP [V \textit{ga}]_i \textit{luaga}]]]$   
           that I go.1sg see
- b.  $[CP i_k [C \textit{gang}]_i] [TP t_k [T \textit{ga}]_i] [VP (\textit{min Onkl}_m) [V \textit{ga}]_i \textit{bsuache t}_m]]]$   
           I go.1sg my uncle visit

## Argumentation

Despite the name, many authors take the term descriptively and do not assume actual syntactic doubling (Salzmann & Brandner, 2011). Perhaps for this reason, no full syntactic analysis of such a derivation has been suggested as of yet. Here I show that such an analysis works. The gist is that traces (movement origin and intermediate landing sites) are spelled-out as what is called here a doubler. Benefit over non-productive doubling analyses:

- predicts the distribution of doublers "for free", drawing on the independently motivated V-to-T(-to-C) movement

When there is more than one doubler in a clause ("tripling" and "quadrupling", so to say), the maximal amount differs between subordinate and main clauses, which supports this analysis.

- (4) a. *I gang ga dr Mama ga bluama ga koufe.*  
       b. *dass i gang ga dr Mama (\*ga) bluama ga koufe*

## Special case 1: Bare doublers without a governing lexical verb

If the full infinitive, parenthesized in 5a, is left out, a silent GO needs to be assumed, as suggested in van Riemsdijk (2002). If, under an auxiliary, the participle, parenthesized in 5b, is left out, an IPP (infinitive-as-participle) plus subsequent silencing of it as in 5a is assumed. These two suggestions potentially salvage the opposition to a productive syntactic doubling analysis brought up in the literature.

- (5) a. *I will ga schaffa (goo).* *modal: go-drop*  
           I want work (go)
- b. *I bia ga schaffa (ggange).* *aux: IPP + go-drop*  
           I AUX work (gone)

## Special case 2: Heteromorphic doubling

Not only the verb *goo* "go" can license a doubler, but also more marked motion verbs such as *khoo* "come", *renne* "run" or the causative *schicke* "send". The analysis requires semantic decomposition here, in line of the suggestion in van Riemsdijk (2002).

## Deletion

More than one *ga* in a sentence is dispreferred but grammatical. While the above analysis predicts the landing sites of doublers, the varying deletion of (intermediate) doublers in the V-to-T-to-C chain needs to be explained: This seems to be a matter of lexical variation, and can be formally captured in terms of Late Insertion.

## Consequence: Alemannic VO

If the analysis of doublers as verbal heads (thus projecting a VP) is correct, the invariably <doubler INF> order means that the phrase is VO. This, under a standardly assumed OV Alemannic VP and TP, is a violation of the Final-over-Final-condition (Sheehan et al., 2017), as pointed out in Salzmann (2010). Given the exceptionless head-initiality of doubler phrases, and given that the FOFC is correct, the verb doubling puzzle at hand is strong evidence that the Alemannic verbal domain (VP, vP, TP) are head-initial, counter to what the majority of the literature assumes.

- (6) Complement-to-spec movement to attain a head-initial TP:
- a.  $\textit{das} [TP i (\textit{sichr/nid}) [XP \textit{ga} [VP \textit{schaffa}]]_i [T \textit{gang}] t_i]$
- b.  $\textit{das} [TP i (\textit{sichr/nid}) [XP \textit{ga} [VP [DP \textit{HäB}]_k [V \textit{koufe}] t_k]]_i [T \textit{gang}] t_i]$
- c.  $\textit{das} [TP i (\textit{sicher/nid}) [XP [DP \textit{HäB}]_k \textit{ga} [VP t_k [V \textit{koufe}] t_k]]_i [T \textit{gang}] t_i]$

## References

- Hodler, Werner. 1969. *Berndeutsche Syntax*. Bern: Francke.
- Lötscher, Andreas. 1993. *Dialektsyntax*. Springer.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 2002. The unbearable lightness of GOing: The projection parameter as a pure parameter governing the distribution of elliptic motion verbs in Germanic. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5.143–196. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021251312697>.
- Salzmann, Martin. 2010. An Alemannic challenge to the FOFC. Handout at DGfS Linearization Workshop 2010.
- Salzmann, Martin, and Ellen Brandner. 2011. Die Bewegungsverbkonstruktion im Alemannischen. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik*, vol. 144, 47–76. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Sheehan, Michelle; Theresa Biberauer; Ian Roberts; and Anders Holmberg. 2017. *The Final-Over-Final Condition: A Syntactic Universal*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. MIT Press.