1 THE EMPIRICAL BACKGROUND

The following overview on doubling phenomena in Swiss German is based on our ongoing research project ‘Syntactic Atlas of Swiss German dialects’ (SADS), from which we take our data. The project started in 2000 and aimed to describe the geographical variation in Swiss German syntax and to complete the ‘Linguistic Atlas of Swiss German’ (Sprachatlas der Deutschen Schweiz, SDS), which focused on phonology, lexicon and morphology. For reasons of time and money, we had to work with written questionnaires in order to reach a sufficient quantity/number of informants. Although it is clear that there are several problems with this kind of elicitation, such as the influence of the written sentence structures on the informants and the impossibility to react to the informants’ choice or to control that the informant writes down his own variant and not the variant of somebody else, our results show that our work with written questionnaires was ultimately successful. Swiss German speakers have no problems reading dialect as there is, on the one hand, increased usage in advertising etc. and, on the other hand, private writing in dialect (letters, e-mails, SMS etc.). We used three different question types: translations of sentences from Standard German, completing questions, and, mostly, multiple choice questions with suggested dialectal variants. In preliminary tests, we found that the acceptance of the elicitation method was higher when the variants to be judged or the sentences to be translated or completed were preceded by a short text.

2 DOUBLING CONSTRUCTIONS IN SWISS GERMAN DIALECTS

Among the syntactical variants investigated, there are some which are already known as doubling in the dialectological literature, such as the various kinds of verb doubling (“Verbverdopplung”). A first example is seen in (1), with the verb la ‘to let, have’, in common use in a particular area of German-speaking Switzerland.

(1) Är laat de Schriner la cho.
   be hav the carpenter have come
   ‘He called the carpenter.’

---

1 We would like to thank Jason Kooiker, University of California, Berkeley, for his assistance with the English version of this text.
2 A total of 118 such questions, divided into four questionnaires, were asked. 2770 people, on average, from 375 places in German-speaking Switzerland, returned the completed questionnaires. Examples of the various question types together with further information on the project design are to be found in Bucheli & Glaser (2002). As for the Swiss German speaking area and the locations where we sent our written questionnaires cf. map 1 in the appendix.
3 For more details see below.
4 The examples in this paper are labelled in the following way: number of the questionnaire, number of the question.
Multiple negation (‘doppelte Negation’), which is seen as multiple occurrence of negative elements without annulment of the negation, as in (2), is another phenomenon of doubling, known from several German dialects. As for the Swiss German dialects, the following example was accepted only very rarely (45 persons total).

(2) Är list käs Buech nid. (III.18)
    'He doesn’t read a book.'

Determiner doubling, however, as in (3), only recently described by Frans Plank (2000) for Bavarian as Double articulation, is a pervasive phenomenon in Swiss German as well. Two-thirds of our informants distributed throughout German-speaking Switzerland accepted the doubling of the indefinite article together with the intensifier ganz ‘really’ (cf. Steiner in press).

(3) Ä ganz ä liebi frau. (I.10)
    'A really lovely wife.'

Another doubling construction dealt with in detail by Fleischer (2003), short and long doubling of the R-pronoun in pronominal compounds, as in (4a) and (4b), is also common in Swiss German.

(4) a. Dadevoo han ich au scho ghört. (I.16)
    'I already heard of it, too.'

Interrogative wb-doubling, as in (5), was first described by Natascha Frey (2001) for a very restricted area of Swiss German, the dialect of Uri, but it seems to be more widespread in the inner regions of the Vierwaldstättersee (map 3 below; Frey 2005; Frey in press).

(5) Was macht de Urs ietz was? (IV.23)
    'What does Urs do now?'

It should already be obvious from the examples presented so far that doubling is used here for quite different phenomena. In the case of determiner doubling or interrogative wb-doubling, we find identical copies: d ... d, was ... was. The same is more or less true for short and long doubling of pronominal compounds. It seems, however, that the bound element often shows a reduced form, de, so that we do not always have doubling in a narrow sense: da[...]amen/amen, da[...]avor/avor etc. A similar kind of doubling is presented by the doubling verbs where a finite verb is doubled by a phonetically reduced, uninflected form, cf. the verb la ‘let’ in (1).

---

6 There seems to be a slight concentration in the central Swiss regions (Uri, Obwalden, Nidwalden). The example III.21 showing negative concord früener bitt niemer kà Gäüt ghaa für bau was more widely accepted, even if, as a whole, not overwhelmingly (453 persons at 251 locations).
7 1088 persons at 344 locations accepted short doubling, 820 persons at 315 locations long doubling. The values for the preference of these constructions are, however, much lower.
8 For some more details see sec. 3.
This kind of reduced doubling is restricted to a small group of verbs, with the motion verb *go* being most affected, but also *come*, where doubling is obligatory in combination with an infinitive.

(6) a. Mir *gönd *(go)*tschutte.  
   *we go go play football/soccer.INF*  
   ‘We go to play football.’

b. Är *chunt* *(cho)*tschutte.  
   *be come come play football.INF*  
   ‘He comes to play football.’

In reality, the picture is a little bit more complicated with the verb *come* because there is a region within German-speaking Switzerland where *come* is not doubled by a reduced form of *come*, as in (6b), but rather by *go*, as in (6c):

10 c. Är *chunt* *(go)*tschutte.  
   *be come go play football.INF*  
   ‘He comes to play football.’

In this case, the concept of doubling no longer refers to identical or at least partial form copies, but rather to double or multiple expressions of grammatical meaning. Sometimes such ‘superfluous’ verbal material is referred to as a semantically empty expletive.

Here we can add another phenomenon: the use of periphrastic *do*. In this case, a lexical verb is accompanied by a finite form of *do*. This is a well-known West Germanic phenomenon (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1998) which we also find as an optional variant in all Swiss German dialects:

(7) I wiess au nid öb_er einisch tuet hürote.  
   *I know really not whether be some day does marry*  
   ‘I really don’t know whether he gets married some day.’

Doubling phenomena in this last sense, i.e. split expression by formally unrelated words in variation with a simple form, is usually considered a kind of redundancy or pleonasm, if it is not considered a kind of semantically motivated periphrasis.

At this point, we touch on a problem of language structure in general, as we often find that several elements seem to share the same function, or, conversely, that a function simultaneously has multiple expressions. An additional example of this kind within the nominal phrase, however, is the marking of the dative case with an additional preposed element, which we find in several areas of German-speaking Switzerland (cf. Seiler 2003):

(8) Ich han i *euere* Chatz aber nüt gäe!  
   *I have PREP your cat really nothing given*  
   ‘I didn’t give anything to your cat.’

---

9 For a discussion of the doubling phenomenon as “a special case of expletive insertion” cf. Schönenberger & Penner (1996: 299-301, 303-304). They also use the term *verb copying*, because there are cases of multiple copying which we found in our research as well (*mir *gönd *go*tschutte*), in particular in the cantons of Zurich and Aargau.

10 Doubling of *cho ‘come’ with the particle *go* is occasionally referred to as cross doubling.

11 A construction noted by a Bernese informant as a variant of the given construction Also *i wiis au nid, ob är äs mal wott bürate* ‘I don’t know whether he wants to get married some day!’

12 As e.g. in the case of the so called intensifying infinitive construction or verb focus construction: *welle wott i schon* (IV.13).
Since the element \( i \), which seems to be a former preposition, marks the dative case together with the pronominal ending \(-ere\), we can, in a way, also speak of doubling here. The double, however, is not identical, not even formally similar.

Furthermore, we can cite several types of complementizer doubling in Swiss German dialects as further examples of doubling by formally differing elements.

In (9) we find an example of a complex comparative clause with complementizer doubling by \( dass \) ‘that’.

\[
\text{(9) Äriscb ältcr wedcr dass i gmcnt han. (III.22)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{be is older than that I thought have} \\
\text{‘He is older than I thought.’}
\end{align*}
\]

A common phenomenon also found in other German dialects is doubling by \( that \) in embedded interrogative \( wb-\)clauses, as in (10), a construction accepted by more than a third of our informants in all of German-speaking Switzerland.

\[
\text{(10) Ärcha doch nid wüsse, wo dass d woonsch. (II.26)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{be can really not know where that you live} \\
\text{‘He really can’t know where you live.’}
\end{align*}
\]

While there are instances of \( wb\)-doubling in fronting constructions (11a), even if they are quite rare (accepted by 97 informants) and restricted to the western and northern part of German-speaking Switzerland, there are no positive answers at all for additional complementizer doubling (11b). Only eight informants, remarkably concentrated in the western (Bernese) region, accepted the fronting construction even with a doubled dative pronoun as in (12).

\[
\text{(11) a. Wer häsch gsäit, wer em K. ghulfe hät? (IV.24)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{who have.2Sg said who the.Dat K. helped bas} \\
\text{‘Who did you say helped K.?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{b.*Wer häsch gsäit, wer dass em K. ghulfe hät?}
\]

\[
\text{(12) Wem häsch gsäit, wem de Pfarrer ghulfe hät? (IV.26)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{whom have.2Sg said whom the priest helped bas} \\
\text{‘Whom did you say the priest helped?’}
\end{align*}
\]

Now we have come back to constructions with formally doubled elements, and we can briefly add several further types not yet mentioned in our overview. In addition to indefinite article doubling, cf. (3) above, we also find doubling of the definite article with intensified comparatives (13) which is, however, much less frequent. 264 informants, scattered more or less over the entire German-speaking area, but in less than half of the measure points, accepted the doubling construction.

\[
\text{(13) Du häsch doch de vil de schöner garte. (II.10)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{you have however the much the nicer garden} \\
\text{‘But you have a much nicer garden.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Doubling of the indefinite pronoun \( öppis \) ‘something’ (or \( eppes\), \( eswas \) and the like) and intensifying \( ganz \) as in (14) was deemed acceptable in fewer cases.\(^{14}\) Only 65 informants scattered throughout German-speaking Switzerland, with the exception of Grisons and the Western Bernese Highlands, accepted this doubling structure.

---

\(^{13}\) The doubling construction was, however, only accepted by 253 informants in all of German-speaking Switzerland with the nearly total exception of Grisons, Basel and Valais.

\(^{14}\) This type of doubling seems to be more prominent in Bavarian dialects, cf. Plank (2003: 366).
Another doubling construction, consisting of an infinitive and a finite form of the same verb, occurs in order to topicalize verbs, as can be seen in (15) with the copula verb.

(15)  
\textit{Sii bisch scho en Flissige.} (IV.22)  
\textit{be.Inf be.2.Sg certainly a hard working}  
‘You certainly work hard.’

This topicalizing doubling construction is again quite rare in the Swiss German area. Sentence (15) was accepted by only 63 informants, the majority of them coming from Grisons where this construction seems to be quite popular in the former Walser settlements.\(^{15}\) For the rest of the dialects, verb topicalization is usually realized through another kind of doubling, using the formally unrelated verb \textit{tun}, as already mentioned in another context in (7).\(^{16}\)

A final case of doubling which should be mentioned is that of preposition doubling, a phenomenon known also from Standard German (cf. McIntyre 2001) which we unfortunately did not include in our questionnaire, so that we cannot present our own data here. An already well known type is the doubling of a preposition by a similar adverb which is postponed, as in the following Swiss German examples:

(16) a.  
\textit{Uf s tach ufe}  
\textit{on the roof up}  
‘upon the roof’

b.  
\textit{im Mundwinkul dri}  
\textit{in the corner of the mouth inside}  
‘in the corner of the mouth’

A subtype of preposition doubling, which has not yet been investigated as far as we know, is doubling by an identical preposition, equally postponed, like in (17).

(17)  
\textit{A was a hesch das gmerkt?}  
\textit{at what at have.2sg it noticed}  
‘How did you notice it?’

This compilation of doubling phenomena in Swiss German dialects is mainly based on our own database. It should, however, cover most of the relevant phenomena represented here

\(^{15}\) Measuring points with more than one positive vote belong exclusively to this group. The phenomenon is also noted by Szadrowsky (1925). For an overview of the existence of the construction cf. Fleischer (forthcoming). A similar construction with modal verbs \textit{welle wott i scho} (want.Inf want.1sg I certainly); I certainly want to’ was much better accepted all over German speaking Switzerland, but the doubling status of this example is not quite clear as modals regularly govern infinitives.

\(^{16}\) There are, however, restrictions as to the verbs involved which are not yet investigated in detail. In the sentence at issue, presenting a copula construction, the \textit{tun}-periphrasis \textit{aii tuoeb echo en Flihoe} (be.Inf do.2.Sg etc.) was only used by very few informants (18). The concentration in the Valais region is, however, remarkable. As for the modal verbs, the \textit{tun}-periphrasis \textit{welle tuan i echo} (want.Inf do.1sg etc., cf. fn. 12) is widely attested, and is found at nearly all of our measure points.

\(^{17}\) This example is taken from Berthele (2004: 35), who includes further details and bibliographical information.
with at least one example each.\(^1\) Of course, the real situation is much more complicated. The doubling constructions may vary according to different lexemes (types of intensifier or preposition, pronominal category, verb types), grammatical categories like person and number, syntactic environment, sentence type and so forth. The necessary descriptive work is yet to be done. It is obvious, however, that quite different phenomena are labelled *doubling*. They differ as to the formal similarity of the repeated elements, the degree of obligatoriness, the existence of some semantic function in contrast to the simple expression and further criteria yet to be established. Even superficially similar cases like verb doubling show considerable differences when studied in more detail. This is illustrated in the following.

In addition to *gaa*, *choo*, cf. (6), and *laa*, cf. (1), the phase verb *afaa* 'to begin' also belongs to the group of doubling verbs, cf. (18) with (partial) doubling of finite *faat* by the particle *afa*.\(^2\) Doubling generally only shows up together with an infinitive. Often the doubled element is to be found immediately before the infinitive.

\[
\text{(18)} \quad [\text{dän}] \text{ faat \ s\_lis \ afa \ schmelze. (III.1)} \\
\text{then \ begins \ the\_ice \ begin \ melt.\text{Inf}}
\]

'Then the ice begins to melt.'

As already mentioned, doubling is obligatory with the motion verb *go* and in a way with the motion verb *come*. In addition, doubling of *go* applies to the whole area of Swiss German. There are no grammatical restrictions, i.e. it is doubled in all tenses and moods. Doubling with the verbs *laa* and *afaa*, however, is clearly restricted to a part of Swiss German, namely the western part. The results of a translation task 'He has the carpenter come' show the distribution of the doubling construction, cf. map 2.

\(^1\) We e.g. left out pragmatically motivated doubling as *ich tubl ich* (I fool I) or other kinds of (substandard) apposition-like constructions, cf. Plank (2005: 374f.).

\(^2\) In fact, *afa* is to be found at the usual position of the verbal prefix *a*-., which is separated from the verb in V2 position just like in Standard German (*fährt an*). So we have in (18) the doubling element *faat* but also the integration of the particle *a*- in *afa*. In spite of this peculiarity, *afaa* is usually considered a doubling verb.
The red points indicate places where informants used a doubling construction when translating into Swiss German är laat de Schrüner la cho. The blue points represent translations without doubling (är laat de Schrüner cho) which we found in the northeastern part of Swiss German. If we look for a parallel to this division between the eastern and western areas, we come across the isogloss dividing the two well-known serialisation patterns in verb clusters. The translation of the sentence (II.5) ‘You may leave everything lying’ Ir törfed alles la ligge (1-2-3) in the western part and Ir törfed alles ligge la (1-3-2) in the northeastern part shows that we only find doubling with la ‘let’ in the western area of 1-2-3 word order. This is a remarkable restriction compared to the situation of doubling go.

The doubling of afaa ‘to begin’ exhibits some similar characteristics but also some differences. Here again we find a division into a western and a northeastern part. The translation of the sentence ‘If it is so warm the ice begins to melt’, cf. (18), shows that in the case of afaa, the isogloss separating doubling and non-doubling is found a bit further in the West. Here we find a correspondence with the infinitival variants of the bare infinitive afaa vs. afange ‘to begin’. Whereas in the northeastern part we find the long form afange, in the remaining area there are a great number of slightly differentiated, reduced forms such as afä, afo, afan etc. We only find doubling forms where such a reduced infinitive exists. Another observation refers to the perfect tense and the form of the past participle of the phrase verb governing an infinitive. Once again, we find a difference between the western and the northeastern parts. The translation of the sentence ‘I have just begun cooking’ (III.8) shows an infinitive instead of a past participle (the so called IPP-effect) in the West, and this is, indeed, the same area as the one presenting doubling with afaa.\(^20\) Therefore we

\(^{20}\) Both laa and afaa seem to lack doubling nearly everywhere when they are not in a finite form. This restriction deserves further investigation.
may conclude that *afaa* can only be doubled where we find a reduced infinitive and the IPP-effect, two restrictions not extant with the other three doubling verbs.

What should have become clear so far is that doubling seems to include a number of quite different phenomena which do not necessarily share common features. This even holds true for the group of doubling verbs which present rather different cases with regard to areas and grammatical integration.

In the following we present some more details concerning the use of interrogative wh-doubling, cf. (5), a phenomenon peculiar to Swiss German and little studied until now.

3 Interrogative Wh-Doubling: A Case Study

In the following, we present some data of wh-doubling in the dialect of the Canton Uri (cf. Frey 2001). The dialect of Uri displays wh-doubling in interrogative main clauses. The wh-word in sentence initial position can be copied at the right edge of the sentence. Compare (19a) and (19b):

(19) a. *Was* machämér moorä?
   *what* do-*we* *tomorrow*¢
   ‘What do we do tomorrow?’

b. *Was* machämér moorä *was?*
   *what* do-*we* *tomorrow* *what*
   ‘What do we do tomorrow?’

This doubling is optional and thus sentences like (19b) can always be replaced by their non-doubled counterpart without changing the meaning of the sentence. For many speakers of the Uri dialect, a doubling structure is a preferred option for information questions. Yet, not all speakers accept them as being grammatical. The following data present properties of wh-doubling of those speakers who use it regularly in wh-interrogatives.

3.1 Position of the Sentence Final Wh-Word

The wh-word at the right edge of the sentence is not in the in situ position, but is situated rather at the absolute end of the sentence to the right of the verb final position as shown in (20). The occurrence of the wh-word in situ in addition to sentence initial position is ungrammatical (cf. 20b and 20c)

(20) a. *[Werisch da gsi] wer?*
   *who AUX* there been *who*
   ‘Who was there?’

b. *[Wiä wotsch das machä] wiä?*
   *how want-you it do bow*
   ‘How do you want to do it?’

c. *[Wiä wotsch das (*wiä) machä]?*
   *how want-you it bow do*
   ‘How do you want to do it?’

3.2 Restrictions

Although wh-doubling is optional, its occurrence is subject basically to two restrictions: sentence type (sec. 3.2.1) and phonological and prosodic properties of wh-items (sec. 3.2.2).
3.2.1 Sentence Type

The doubling option is limited to true information questions. In the following wh interrogative constructions doubling is excluded:

(i) echo questions with wh-word sentence initial as well as in situ (21a)
(ii) questions such as (21b), where the second part of the sentence represents an choice of alternatives;
(iii) rhetorical questions with negative polarity (21c) and
(iv) negative wh-question (21d):

\[(21)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{WO chasch dü mitgaa (*wo) / Dü chasch WO mitgaa (*wo)?} \\
& \quad \text{Where can you will-go where} \\
& \quad \text{`Where can you go?'}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Was macht de der da (*was), Feeriä oder Schaffä?} \\
& \quad \text{what do MP be here what holidays or business} \\
& \quad \text{`What is he here for, holidays or business?'}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Was wiusch dü nu verlää (*was)? ("Nyd")} \\
& \quad \text{what want you MP lose what ("Nothing")} \\
& \quad \text{`What do you want to lose?’ ("Nothing")}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d.} & \quad \text{Was isch de nig-gangä (*was)?} \\
& \quad \text{what AUX MP NEG-gone what} \\
& \quad \text{`What didn’t work?’}
\end{align*}
\]

3.2.2 Prosodic properties of wh-items

Wh-doubling is confined to monosyllabic wh-words such as was `what', wer `who', wiä `how' as shown above in (19b), (20a and b), (21a) and wenn `when' in (22b). Polysyllabic wh-items are excluded as illustrated in (22c) and (22d):

\[(22)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Was lisisch dü da was} \\
& \quad \text{what read you here what} \\
& \quad \text{`How do you read here?’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Wenn hesch dü dyys Referat wenn?} \\
& \quad \text{when have you your talk when} \\
& \quad \text{`When will you give your talk?’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Uf wenn het d'Anna Bsuäch (*uf wenn)?} \\
& \quad \text{on when has the-Anna visit on when} \\
& \quad \text{`When does Anna receive visitors?’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d.} & \quad \text{I welem Zug gaasch dü hinächt üüsä? (*i welem?) / (*i welem Zug)} \\
& \quad \text{in which train go you tonight out / in which / in which train} \\
& \quad \text{‘Which train do you take tonight?’}
\end{align*}
\]

This restriction also applies to wh-words consisting of two or more syllables like wiäso `why' as well as for wh-constituents which can be split like wobär `where' and was für `what kind of' as in (23):

\[(23)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Wo gömmer här (*wo) / (*wohär)?} \\
& \quad \text{where go-we PART where} \\
& \quad \text{`Where do we go?’}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Was isch das für Gmiäs da drin (*was) / (*was für Gmiäs)?} \\
& \quad \text{what is that for vegetables there in what / what for vegetables} \\
& \quad \text{‘What kinds of vegetables are in there?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[21\] Capitals indicate stressed constituent. MP indicates modal particle.
Another prosodic property concerns sentence stress in wh-interrogatives and the relative prominence of wh-words and phrases. The dialect of Uri marks a focus constituent with pitch accent (high pitch) in declaratives. In wh-interrogatives the primary stress falls on the finite verb in the second sentential position, even if this finite verb is an auxiliary, as illustrated in (24):

(24) Wer ISCH da gsi wer?
who AUX there been who
‘Who was there?’

Monosyllabic wh-words preceding the strongly stressed finite verb cannot be accented and show up in their weak form. Thus, lacking any prosodic prominence, they build a close prosodic unit with the finite verb. In addition to that, the length of the whole sentence is relevant as well. The shorter the distance between two wh-words, the better speakers accept doubling constructions.

Polysyllabic wh-words like wiäso ‘why’ and wh-phrases like i welem N ‘in which N’ or uf wenn ‘on when’, as shown in (22c) and (22d), being prosodic phrases on their own, receive secondary stress and pitch marking. This is the crucial point in the account of wh-doubling in the dialect of Uri given in Frey (2001) where it is argued that the prosodic weakness of monosyllabic wh-words associated with focus triggers the occurrence of the wh-word at the right edge of the sentence.

3.3 Wh-doubling in other Swiss German dialects and in other languages

In addition to the dialect of Uri, wh-doubling as the preferred construction for wh-interrogatives is attested in some other Swiss German dialects (cf. Frey in print). These are the neighbouring dialects of Uri (UR): Nidwalden (NW), Obwalden (OW), Luzern (LU) and Schwyz (SZ) which are all situated in the central part of Switzerland. Preference of doubling is also found sporadically in the dialects of the cantons Valais (VS), Basel-Land (BL), Zurich (ZH), Grisons (GR), Aargau (AG) and Appenzell Ausserrhoden (AR). Map 3 shows the areal distribution of wh-doubling in German-speaking Switzerland.
Cross-linguistically, wh-doubling is a rather rare phenomenon. To the best of our knowledge, it is found in northeastern Italian dialects (cf. Poletto & Pollock 2004) and in American Sign Language (cf. Neidle et al. 2000).

4 Summary

To sum up, this survey seems to show that Swiss German dialects do not demonstrate a particularly high number of doubling phenomena when compared to e.g. Dutch dialects. As far as we know there are e.g. no cases of subject pronoun doubling or subject agreement doubling, which is common in other European areas. There are, however, several domains showing special types of doubling, such as verbal doubling, determiner doubling and R-pronoun doubling. As far as we can see, there is no regional preference for doubling phenomena in general, i.e. there is no region showing an especially high number of different doubling phenomena. But if we concentrate on certain doubling phenomena we can clearly see areas which are more inclined to doubling than others. It obviously depends on the phenomenon itself whether there are geographical differences or not. The doubling of the indefinite article e.g. is an optional device to express indefiniteness and is found all over Swiss German territory. This also holds true for the definite article doubling with comparatives which is, however, much less frequent, whereas verb doubling is much more prominent in the western part of German-speaking Switzerland, as we have seen. Interrogative wh-doubling is common in a central area. The different doubling phenomena apparently either concentrate in rather different areas, or are to be found all over the Swiss German speaking area. Most of the phenomena presented here coexist with non-doubling structures.
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APPENDIX

Map 1: Language areas of Switzerland