Saarland *nommo,* 'again': insights for the structure of iteratives beyond inductive fallacies

The goal of the present contribution is to elucidate the behavior of the Saarland adverb *nommo/nochmal,* 'again' (incl. distinct spelling variants in a non-standardized system) in the wider context of developments between counterdirectional/restitutive (cd./res.) and repetitive (rep.) readings in West Germanic and beyond. Studies such as Fabricius-Hansen (2001), Gergel & Beck (2015), and Zwarts (2019) discuss the iteratives *wieder*, *again*, and *terug.* In a nutshell: what emerges is, essentially, a typological semantic map that is directed from cd./res. to rep (in Standard German and English in the first two cases, and ranging into Flemish dialects of Dutch in the latter). When we consider the conjunction of such developments, they are particularly interesting in their totality since the items are non-cognates (their sources are even categorially distinct on closer inspection of the early and recent historical facts). However, they undergo semantically rather similar developments.

In this talk, we show, **first**, that the inductive step that one may be tempted to take (viz. that such developments are therefore more generally unidirectional as potentially indicated empirically by the earlier studies, i.e. cd./res. → rep) is a fallacy – there is no unidirectionality as e.g. the Saarland dialect group shows (in parallel work, we have found more such adverbs, i.e. going rep.→ cd./res.). **Second**, we show that despite the opposite developmental direction, there are striking similarities between *nommo* and the standard German *wieder.* This holds primarily with respect to the syntactic constraints placed on interpretation, when the latter is carefully contextually controlled. While Standard German *nochmal* is only lexicalized as a repetitive adverb, low-scope *nommo* (e.g. in (2/3a)) is indeed interpreted as restitutive and only as such. Interestingly, however, when *nommo* is scrambled over the object, as e.g. in (2/3b), it becomes infelicitous in a restitutive context (and could conversely only be interpreted repetitively). This matches to a significant extent the classical structural discovery of von Stechow (1996) based on the syntax of *wieder*. **Third**, we show that intonation (another major player known from *wieder*, cf. e.g. Klein (2001), Beck (2006)) plays indeed a role in the Saarland *nommo* variant as well. When bearing a pitch accent, the adverb is infelicitous as a cd./res. and can only be appropriately inserted in rep. contexts (2/3c). **Fourth** (time permitting), we will discuss additional readings that obtain with *nommo* and which do not standardly obtain with *wieder* itself, stressing a developmental variationist account. What is, then, one to make of the facts we have observed? Analytically, the attainment of two major results can be reported:

(A) Overall, we argue, the emergent adverb shows quite clearly that the developmental direction rep. →cd./res. is not only theoretically possible, but also attested in West Germanic (we additionally will argue that this is typologically also more widely the case). An account that naturally accommodates such facts is the one suggested by Beck & Gergel (2015), based on Constant Entailments. The source of change are then contexts in which the two readings are truth-conditionally nearly indistinguishable (cf. Zwarts 2019 for a relevant related system). Crucially, there is no commitment whatsoever in such an account to directionality.

(B) A long-standing question in the literature of iteratives is, of course, whether they are better accounted for structurally or lexically. Beck & Gergel (2015) have suggested that diachronically and for English both analyses are required. Our current argument is that the two accounts are, in fact, also required synchronically. The syntactic correlations we have uncovered receive indeed a natural account in a structural framework, in which either a result state or an entire event are to be presupposed and alternatives play their part when it comes to focusing. But the range of readings (including cd. ones that do not obviously receive a plausible result state) indicate that the range of variation is larger than a core structural account predicts and this holds at a synchronic stage in the Saarland dialect as well.

(1) Datt Land […] hat sisch verirrt on hat sisch nommo fonn.
    the   land   has itself   lost and has itself again found.
    (Jürgen Brill, 1995, Us Land)
    The land was lost and found itself again.

(2) Peter hat im vergangenen Jahr einen weißen Zaun gekauft und damit den Garten ein-
    gezäunt. Nach dem Winter ist die Farbe zum Teil abgesplittert. Er sagt:
    Peter bought a white fence and fenced his garden with it. After the winter, some of
    the paint has flaked off. He says:
        a. Ich denk, dass ich de Zaun nommo weiß streiche.
            I   think that I   the fence again   white paint
            I think I'm going to paint the fence white again.
        b. #Ich denk, dass ich nommo de Zaun weiß streiche.
             I   think that I   again   the fence white paint
            I think I'm going to paint the fence white again.
        c. #Ich denk, dass ich de Zaun NOMmo weiß streiche.
            I   think that I   the fence again   white paint
            I think I'm going to paint the fence white again.

(3) Katja backt sehr gerne und probiert häufig neue Rezepte aus. Als ihr Nachbar Tom sie
    fragt, ob er sich ein Backbuch ausleihen kann, willigt sie gerne ein. Tom hat vor eine
    Schokoladentorte zu backen, Katjas absoluter Lieblingskuchen. Abends erzählt sie ih-
    rer Freundin davon. Sie berichtet:
    Katja likes to bake and she often tries out new recipes. When her neighbor Tom asks
    her if he could borrow a recipe book, she agrees readily. Tom wants to bake chocolate
    cake – Katja's favorite. Later that night, she tells a friend about it. She says:
        a. Er bringt ma e Stick Kuche mit, wenn er mir es Buch nommo gebt.
            He brings me a piece cake with when he me the book again gives.
            He will bring me a piece of cake when he returns the book.
        b. (#)Er bringt ma e Stick Kuche mit, wenn er mir nommo es Buch gebt.
            He brings me a piece cake with when he me   again the book gives.
            He will bring me a piece of cake when he returns the book.
        c. #Er bringt ma e Stick Kuche mit, wenn er mir es Buch NOMmo gebt.
            He brings me a piece cake with when he me the book again gives.
            He will bring me a piece of cake when he returns the book.

Selected references
Beck, S. (2006). Focus on again. *Linguistics and Philosophy 29*: 277–314.
Beck, S. & R. Gergel (2015). The diachronic semantics of English again. *NLS* 23:157–203.
Fabricius-Hansen, C. (2001). "Wi(e)der" and "again(st)". In Fery, C. & W. Sternefeld (eds.),
    Audiatur Vox Sapientiae. A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow. Akademie Verl. 101–30.
Klein, W. (2001). Time and again. In Fery, C. & W. Sternefeld (eds.), *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae. A*
    Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow. Akademie Verl.267-286.
von Stechow, A. (1996). The different readings of *wieder* 'again': A structural account. *Journal*
    of Semantics 13: 87-138.
Zwarts, J. (2019). From 'back'to 'again' in Dutch: The structure of the 're'domain. *Journal of*
    Semantics 36: 211-240.