

DETERMINER DOUBLING IN BAVARIAN GERMAN
DALINA KALLULLI & ANTONIA ROTHMAYR

A substantial amount of current work in linguistics has focused on determiner phrases, their internal structure, and their semantic interpretation. In this context, the study of the D-layer has been particularly important in highlighting the nature of the relationship between syntactic form and semantic interpretation (Longobardi 1994, Chierchia 1998, Matthewson 2001, i.a.). In this paper, we investigate determiner doubling constructions in Bavarian German (BG) and their relevance for ongoing discussions on the syntax and semantics of DPs, QPs and the interaction between them. The central claim that we put forward is that determiner doubling constructions are restricted to structures containing a quantificational element, and that the “doubling” determiner adds to this quantificational element.

1. FACTS

In BG, unlike in Standard German (SG), the indefinite determiner may be “doubled”, as in the examples in (1).

- (1) a *so a große Bua*; *a gons a blöde Föhla* (BG)
 a *so a big boy*; *a rather a stupid mistake*

Similarly, in BG, the universal quantifier *jeda* ‘every’ may occur together with an indefinite determiner, as in (2a) and (2’) – the similarity with (1) consisting in the fact that the quantificational element *jeda* (*jeder* in SG) is morphologically composed of the quantificational element *je* and the definite determiner *da*.

- (2) a. *a jeda Bua* (BG) b. *jeda Bua* (BG)
 a *every boy* every boy
 (2’) a. *Di Anna liebt an jedn.* (BG)
 the Anna loves a everyone.
 b. **Anna liebt einen jeden.* (SG)
 Anna loves a everyone
 ‘Anna loves everyone’

The elements *so* and *gons* (*ganz* in SG) in (1) are also found in other syntactic environments, such as in (3a) – i.e., immediately preceding the adjective, exhibiting in this way a distribution typical of all degree words, as illustrated in (3b) for *sehr* ‘very’ and *irrsinnig* ‘insanely’. (The examples in (3) are good both in SG and BG.)

- (3) a. *ein so großer Bub*; *ein ganz blöde Fehler*; (BG)
 a *so big boy*; *a rather stupid mistake*
 b. *ein sehr großer Bub*; *ein irrsinnig blöde Fehler*; (BG)
 a *very big boy*; *a insanely stupid mistake*

However, as (4) shows, the pattern in (1) is not replicable with *sehr/irrsinnig*.

- (4) **a sehr a große Bua*; **a irrsinnig a große Bua* (BG)
 a *very a big boy* a *insanely a big boy*

In fact, while *so/ganz* may precede the indefinite determiner also in SG with no determiner doubling, as in (5a), *sehr/irrsinnig* cannot do so, as in (5b). That is, the opposition in (5a) vs. (5b) mirrors the opposition in (1) vs. (4).

- (5) a. *so ein großer Bub*; *ganz ein blöde Fehler*; (SG)
so a big boy; *rather a stupid mistake*
 b. **sehr ein großer Bub*; **irrsinnig ein blöde Fehler*; (SG)
very a big boy; *insanely a stupid mistake*

Crucially, while *so* and *ganz* can modify DPs, (6a), *sehr* and *irrsinnig* cannot do so, (6b).

- (6) a. So ein Mist; so ein Trottel; so eine Überraschung; (SG)
 so a garbage; so a idiot; so a surprise
 ‘Such a mess! Such an idiot! Such a surprise!’
 b. *Sehr ein Mist; *sehr ein Trottel; *sehr eine Überraschung; (SG)
 very a garbage; very a idiot very a surprise
 c. a so a Depp (BG)
 a so a idiot
 ‘Such an idiot!’

In sum, determiner doubling constructions in BG and other observations thereof raise the following questions: firstly, what is the descriptive generalisation (if any) that captures the distribution of *so/ganz* on the one hand, and *sehr/irrsinnig*, on the other? Secondly, what is the syntax and semantics of the intensifier elements *so/ganz* and how does it differ from *sehr/irrsinnig*? Thirdly, do the patterns in (1) and (2) share the same syntactic structure? And finally, what is the syntax and semantics of BG determiner doubling constructions?

2. PROPOSAL

While the standard analysis of quantification says that determiner quantifiers (such as *every*) take an NP predicate (type $\langle e, t \rangle$) and create a generalized quantifier (type $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$) (Barwise and Cooper 1981 and subsequent literature), Matthewson (2001) argues that quantifiers always require sisters of argumental types (i.e., type $\langle e, t \rangle$). We contend that German data provide further empirical evidence for this analysis. While the elements *sehr/irrsinnig* are genuine degree words, which is why they can only combine with adjectives but not nouns, we argue that, in contrast, the elements *so/ganz* are ambiguous between a degree and a quantificational interpretation. In other words, unlike degree words, *so/ganz* (can) quantify over DPs. Degree words (such as *sehr/irrsinnig*) assign a value to the degree argument of adjectives; therefore they cannot be used with DPs, as DPs do not have a degree argument; hence the ungrammaticality of (4). In contrast, *so/ganz* can quantify over DPs; *so/ganz* in (1), (6a) and (6c) bind a *kind* and not a degree variable. The “inner” or lower determiner *a* is present, providing empirical evidence for Matthewson’s structure QP-DP. (As can be seen from the data presented here, this determiner is also present in the SG.) The difference between *so* as a degree word on the one hand and as a quantificational element on the other, corresponds to the difference between *so* and *such* in English. Finally, the top (or “doubling”) determiner *a* in (1), (2a), (2’) and (6c) indicates that quantifiers denote a set of individuals, where a higher determiner can specify a particular element from the set. (Note in this context that the difference between (2a) and (2b) corresponds to the difference between *each* and *every*.) In SG, this mechanism remains often implicit and could be explained by whatever macro- or micro-parameters that would explain the lack of any doubling material in certain languages as opposed to their presence in certain others. We therefore assume (7) as the structure for determiner doubling construction in BG.

- (7) [DP- QP- DP- NP]
 a so a Depp
 a je da Föhla

In SG, the top DP layer is (usually) empty phonologically.

REFERENCES

- Barwise, J. & Cooper, R. 1981. Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4: 159–219.
- Chierchia, G. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 339-405.
- Longobardi, G. 1994. Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-665.
- Matthewson, L. 2001. Quantification and the nature of crosslinguistic variation. *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 145-189.