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1 The problem

Standard English and German: no overt C with an overt interrogative or relative operator

• embedded interrogatives:

(1) I don't know who (*that) has arrived.

• relative clauses:

(2) This is the city in which (*that) I live.

Traditional idea: Doubly Filled Comp Filter (see Koopman 2000) – prohibiting lexical material in both the specifier and the head of the same XP projection

But: Doubly Filled Comp Filter is not obeyed in main clauses (T-to-C movement in interrogatives, V2 in German) and there are languages/varieties with Doubly Filled Comp in embedded clauses

Doubly Filled Comp in non-standard English:

(3) a. They discussed a certain model, but they didn't know which model that they discussed.
   (Baltin 2010: 331, ex. 1)

   b. It's down to the community in which that the people live.
   (Van Gelderen 2013: 59, ex. 8)

Proposal: Doubly Filled Comp indeed involves a single CP → there is no Doubly Filled Comp Filter; differences between (1)/(2) versus (3) can be explained by feature encoding, no need to postulate further functional projections
2 Doubly Filled Comp with a single CP

Both the C and the [Spec,CP] filled:

(4)  

\[ \text{in which } C' \]

\[ C \ldots \]

\[ \text{that} \]

Question: why doubling occurs

Evidence from German: C in interrogatives mere subordinator, in relative clauses a relative C

3 The cartographic approach

Core idea: representation in (4) violates the DFCF, but an alternative analysis is possible with multiple CPs, where each CP has a distinct function (e.g. Baltin 2010)

Cartographic approach: CP-periphery consists of designated CP-projections 

(see Rizzi 1997)

Structure:

(5)  

\[ \text{in which } C' \]

\[ C \quad CP \]

\[ \text{that} \]
4 Doubly Filled Comp effects in embedded interrogatives in German

Doubling of *wh*-element and *dass*: attested in dialects such as Bavarian and Alemannic

(6) I ask-

\[\text{I wonder what one needs a second TV for.}\]

(Bavarian; Bayer & Brandner 2008: 88, ex. 3)

Complementiser: *dass* ‘that’ – general finite subordinator, not [wh]

Variation: depending on the *wh*-element (Bayer & Brandner 2008)

- visibly phrase-sized *wh*-element: always occurs together with *dass*

- head-sized *wh*-element (e.g. *wer* ‘who.NOM’, *was* ‘what’): without *dass* (interner variation whether *dass* is obligatorily absent or there is optionality)

Problems for representation in (5):

- combination of designated [wh] CP and designated finiteness CP: cannot explain variation with *wh*-elements (selectional restrictions on lower C should not be defined by the specifier of the higher CP)

- if iterable CPs (no designated functional split): operator should move to the lowest specifier, (5) violates the Minimal Link Condition (see Fanselow 1990; 1991, Chomsky 1995)

5 Doubly Filled Comp effects in relative clauses in German

Doubling of relative operator and *wo*: attested in South German (Bavarian, Alemannic)

(7) the man PRON.DEM PRT his shoes lost has

\[\text{‘the man who has lost his shoes’ (Brandner & Bräuning 2013: 132, ex. 2)}\]

Complementiser: *wo* – general relative complementiser in South German, not mere subordinator (↔ *dass*)

Relative clauses in South German: regular pattern with *wo* (Brandner & Bräuning 2013)

- *wo* relativizes all types of head nouns (see also Brandner 2008, Fleischer 2004)

- doubling with a demonstrative-based relative operator (cf. Weise 1917): Doubly Filled Comp effect

- no relative operators genuinely in these dialects; visible operators (borrowing from Standard German) can lexicalise the operator function (covert operator present anyway)
Problems for representation in (5):

- combination of designated [rel] CP and designated finiteness CP cannot hold: *wo* is itself [rel] → idea of designated layers (as in embedded interrogatives) cannot be maintained across constructions

- if iterable CPs (no designated functional split): operator should move to the lowest specifier, (5) violates the Minimal Link Condition

6 A feature-based analysis

Proposal: the C head position has to be filled in the given dialects if carrying [wh] or [rel] feature

- embedded interrogatives: similar to main clause questions (T-to-C in English, V2 in German)
- relative clauses: default pattern with head (*wo* or *that*) but visible operator may be lexicalised in addition – *wh*-based relative pronouns an innovation along that in Middle English as well (Van Gelderen 2009), hence additions to overt C, similarly to demonstrative-based relative operators in South German as borrowings

Structures for German:

(8) a. CP
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{für was}_{[wh]} \\
    \text{C}_{{[wh]}} \ldots \\
    \text{C}_{{[wh]}} \\
    \text{dass}
    \end{array} \]

b. CP
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{der}_{[rel]} \\
    \text{C}_{{[rel]}} \ldots \\
    \text{C}_{{[rel]}} \\
    \text{wo}_{[rel]}
    \end{array} \]

c. CP
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{C}_{{[wh]}} \ldots \\
    \text{C}_{{[wh]}} \\
    \text{wer}_{[wh]}
    \end{array} \]

- no real doubling in interrogatives like (8a) – only the operator carries the clause-typing feature (insertion of a [wh] complementiser would check off the feature and block further movement)

- real doubling in relative clauses like (8b) – [rel] complementiser inserted by default, but this does not block operator movement, which has to take place due to semantics (no relative-in-situ, cf. Bacskaï-Atkari (2014))

- no doubling if the head-sized *wh*-element moves to the C head (see Bayer & Brandner 2008)
7 Conclusions

Doubly Filled Comp Effects: truly instances of filling both [Spec,CP] and C head, yet not necessarily doubling semantically

Overtness: certain clause-typing features must be realised overtly

- [wh] must be realised morphophonologically in embedded clauses (no distinctive intonation) → in embedded wh-questions, the operator is necessarily overt

- [rel] must be realised overtly (unless the language has a zero relative complementiser, but restrictions hold on this) as the relation to the matrix clause must be recoverable → either the operator or the C is necessarily overt

- in certain non-standard Germanic dialects: the embedded C head must be filled, similarly to matrix V2 or T-to-C movement

→ absence of Doubly Filled Comp in the standard varieties: no requirement on filling the head, hence the presence of an overt operator blocks the insertion of an overt complementiser (economy)

→ Doubly Filled pattern in South German embedded wh-questions: wh-element overt anyway, and C head has to be filled by an underspecified complementiser (unless the wh-word occupies the C head position)

→ Doubly Filled pattern in South German relative clauses: C head filled by wo anyway, and the operator may be lexicalised (no deletion mechanism applying to either element)

Feature encoding: a single clause-typing feature has to be checked off and overtly encoded in either case, no need to overtly encode finite subordination in itself

→ a single CP is generated (minimal structure)
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