What the wh-agreement marker 'n reveals about wh-movement in Bavarian

Josef Bayer

Universität Konstanz

<u>Abstract</u>

There is a classical debate about extraction from V2-clauses such as *Wer glaubst du hat recht?* Long *wh*-movement theories argue for an intermediate trace as in *Wer₁ glaubst du t₁ hat recht?* The alternative is a theory that allows so-called "integrated parentheticals". Under the latter, the proper analysis is one in which there is *wh*-movement from a simplex clause albeit one with an inserted parenthetical: *Wer - glaubst du - hat recht?*

Returning to my 2020 SaRDiS talk "The reduction of *denn* to -*n* and some of its consequences", I will take a close look at Bavarian *wh*-extraction. The interesting data issue is that Bavarian employs the Q-sentitive clitic '*n*, a residue of *denn*, which is a) obligatory and b) has been deprived of its original semantics. As Bayer 2012 argues, '*n* has become a *wh*-agreement marker. The following data on extraction reflect my native speaker judgements.

(1) Wer moanst'**n** hot'**n** recht?
    Wer meinst.2SG-n hat-n recht
    „Who do you think is right?"
(2) *Wer moanst hot'**n** recht?
(3) *Wer moanst'**n** hot recht?
(4) *Wer hot'**n** moanst'**n** recht?
(5) Wer hot'**n** moanst recht?
(6) *Wer hot'**n** recht moanst'**n**?
(7) Wer hot'**n** recht moanst?

Where we find *wh* in the specifier overtly or covertly as a trace, we find the agreement marker '*n*. In cases where the integrated parenthesis appears in a lower position there cannot have been a *wh* in the specifier, and we do not find '*n*. The interesting case is (1): '*n* appears twice, upstairs and downstairs. The integrated parenthetical theory would predict that the grammatical form is (2). But (2) is degraded, whereas (1) is perfect. This suggests that there is cyclic movement nevertheless. The *wh*-element is first moved to the specifier of the lower CP where it agrees with '*n*; then it moves to its final destination where it agrees again with '*n*.

(8) Wer   moanst'n [~~wer~~   hot'n   recht] ?
          └─AGR────┘   └─ AGR ─┘

We will discuss this situation with respect to a dual analysis that allows long wh-movement next to the use of integrated parentheticals.

Bayer, J. (2012) From modal particle to interrogative marker: a study of German denn. In: L. Brugè, A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, and C. Poletto (eds.): *Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. vol.7. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 13-28.

Bayer, J. (2020) The reduction of *denn* to -*n* and some of its consequences. SaRDiS 2020. 20-21.11.2020

Bayer, J. & Salzmann, M. (2013). That-trace effects and resumption – How Improper Movement can be repaired. In: P. Brandt and E. Fuß (Eds.). *Repairs - The Added Value of Being Wrong*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 275 – 333

Kiziak T. 2007. Long extraction or parenthetical insertion? Evidence from judgement studies. In: N. Dehé and Y. Kavalova eds.), *Parentheticals*, 121–144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pankau, A., C. Thiersch & K.-M. Würzner 2020. Spurious ambiguities and the parenthetical debate. In T. Hanneforth and G. Fanselow (eds.) *Language and Logos*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Reis, M.. 1995. Extractions from Verb-Second clauses in German? In: U. Lutz and J. Pafel (eds.), *On Extraction and Extraposition in German*, 45–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Viesel, Y. 2011. glaubt er, glaub ich, glaub. Integrierte V1-Parenthesen, Extraktion aus V2-Komplementen, Grammatikalisierung. *Linguistische Berichte* 226. 129-169.