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This article deals mainly with the distribution and function of the infinitival marker in Standard German and in Alemannic, a dialect spoken in Southern Germany.* At first sight both form and distribution differ in these two variants to a great extent. The most important difference is that Alemannic generally lacks the infinitival marker zu (to in English, te in Dutch) in the environments where it occurs in SG. Instead, bare infinitives are used to a much greater extent than in SG.

A detailed comparison shows how these Alemannic data can shed some new light on SG infinitival constructions — which are notoriously hard to analyze, especially the use of zu. It will turn out that zu plays hardly any syntactic role in restructuring contexts and is thus best accounted for in the word formation component rather than in the syntax. Another important issue to be discussed is extraposition. As will be shown below, extraposition is a much more widely used option in Alemannic than in SG — nevertheless, the Alemannic constructions show mono-clausal, i.e. coherent properties. I will argue that extraposition should not be taken as an indication for a bi-clausal structure — as it is done traditionally — but rather that the preferred intraposed order in SG should be analyzed in terms of a PF “flip-operation”. The attested variation between SG and Alemannic will thus turn out to be merely variation on the surface. But there are constructions where both variants differ more profoundly, namely in the context of propositional verbs. These differences will be traced back to the existence of a second kind of zu — existing only in SG — that can indeed license a full CP.
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1. Introduction

Traditionally, it is assumed for German and similar languages that the presence of an infinitival marker (IM) indicates the presence of some functional layer above
VP and that therefore infinitival complements with an IM are at least IPs, or even CPs. Consequently, the lack of the infinitival marker (e.g. in modal constructions and the complements of perception verbs) signals that the infinitival complement consists only of a VP, i.e. we have a mono-clausal structure. However, as is well-known, this correlation does not always hold. This is true for Standard German (SG henceforth) but also for other Germanic languages.

For example, in Icelandic, complements of (some) modals show the infinitival marker whereas this is excluded e.g. in Modern SG, but also in many other Germanic languages (Dutch, English etc.):

(1) *Umsækjandann verður að vanta peninga*  
applicant-the-acc must to lack money  
“The applicant must not have money”

(2) *Ein Bewerber muss Geld haben/*zu haben*  
an applicant must money have/*to have

Thus, Icelandic suggests that mono-clausal structures can exist where the infinitive verb is nevertheless functionally marked. If we do not want to assume that there is a deep-rooted difference between the modal constructions in Icelandic and the other languages — which seems implausible also from a semantic point of view — then we must conclude that there is some kind of “surface” variation which should be accounted for in principled terms.

Secondly, there is much evidence that some types of *zu*-complements in SG show mono-clausal properties in terms of so-called long passive and long scrambling, see Höhle (1978) who first discussed the phenomenon, see for detailed discussion Section 3.

(3) *weil der Wagen zu waschen versucht wurde*  
because the car-nom to wash tried was  
“Because there was an attempt to wash the car”

As can be seen, it is the matrix verb which is passivized but it is the object of the embedded infinitive which functions as the subject of the whole construction. This indicates that there is no clause boundary between the two, even though the infinitival complement shows an IM.

On the other hand, there are clear cases of *zu*-infinitivals which replace full CPs. The only condition is that the subject of the main and the embedded clause are referentially identical:

(4) a. *er hat behauptet [PRO nicht am Tatort gewesen zu sein]*  
he has said not at-the site of crime have-part. to be
b. *er hat behauptet [dass er nicht am Tatort war]*
   he has said that he not at-the site of crime was
   “He said that he hasn’t been at the site of crime”

(4a&b) are equivalent, i.e. there seems to be free variation between the finite clause and the infinitival. The infinitival complement shows the same functional and distributional properties as finite clauses. Therefore — and since *zu* is the only functional marking — we have to assume that it is presence of the IM which guarantees the status of the complement as a full clause. However, the infinitival marker cannot be generally taken as a functional head, projecting functional clausal structure, since then the data in (3) cannot be accounted for without a whole set of additional assumptions and procedures like e.g. Evers (1975) rule of pruning or as in the many other ‘classical’ treatments of restructuring infinitives, e.g. Haegeman & van Riemsdijk (1986).

A final point that adds further complications is the positional distribution of the IM. It does not occupy the left-peripheral position which is otherwise typical for functional heads, even in the Germanic OV-languages Dutch and German. Instead, its distribution reminds us rather of verbal inflection, e.g. it occurs between the particle and the verb stem.

These facts have lead some researchers to the conclusion that the insertion of *zu* does not have any syntactic consequences and cannot be explained in a principled way (e.g. Wurmbrand (2001)). Others, e.g. Abraham (2001,1998), assume that *zu* is a simple “formative” and does not contribute to the functional architecture of the infinitival complement. In contrast, Haider (1994, 2004) suggests that *zu* plays an important role in the “unification” of the argument structures of the involved verbs. Sabel (1996) analyzes *zu* as a ‘complementizer’ that moves at LF to the C⁰-position of the infinitival clause. Its non-presence at S-structure in C⁰ has several consequences for the syntax of infinitives in German — in contrast to languages which have an overt infinitival complementizer, like the Romance languages. Ijbeema (2002) suggests for Dutch (where it has basically the same distribution as in SG) that it represents Tense, in the way that is assumed for English. Finally, Wilder (1988) analyzed it as a clause-final complementizer. So we find a number of (in some cases) contradictory analyses — a situation which is clearly not satisfying, but which already hints at a possible solution: namely that we are dealing with two different kinds of IMs which are identical on the surface but differ in their functional features.

This is in fact the hypothesis I would like to defend in this paper. Comparing the Alemannic¹ (ALM henceforth) data, to be presented below, and their syntactic behavior with SG, it appears that we can identify two different kinds of *zu* in SG: One type should be treated in the morphological component, i.e. as a formative
that has lost (or never had) a syntactic impact on the clausal structure, comparable to the affix ge- in participle formation. It occurs in SG with the so-called “optional coherent verbs” or lexical restructuring verbs (“opc-verbs” in the following). This type of zu is missing in Alemannic, i.e. Alemannic uses bare infinitives exactly in those constructions where we find a mono-clausal behavior of opc-verbs. We will also see that the diachronic development of these constructions justifies an analysis in terms of (morphological) analogy. On the other hand, we have the clausal type of zu, illustrated in (4) with factive and propositional verbs. Under these verbs, Alemannic does not allow infinitivals at all, i.e. a finite clause must be used instead. Again, this kind of IM is missing in Alemannic but present in SG. We will see in Section 4. that there is a plausible diachronic account of how this IM could have developed into a functional head. Finally, in certain environments (not selected by a verb but by a noun or adjective) Alemannic uses an infinitival complementizer zum (consisting of zu + a contracted form of a dative determiner dem) which occurs at the left periphery of the infinitival, which thus behaves as a proper functional head. This type of infinitival complementizer now is missing in SG in this function; the infinitive is realized again as a zu-infinitive — identical to the other infinitival complements.

So the gist of the story is that Alemannic shows a distribution of IMs that is perfectly compatible with their syntactic behavior (bare infinitives as mono-clausal structures and marked infinitives as either infinitival CP-complements, or as finite clauses). In SG, these two types cannot be distinguished overtly. Instead, they fall together on the surface, a development traceable perhaps to elaborate linguistic standardization. This, in turn gives rise to the complexities described above.

I will proceed as follows: Section 2. gives a (rather complete) overview of infinitival complements and constructions in Alemannic. These constructions illustrate nicely how a spoken, non-standardized dialect distinguishes between various types of infinitival complements. Section 3. has a closer look at the bare infinitives in Alemannic and compares them with their SG counterparts. The comparison will lead to a unified analysis of these constructions in both languages as mono-clausal, consisting of left-branching stacked VPs with the option of surface reordering in SG. Section 4. discusses the evidence for the CP-status of the (extraposed) complement of an opc-verb in SG in terms of binding, scope and time reference. I will show that we have in these cases “disguised” finite clauses in SG which have the surface form of an infinitive but are clearly of the category CP. This analysis is corroborated by historical evidence.
2. Infinitival complementation in Alemannic

As already hinted at above, the distribution of infinitival markers in Alemannic differs remarkably from the SG one. In this section, I will give an overview of various infinitival constructions in Alemannic in contrast to SG and postpone a detailed discussion of some of the constructions to the next two sections. This section is thus an attempt at showing how a non-standardized variant of a West Germanic language differentiates between various types of infinitival constructions.

2.1 Bare infinitives in Alemannic

2.1.1 Lexical restructuring verbs

A fact that is noted in many traditional descriptive grammars of Alemannic, such as Noth (1983) and Staedele (1927) is that bare infinitives are used in much more contexts than in SG. A few examples are given below:

(5) er probierte grad [die obere öpfel o no abehole] ALM
he tries at the moment the higher apples also PRT (to) get

(6) er versucht gerade [die oberen Äpfel auch noch zu pflücken] SG
he tries at the moment the higher apples also to get
“He tries at the moment to collect even the higher (situated) apples”

(7) etz het der doch vergesse [de Block zuemache]³ ALM
now has he PRT forgot the greenhouse close-make

(8) jetzt hat er doch vergessen [das Gewächshaus zuzumachen] SG
now has he PRT forgot the greenhouse close-to-make
“He has forgotten to close the greenhouse”

(9) woasch no wo die aagfange hond [d’schtrooss uffriisse] ALM
know-you still where they started the road up-tear

(10) weißt du noch als sie angefangen haben [die Strasse aufzurissen] SG
know-you still where they started the road up-tear
“Do you remember when they started to tear up the road?”

Note that the bare infinitival occurs in extraposed position and that this is the preferred, i.e. most natural position, according to the native speakers we consulted.

(11)? woasch no wo die [d’schtrooss uffriisse] aagfange hond ALM
know-you still where they [the road up-tear] started have
As can be seen, the type of matrix verbs are the lexical restructuring verbs whose properties will be discussed in more detail in Section 3. Further verbs that select for a bare infinitive are listed in (12):

\begin{itemize}
  \item glinge (succeed)
  \item verschtoh (know)
  \item helfe (help)
  \item heiße (order, lit. to name)
  \item afange (begin)
  \item uffhöre (stop)
  \item sich traue (dare)
\end{itemize}

So the important observation is that Alemannic allows bare infinitives in lexical environments (opc-verbs) and syntactic positions (extraposition) where SG uses a zu-infinitive. The selection of a zu-infinitive is standardly attributed to the selectional properties of these verbs, i.e. ‘status-marking’ as it is called in Bech (1955/1983) in order to draw the parallel to case-marking in the nominal domain. The question then is whether these verbs have different selectional properties in Alemannic and SG or whether the surface marking of the infinitive can be explained in other terms.

### 2.1.2 Modal verbs

Modal verbs do not occur with zu-marking, just like in SG and most of the other Germanic languages:

\begin{itemize}
  \item dass er des buch it hett welle lese
\end{itemize}

The preferred order of the infinitival verbs is as in (13), i.e. the modal verb is before the lexical verb and both are preceded by the auxiliary. This is the so-called verb raising order as it is also found in Dutch and Swiss German. Finite modal verbs can easily appear before the non-finite verb; an order which is excluded in SG, cf. (14), but again possible also in Swiss German (and Dutch):

\begin{itemize}
  \item dass er des buch it will lese
  \item dass er des buch it het welle lese
\end{itemize}

The same pattern is found in Kaiserstuhl Alemannic, cf. Noth (1993:335). Verb raising thus seems to be obligatory in Alemannic. In this context, it should also be mentioned that verb projection raising (VPR), discussed e.g. in Haegeman & van Riemsdijk (1986), is a wide-spread construction in this dialect. An example is given below. It shows that the position of the non-verbal material is rather free whereas the relative order of the verbs is constant.
(16) a. daß die hond künne die Knoche ofach uff d’Dilli uffituo ALM
    that they have can the bones simply on the attic on-do
b. daß die hond die Knoche ofach uff d’Dilli künne uffituo
   c. daß die die Knoche hond ofach uff d’Dilli künne uffituo
   d. daß die die Knoche ofach uff d’Dilli hond künne uffituo
   “…that they could simply put the bones in the attic”

I will come back to the various possibilities in this construction and its analysis in the context of extraposed bare infinitives in Section 3.4.

2.1.3 Causative and Perception verbs
These verbs basically pattern in Alemannic the same way as they do in SG, i.e. they select a bare infinitive, but again, word order is different in that the complement of the perception verb can appear in extraposed position:

(17) weil ich en geschtern gsehna ha a de Dischdecke rumschnipfle ALM
    because I him yesterday seen have at the tablecloth around-snip
    “Because I saw him yesterday snipping at the table cloth”

(18) a. dass ich ghört ha de Vater mit ebber dadrüber schwätze
    ALM
    that I heard have the father with somebody there-about talk
b. dass ich ghört ha wie de Vater mit ebber dadrüber schwätzt
   that I heard have how the father with somebody there-about talks
   “…that I heard somebody talk about it with the father”

As shown in (18b), a finite version — introduced with the complementizer wie (how) — is equally possible (just like in SG).

Interestingly, it is reported in Staedele (1927) that things are different with the causative verb lassen. This appears invariably at the end of the clause, i.e. the complement seems to be obligatorily intraposed. These facts are not completely confirmed by our informants. However, it is clearly true that the intraposed version is in this case in fact the preferred one — in contrast e.g. to the opc-verbs discussed in (5–12):

(19) a. dass se d’Kind it so gern im Garte spiele laat
    ALM
    that she the children not prt in-the garden play lets
b. *dass se d’kind it so gern im Garte laat spiele
   that she the children not prt in-the garden lets play
   c. 3dass se d’kind it so gern laat im Garte spiele
      that she the children not prt lets in-the garden play
      “that she hesitates to let the children play in the garden”
Although these data raise some interesting questions, I will not discuss the details of this construction in this paper. But note that an intraposed structure — as it is the standard in SG — is at least available and not completely excluded from the grammar.

2.1.4 * Raising constructions

An interesting fact concerning Alemannic is that the only zu-infinitive construction in SG which obligatorily constructs as coherent is completely absent: this is the raising construction with scheinen (seem). (20) illustrates the ungrammaticality of extraposition in SG:

(20) a. *weil es scheint [keinen Wein mehr zu geben]  
     weil es [keinen Wein mehr zu geben] scheint  
     because it seems no wine anymore to give  
     because it no wine anymore to give seems  
     “It seems that there is no wine left”

The impossibility of extraposition is standardly taken as a clear indication of obligatory restructuring — although the infinitival complement is marked with zu. Additionally, the raising operation itself already shows that there is no clause-boundary between the projections headed by the two verbs. Now as said, the construction does not occur in Alemannic:

(21) a. *er schiint nümme (zum) kumme  
     er kummt [schiint’s] nümme  
     he seems not-anymore to come  
     he comes seems-it no-more  

(22) a. ?es schiint [dass er nümme kummt]  
     es schiint [er kummt nümme]  
     it seems that he no-more comes  
     it seems he comes no-more  
     “He doesn’t seem to come anymore”

(21a) shows that the construction is not possible even with the — otherwise rather productive — infinitival marker zum, see Section 2.3 below. The verb scheinen exists in Alemannic, but as can be seen in (21b) it is preferably inserted as a V/1 parenthetical whereas finite complements, as illustrated in (22), seem to be marked. The other raising verbs occurring in SG (pflegen in its habitual reading and drohen in an epistemic use6) simply do not exist as lexical items in this dialect. It seems thus that the raising construction is entirely absent.
2.2 SG zu-infinitives as finite clauses

Alemannic differs also from SG in the realization of argumental clauses. Those verbs which allow only a non-coherent construction, factive and propositional verbs, accept only finite clauses.

2.2.1 Object sentences

Object sentences can be realized in both varieties as a finite clause, either introduced by a complementizer or as a V/2 clause. They differ however in the availability of an infinitival complement:

(23) er het versproche…
    he has promised
    
    dass er zittig kommt (finite, compl.)
    er kummt zittig (finite, V/2)
    *zittig kumme (infinitive)
    that he in time comes/he comes in time/to come in time

(24) er hat versprochen…
    he has promised
    
    dass er rechtzeitig kommt (finite, compl.)
    er kommen rechtzeitig (finite, V/2)
    rechtzeitig zu kommen (infinitive)

    that he in time comes/he comes in time/to come in time

“He promised to be in time”

(25) er het gseet…
    he has said
    
    dass er se gsene het (finite, compl.)
    er hei se gsene (finite, V/2, subjunctive)
    *se gsene hon (infinitive)

    that he them seen has/he has-subjunctive them seen/them seen hav-INF

(26) er behauptet…
    he claimed
    
    dass er sie gesehen hat (finite, compl.)
    er habe sie gesehen (finite, V/2, subjunctive)
    sie gesehen zu haben (infinitive)

    that he them seen has/he has-subjunctive them seen/them seen hav-INF

“He said/claims that he has seen them”
2.2.2 Subject sentences

The case is different with subject sentences. Here, infinitives are possible beside finite clauses, introduced by various complementizers:

(27) \textit{sich des merke (des) isch doch it so schwer} ALM
\textit{himself that remind (that) is \textsc{prt} not so difficult}
\textit{‘To remember that shouldn’t be that difficult’}

(28) a. \textit{es isch fürchtig wenn ma nümme lese kaa} ALM
\textit{it is horrible if one not-anymore can read}
\textit{‘It is horrible if one cannot read anymore’}

b. \textit{es isch fürchtig nümme lese künne}
\textit{it is horrible not-anymore read can}
\textit{‘It is horrible if one cannot read anymore’}

(29) \textit{es gefällt em ger it dass er um achte iis Bett muess} ALM
\textit{it likes him \textsc{prt} not that he at eight into-the bed must}
\textit{‘He doesn’t like it that he has to go to bed at eight’}

(30) \textit{um achte iis Bett mösse des gefällt em ger it}
\textit{at eight into-the bed must-inf that likes him \textsc{prt} not}
\textit{‘He doesn’t like it at all that he has to go to bed at eight’}

There is obviously a correlation between the position of the clause and its finiteness/non-finiteness. Thus, infinitives are more readily accepted in initial position than in an extraposed one. But note that a resumptive pronoun occurs in these examples. The infinitives could thus be analyzed as ‘absolutive constructions’, but I will not go further into this. What is important in the discussion here, is that in SG, these complements can be uniformly realized as \textit{zu}-infinitives:

(31) a. \textit{sich das zu merken ist doch nicht schwer} SG
\textit{himself that to remember is \textsc{prt} not difficult}

b. \textit{es ist furchtbar nicht mehr lesen zu können}
\textit{it is horrible not anymore read to can}

\textit{c. es gefällt ihm gar nicht um acht ins Bett (gehen) zu müssen}
\textit{it likes him \textsc{prt} not at eight into-th bed (go) to must}

So we see again that Alemannic uses a variety of constructions whereas SG uses a \textit{zu}-infinitive — although it must be noted that in many cases SG also allows finite clauses instead of infinitives. This is also true for the complements of propositional and factive verbs. I will come back to this issue.

2.2.3 Clauses connected to a prepositional argument

A set of data that patterns with object sentences is shown below:
   “I didn’t reckon upon it that he will call me"
   
   b. ich habe damit angefangen [regelmässig zu joggen]
   “He started with jogging regularly”

(33) a. *ich hab mit demit gerechnet [vun em aagrufe were] ALM
   “I didn’t reckon upon it that he will call me”
   
   a’. ich hab mit demit gerechnet [dass er mich aarüeft]
   “I didn’t reckon upon it that he will call me”
   
   b. *er het demit aagfange [regelmässig joggen]
   “He started with jogging regularly”
   b’. er het demit aagfange [dass er regelmässig joggt]
   “He started with jogging regularly”
   b”. er het mit’m jogge aagfange
   “He started with jogging regularly”

All the SG infinitival clauses in (32) must be realized as a finite dass-clause in Alemannic or as a nominalization introduced by a preposition, cf. (33b”). So clauses that have a correlate (i.e. damit) in the main clause cannot appear as infinitives in Alemannic, but they do in SG. Again, it should be noted that SG also allows finite clauses in these constructions. The important observation is that Alemannic only allows finite clauses.

We can make thus the following generalizations about the complementation patterns in Alemannic:

i. Complements of modals take bare infinitives
ii. Semi-lexical verbs (phase verbs, opc-verbs) take either bare infinitives or finite clauses
iii. Complements of factive and propositional verbs take only finite CPs
iv. Subject sentences occur either as bare infinitives or as finite clauses

With the exception of modals and perception verbs all these complements can be realized as zu-infinitives in SG.

2.3 Complementizer introduced infinitives

Let us now turn to those infinitival constructions which are introduced by a complementizer in Alemannic. It is known that SG lacks infinitival complementizers
in the strict sense. The only constructions that come close to one containing a complementizer-introduced CP are final/purpose clauses or infinitivals which are introduced by the prepositions *um* (in order) or *ohne* (without):

34) *er hat das Buch geschrieben [um berühmt zu werden]*

*he has the book written in-order famous to become* 
“He has written the book in order to become famous”

35) *er ging weg [ohne noch einmal zurückzublicken]*

*he went away without prt again back-to-look* 
“He went away without looking back again”

Whether the prepositions occupy the C-position or whether they head a PP to which the infinitive is adjoined is still a matter of debate. In Alemannic, these constructions are realized differently again. Both constructions are only possible with a finite clause:

36) *er het des Buch geschriebe dass/damit er berühmt wird*

*he has the book written that/there-with he famous becomes* 
“He has written the book in order to become famous”

37) *er isch weggange ohne dass er nomal zruck gluegt hett?*

*he is away-gone without that he again back looked had-subj./had-ind* 
“He went away without looking back again”

As is evident from the gloss in (37), a subjunctive form of the finite verb is nearly obligatory in this case, cf. also the examples in (25 & 26). This fits very well with an observation made by Los (1998), namely that there is a close connection between subjunctive clauses and infinitives. I will discuss this issue in detail in Section 4.

2.3.1 **Final/Purpose clauses**

With regard to final or purpose clauses, the important difference to SG is that in Alemannic these infinitive clauses are introduced by the prepositional element *zum* and that this element appears at a left peripheral position, as shown in the examples below:

38) *ich zünd jo oh ko liecht aa [zum’s unter de schemmel stelle]*

*I light prt prt no light on to-the it under the stool place* 
“I do not turn on a light in order to place it under the stool”

39) *Mr bruchet an Oszillograaf [zum dr Schbannungsvrlaüf ufzaichna]*

*we need a oscillograph to-the the tension record* 
“We need an oscillograph in order to record the tension”
In Müller (2000) these purpose constructions are discussed with respect to Swabian. In Swabian (SW), these structures can be realized with two occurrences of the prepositional particle: at the beginning of the clause — just as in the Alemannic variant — but optionally with an additional IM directly before the verb. Note that this IM is either cliticized or appears with a reduced vowel:

(40)  *I han a Auto kauft [zum des Johr noch Spania Ø/z’/zom fahra] SW  
I have a car bought to-the this year to Spain drive

The doubling of the infinitival marker is sometimes accepted by our speakers, too — however, it is felt to be a concession to the standard variety. The interesting question is then how the grammar of the IM should be formulated to account for this optionality. As I will argue below, doubling is possible because the second type of zu belongs to the morphological component and does not occupy a functional position. In that sense it does not alter the syntactic structure of the clause and thus can be borrowed easily.

2.3.2 Complements of nouns and adjectives
Modifying complements of nouns appear in SG with a zu-infinitive. These are realized in Alemannic either as a nominalization (41b) or as a finite clause (41c):

(41)  a. *er hat Angst (davor) [nass zu werden] SG  
he has fear (thereof) wet to get
b.  *er het anscht vorem nass werre ALM  
he has fear of+the wet get
b’. *er het anscht dass er nass wird  
he has fear that he will get wet
“He fears that he will get wet”

The analysis of (41b) as a nominalization is confirmed by (42), which shows that the usual restrictions on nominalizations hold, namely that only “incorporated” objects, i. e., only indefinite or unspecific NPs are allowed.

(42)  a. *er het Angscht vorem des Buech lese ALM  
he has fear of-the the book read
“He fears to read the book”
  b. *er het Angscht vorem Buecher lese; s’künnt em z’lang goh  
he has fear of+the books read it could him too long last
“He fears to read books (it could last too long for him)”

Hence for the nominalization, we can rather safely assume that the infinitive indeed has the categorial features [−V,+N] and that there are no verbal/clausal functional layers.
The type of the preposition is determined by the noun, i.e. *Angst* (fear) selects for *vor*, whereas e.g. *Ziit* (time) selects *zum*.

(43) *Ich ha koa Ziit zum schpilie*  
I have no time to-the play  
“I have no time for playing”

Now interestingly, as soon as *zum* is selected we get extended possibilities for syntactic elaboration. *Zum*-introduced infinitives show clausal behavior insofar as they can include any type of additional constituent compatible with the verb, see (44), (45). This is not possible with prepositions other than *zu*, which seem able to introduce no more than simple nominalizations, see also (46), — even though in these cases as well, the preposition is amalgamated with the definite dative determiner, as if it, too, were introducing a nominalization.

(44) *ich ha koa Luscht zum mit dir do morge anigoh*  
I have no desire to-the with you there tomorrow there-go  
“I have no desire to go to that place with you tomorrow”

(45) *ich ha koa Ziit zum mit mine Kind schpiler*  
I have no time to-the with my kids play  
“I have no time to play with my kids”

(46) *er hot koa Freud am sich mit sine Freund treffe*  
he has no pleasure at-the himself with his friends meet  
“It is not a pleasure for him to meet with his friends”

(47) *er hot koa Freud am schaffe*  
he has no pleasure at-the work-nom  
“It is no pleasure for him to work”

Prepositional complements of this type are also possible in (colloquial) SG; however, we do not find the extended possibilities with *zum* that are observed in Alemannic, cf. (44), (45). Thus it appears that *zum* in Alemannic has indeed developed into a complementizer, occupying the C⁰ position and that it is thus compatible with a clausal projection. Evidence for the complementizer status of *zum* can be taken from the following considerations:

First, *zum* occupies the C-position because nothing can appear before it although the adjunct *vu hand* can appear in other positions, cf. (48c):

(48) a. *die sell Wies war amel schwer [zum vu Hand maie]*  
the that meadow was sometimes hard to-the by hand mow  
[ALM]

b. *die sell Wies war amel schwer [vu Hand zum maie]  
[ALM]
c. *die sell Wies war amel schwer [zum maie vu hand]
   “This meadow was sometimes hard to mow by hand”

It behaves like other complementizers in that it can delete under coordination, which is not possible with the SG IM zu:

(49) a. ich ha koa Luscht [zum da anigoh] und
   I have no desire C there to-go and
   [denn nuu umeand hocke] then only around sit
   ALM

b. Ich habe keine Lust [dort hinzugehen] und
   [dann nur rum*(zu)sitzen] “I don’t want to go to this place and then merely sit around”
   SG

Another typical property of complementizers is that they can be deleted if the clause is in its base position, e.g. in English where *that can delete if it is in its canonical position but not if it is topicalized. The same behavior is found with zum:

(50) a. ich ha ko Luscht gha [zum Karte schpiele] ALM
   I have no desire had COMPL cards play

b. *ich ha ko Luscht gha [Ø Karte schpiele]  I have no desire had COMPL cards play
   SG

(51) a. ich ha ko Luscht [zum Karte schpiele] gha
   I have no desire COMPL cards play had
   ALM

b. *ich ha ko Luscht [Ø Karte schpiele] gha
   I have no desire COMPL cards play had

(52) a. [zum Karte schpiele] han ich ko Luscht gha
   COMPL cards play have I no desire had
   ALM

b. *[Ø Karte schpiele] han ich ko Luscht gha
   COMPL cards play have I no desire had
   “I have no desire to play cards”

At this point is seems safe to conclude that there is an infinitival complementizer in Alemannic which does not occur in this form in Standard German.

Sabel (1996) established the correlation that languages with an overt infinitival complementizer have the possibility of forming wh-questions with infinitives. This is impossible in SG, as has been noted in the literature. Now if Alemannic has an infinitival complementizer, we would expect that wh-infinitives are possible, and this exactly what we find:

(53) I woass it [wellem Enkele wa schenke] ALM
   I know not which grandchild what give
As can be seen, wh-infinitives are productive in this language; we find examples with two-place verbs, where both arguments are wh-marked, cf. (53), prepositional phrases, cf. (57), and dative arguments, cf. (56). Additionally, there are several types of matrix verbs.

Wh-infinitives never occur together with the complementizer *zum* (or one of its other realizations):

(58) *I ha dir doch gseet [weller Pinseal (*z'/*zum) nea]*
I have you PRF told which brush take

This complementary distribution is also found in other languages that allow wh-infinitives; see Sabel (1996) for further discussion.

One final point should be mentioned, namely that *zum* — although it is compatible with a clausal projection — can generally not be used to “imitate” the SG construction illustrated in (59a):

(59) a. *er hat Angst (davor) [nass zu werden]*
he has fear (thereof) wet to get
b. *er het Angscht davor [zum nass were]*
he has fear there-of to-the wet get
c. ?*er het Angscht [zum nass were]*
he has fear to-the wet get

“*He fears to get wet*”

(59b) is completely unacceptable, whereas (59c), i.e. the version without the correlate, seems for some speakers to be acceptable.

This is in line with the fact that some speakers occasionally accept the insertion of *zum* in the complements of opc-verbs.

(60) *ich ha vergesse zum de Block zuemache*
I have forgotten to-the the greenhouse close
However, its occurrence in this construction doesn’t seem to follow any clear pattern — as far as I can judge from the data we have collected. And since the bare version of the infinitive is always judged as grammatical in this dialect, I will neglect these data in the following. It may very well be that this is a kind of interference effect, where the SG version with a final IM is imitated by the more “usual” complementizer — but I will leave that open for the moment.

Let me summarize the results so far.

We have clear indications that nominalizations of the infinitive occur as (PP-) complements of both verbs and nouns. This is the case in both variants, i.e. Alemannic and SG. However, in Alemannic, \textit{zum} has developed into an infinitival complementizer whose occurrence seems to be restricted to non-verbal environments with a tendency to spread to further environments. The analysis of \textit{zum} as a left peripheral infinitival complementizer is corroborated by the fact that this dialect allows wh-infinitives — two phenomena which are known to correlate with each other.

2.4 Other infinitival constructions

I would like to mention in this sub-section some further infinitival constructions which are (or can be) realized as zu-infinitives in SG but have a different realization in Alemannic. The point of this section is to illustrate and corroborate the widely made observation that non-standardized variants of a language often exhibit a much more explicit marking of differing constructions.

2.4.1 The gerund

As mentioned above, Alemannic does not use \textit{zu} as an infinitival marker; instead, it uses either bare infinitives, \textit{zum}-complements or nominalizations. In addition, a finite clause seems (nearly) always to be an alternative. However there is one construction where we find a reduced version of \textit{zu}, namely \textit{z’} in Alemannic. This is the so-called gerund-construction, exemplified in (61):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(61) a.] \textit{hesch nünt z’tend?}
  \textit{have-you nothing to do}
  \textit{ALM}
  \item[(61) b.] \textit{ich suech ebbes z’essit}
  \textit{I look for something to eat}
\end{itemize}

Note that there is a different infinitive form: it has an ending with a dental stop and is thus clearly distinguished from the bare infinitive.

In SG, this construction has the same (surface) form as all the other infinitives, i.e. the infinitive is marked with \textit{zu} and the infinitival verb has the same form as in other occurrences:
(62) a. Hast du nichts zu tun?
    have you nothing to do
b. Ich suche etwas zu essen
    I look for something to eat

This construction is extensively discussed in Bayer & Brandner (2004, ms), also Brandner (2005), so I will restrict myself to some essential remarks. The most important observation is that only a restricted class of nominals can appear in this construction, i.e. so-called ‘light nouns’ like something, nothing, and measure phrases like a lot, enough, etc. Second, only active transitive verbs which can leave their direct object unprojected can be used (like eat, drink etc.). And third, the matrix predicate must come from the class of existential or intensional verbs. The construction is interpreted such that the lexical content of the verb is “transferred” to the light noun, i.e. the verb has a pure property reading and no event reading.

To account for these properties, Bayer & Brandner (2004) suggested analyzing the gerund construction as a small clause whose head is z’ and whose predicate is the infinitive. Now interestingly, Alemannic allows also a version with zum — but then (i) the usual infinitive form must be used and (ii) the semantic restrictions mentioned above do not hold anymore:

(63) ich hett gern a Schnitzel zum essit
    I had gladly a schnitzel to-the eat
    “I would like to have a schnitzel to eat”

It is possible to analyze the structure with zum as a purpose clause which is adjoined to the noun. As already shown above, Alemannic uses initial zum in purpose clauses, cf. (38,39).

This form is not available in SG and thus there is no grammatical structure for a sentence like in (63):

(64) *Ich hätte gerne ein Schnitzel zum essen
    I had gladly a schnitzel to-the eat

The important thing here is that the invariability of the infinitival marker in SG obviously reduces the range of syntactic structures available in that language

2.4.2 Motion verbs and infinitives

Another construction that supports the observation that dialects use more different forms is the so-called gi-construction, exemplified in (65)

(65) a. I gang gi schaffe
    I go gi work-infin
b. *er kummt gi em Vater helfe*
   he comes *gi* the-dat father help
   “He’s coming to help his father”

c. *mir sind schtoh blibe gi de Kind bim schpiele zuluege*
   we are stand stay *gi* the children at-the play watch
   “We stayed in order to watch the children play”

As can be seen, *gi* introduces complete infinitival sentences where all the arguments/additional phrases can occur without restrictions, i.e. it also seems to behave like a left-peripheral complementizer. However, since it can occur only with the three verbs illustrated above, it is highly restricted in lexical terms; and since its syntax slightly differs from the genuine infinitival complementizer *zum*, I will not discuss this construction any further, but see Lötscher (1993), Dobler (2002), and Brandner (in prep).

### 2.5 Summary

To summarize the findings so far, it has been demonstrated that Alemannic shows a variety of constructions where in SG a *zu*-infinitive occurs. This is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of construction</th>
<th>Standard German</th>
<th>Alemannic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opc-verb</td>
<td><em>zu-INF.</em> (finite clause)</td>
<td>bare inf. (finite clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object sentence (factive, propositional verbs)</td>
<td><em>zu-INF./finite clause</em></td>
<td>finite clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject sentence</td>
<td><em>zu-INF.</em></td>
<td>bare inf.(finite clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motion verb</td>
<td>bare/(um) … <em>zu-INF.</em></td>
<td><em>gi-INF.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gerund construction</td>
<td><em>zu-INF.</em></td>
<td><em>z’.</em>+ dental inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective, noun</td>
<td><em>zu-INF.</em></td>
<td><em>zum-INF., P+nom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final/purpose clause</td>
<td>um…<em>zu-INF.</em></td>
<td><em>zum-INF.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are of course many intersections in the realization of a non-finite complement in the two varieties; nevertheless, it is obvious that (i) Alemannic has a much wider range of different construction types than SG and (ii) that the uniformity in SG obviously does not reflect the underlying diversity of the constructions in question.
3. The structure of bare infinitives

3.1 The Problem

As shown in Section 2.1., the complements of optional coherent verbs differ (at first sight) to a great extent in the two varieties. The most important features are (i) that there is no \( \text{zu} \)-marking in Alemannic and (ii) the complement appears by preference in an extraposed position, as repeated in (66) for convenience:

\[(66)\]
\[
a. \text{woasch no wo die aagfange hond [d'schtrooss uffriisse]} \quad \text{ALM}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{know-you} & \hspace{1em} \text{still where they started} & \text{have} & \hspace{1em} \text{the road} & \text{up-tear}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
b. \text{woasch no wo die [d'schtrooss uffriisse] aagfange hond}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{know-you} & \hspace{1em} \text{still where they} & \text{the road} & \text{up-tear started} & \text{have}
\end{align*}
\]

“Do you remember when they started to tear up the road”

Extraposition is traditionally taken as one of the most important diagnostics for an incoherent, i.e. bi-clausal structure, see Bech (1955) and the adaptations in modern generative grammar, Reis (2001), Haider (1994, 2003), and explicitly in Reis & Sternefeld (2004). The general assumption is that the infinitival complement originates in a position to left of the main verb (German being an OV-language). It is then moved to the right via the syntactic rule of extraposition. This syntactic rule can apply only to ‘complete’ categories which means concretely that the infinitival complement must be a CP. Therefore we find bi-clausal behavior as soon as the complement appears to the right. As will become clear below, this is not true for Alemannic, although the infinitival complement does appear to the right of the matrix verb. What is more, the extraposed infinitives in Alemannic are not marked with the infinitival marker \( \text{zu} \) — which is again traditionally taken as (at least) a necessary condition for the clausal status of the infinitive. So the prediction concerning the Alemannic data according to the traditional analysis is that (i) because of the extraposed structure we should not detect mono-clausal behavior but (ii) lacking \( \text{zu} \), the complement should not have clausal status, so that monoclusal behavior can be expected. Hence, it seems that the Alemannic constructions contradict these — as it seems — quite established assumptions. There are two ways out:

i. the Alemannic infinitival syntax differs from SG to such a great extent that the syntax of opc-verbs in the two variants must be accounted for in a macro-variational, parametric way.

ii. the diagnostics and analysis as they are given in traditional approaches concerning the distinction between coherent/non-coherent must be revised (which will lead to a slightly different analysis for SG).
3.2 Outline of the proposal

3.2.1 The basic structure for restructuring

I will show in the following that the approach under (ii) from above is the correct one. The revised analysis for SG will solve some of the problems that are connected with the traditional analysis. In particular, I will suggest that in both varieties the basic structure with an opc-verb is a right-branching “stacked” VP; see den Dikken (1996) and Zwart (1993) for earlier suggestions along these lines within the Antisymmetry framework, developed in Kayne (1994). Due to the mobility of NPs within the clausal projection in German, the arguments of the lower VP may occur in various higher positions with subsequent (surface) reordering of the verbs. Alemannic reflects the base order of the verbs directly, such that there is basically no difference between a verb projection raising construction (involving a modal verbs) and an opc-verb construction. So I will suggest the following basic structure for the bare infinitives in Alemannic and also for the coherent constructions in SG.

\[
\text{(67)} \quad \ldots
\]

I will take v as a functional head, which licenses the thematic subject to which it assigns a theta-role. The ‘extensions’ of the lexical vP, i.e. modals, opc-verbs, and auxiliaries are also taken to be of the category v, providing a specifier position for the subject. Since they are extensions, they cannot introduce a subject of their own but instead serve as an intermediate landing site for the subject. In combination with Tense, the highest v will eventually license the subject in terms of case and agreement. This gives us the welcome result that we do not find effects of a non-obligatory control relationship in restructuring contexts; see Wurmbrand (2001:ch.5) based on Landau (2000); see also Wöllstein-Leisten (2001) for more extensive dis-
cussion. The structure proposed here calls for a control theory in terms of movement, as suggested in Hornstein (1999). I will thus take the theta-roles assigned by v to be features which are checked by the subject-NP. In case there is semantic compatibility and a temporal overlap, a subject-NP can bear more than one theta-role. This is exactly the case with opc-verbs (and modals) since the type of theta-role that these verbs assign to their subject is such that it merely “modifies” the subject-role of the thematic verb, although in a broader sense than pure modals would do because they show more lexical content. This is also what is meant with the notion of ‘semi-lexical’ verbs, namely that they do not have a full theta-grid but instead operate on an already existing one. This intuition also underlies approaches to clause union effects in terms of complex predicates where an argument structure merger operation applies, see. e.g. Rosen (1989), also Haider (1994).

That a mere VP analysis (without a position for a subject) as suggested in Wurmbrand’s work for lexical restructuring contexts is not quite adequate can be seen from the following data, involving floated quantifiers — which not only occur in modal contexts but also with lexical restructuring verbs:

(68) a. …dass se hond alle mösse homgoa
   that they have all must home-go
b. …dass se hond mösse alle homgoa
   “that they had (all) to go (all) home”

(69) a. …wo se hond probiert alle gleichzittig losrenne
   when they have tried all at-the-same-time start-run
b. …wo se hond alle probiert gleichzittig losrenne
   “…when they (all) tried (all) to start with running at the same time”

(70) a. …wo se denn hond aagfange alle rumpläre
   when they then have started all around-cry
b. …wo se denn hond alle aagfange rumpläre
   “…when they (all) started (all) to cry”

(71) a. Als die Kinder dann begonnen haben alle rumzuschreien… SG
   when the children then started have all around-to-cry
b. Als die Kinder dann doch [alle rumzuschreien] begannen…
   when the children then ptr all around-to-cry started
   “When the children all started to cry…”

(72) a. dass die Kinder vergessen haben alle das Geld mitzubringen SG
   that the children forgotten have all the money with-to-bring
b. dass die Kinder dann doch alle das Geld mitzubringen vergessen
that the children then prt all the money with-to-bring forgot
“that all the children after all forgot to bring the money with them”

Turning first to the Alemannic examples, it can be seen that in each underlying subject position a floated quantifier can show up.¹⁰ (68) is a V(P)R construction and reflects directly the order in (67).¹¹ The picture as a whole will turn out to be a bit more complex (especially in SG where it will turn out that the examples are not really decisive; I will return to that at the end of Section 4.4.4.), but what is important at the moment is the mere fact that floated quantifiers can occur within the lexical vP. Thus, we have some preliminary evidence from the distribution of floated quantifiers that there is a subject position available in the complement of lexical restructuring verbs,¹² and thus the structure in (67) with a full vP for the infinitive is justified.

I will further assume that functional heads occur invariably to the left of their complement but that lexical heads may project head-final phrases, as shown for the lexical V in the structure above. This structure will be taken as underlying all the coherent, i.e. monoclausal infinitival constructions to be discussed below.

For SG, I will assume that there is a “flip” operation, see Williams (2004) and Wurmbrand (2003), yielding the surface outcome with an intraposed structure. The flip operation can apply only if the two verbs undergoing it are adjacent in the input structure, which means concretely that SG must “empty” the lexical vP. From this I will derive the verbal cluster properties in the coherent construction.

The main evidence for the claim that (67) underlies both variants will come from the fact that both pattern alike in long passive and long scrambling constructions. This unified analysis (with only surface variation) implies that (i) the IM zu does not play a significant syntactic role in these constructions and (ii) that intraposition vs. extraposition should not be taken as a decisive factor for classifying a construction as coherent or non-coherent.

3.2.2 The dual nature of opc-verbs
First we have to make clear how opc-verbs can be characterized and where the “optionality” comes from. According to the traditional view, as developed in Bech (1955), opc-verbs are ambiguous in that they select on the one hand only for a vP (or even a smaller category) and thus show coherent behavior and on the other hand for a CP, leading to a non-coherent, bi-clausal structure. The problem for SG is that both complements look basically the same on the surface, i.e. they are both realized as zu-infinitives. And thus the two “versions” can be distinguished from each other only indirectly. That this dual nature is real can be seen by the simple fact that e.g. a verb like vergessen (forget) can indeed select for various types of complements.
Beside its implicative usage as a semi-lexical verb, in which case it selects for a vP, it can also have finite clauses as its complement, as illustrated in (73a,b).

(73) a. *er hatte vergessen [dass Maria ja immer zu spät kommt]*  
   he had forgotten that M. prt always too late comes  
   “He had forgotten that Maria is always late”

b. *er hatte vergessen [dass er schon einmal dort war]*  
   he had forgotten that he already there was  
   “He had forgotten that he had already been there”

b’. *er hat vergessen [schon einmal dort gewesen zu sein]*  
   he has forgotten already prt there been to be  
   “He has forgotten that he’d been there already”

c. *er hat vergessen [was er einkaufen sollte]*  
   he has forgotten what he buy should  
   “He has forgotten what he should buy”

It can even select for NPs, as shown in (74).\(^{13}\)

(74) a. *er hat seinen Turnbeutel vergessen*  
   he has his sport-bag forgotten  
   "He has forgotten his sport-bag"

b. *sie hat sogar sein Gesicht vergessen*  
   she has even his face forgotten  
   "She has forgotten his face"

One could argue that (74a) is an elliptical structure (*er hat seinen Turnbeutel (mitzunehmen) vergessen*; he has forgotten (to bring) his sport-bag), but such an analysis would lead to difficulties in b., since there is no non-finite verb that would be a plausible candidate to govern *Gesicht*.\(^ {14}\)

Considering in more detail the clausal complements, we can see in (73a) that *vergessen* can select for a propositional complement, as do many verbs that can c-select either for a DP or a CP (73b) shows CP-complementation with a co-referential subject, and (73b’) illustrates again the fact that a finite CP can be freely replaced by a non-finite CP. (73c) finally shows that *vergessen* can select even for wh-clauses. The ambiguity between an implicative and a factive usage of this verb is also discussed in detail in Wurmbrand (2001, ch. 5.4.1). She shows that the complement of the implicative usage corresponds to a restructuring configuration (i.e. a VP in her analysis); and the factive one to a non-restructuring CP.

The Alemannic data corroborate this distinction because Alemannic marks different types of complements in a much more explicit way than SG, as was shown in Section 2. As discussed there, Alemannic cannot replace finite complements with infinitives the way SG does. If *vergessen* selects a CP, cf. (73b’), representing a proposition with independent time reference, then we would expect that Alemannic only allows the finite version. This is indeed the case:
(75) a. *er het vergesse scho mal dürt gsii sii
   he has forgotten already prt there been be
   “He has forgotten to have been there already”

b.  er het vergesse dass er scho mol dürt gsii isch
   he had forgotten that he already there was
   “He had forgotten that he had already been there”

Hence, in Alemannic we find bare infinitives with the semi-lexical usage of an opc-verb but with finite clauses in the main verb usage. In SG, both cases can produce the same surface output in the form of a zu-infinitive; in the semi-lexical usage, because zu is inserted on the morphological level (as will be argued in more detail below), and in the main verb usage as a zu-infinitive, because SG can replace finite clauses with zu-infinitives; — a possibility which entered the syntax of SG via a different historical route, see Section 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALM</th>
<th>bare infinitive (semi-lexical)</th>
<th>finite clause (lexical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>zu-infinitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this scenario can be justified, the ambiguous behavior of opc-verbs in SG could find a natural explanation. And furthermore, since Alemannic distinguishes between coherent and non-coherent constructions overtly, we expect that the Alemannic bare infinitives show only coherent behaviour whereas the finite clauses — naturally — should show the properties that are found in the non-coherent construction.

But let us first have another look at the properties of opc-verbs. In the semi-lexical usage, it is (in general) not possible to merely change between a finite and a non-finite version of an opc-complement; instead, a modal must be inserted in order to get an equivalent interpretation, see (76). (77) shows that a finite clause is possible with versuchen only if we have identical time reference. (78), (79) illustrate that in some cases, a finite clause is not possible at all:

(76) a. weil ich vergaß ein Brot zu kaufen
   because I forgot a bread to buy

b. *weil ich vergaß dass ich ein Brot kaufe
   because I forgot that I a bread buy

c. weil ich vergaß dass ich ein Brot kaufen soll/muss
   because I forgot that I a bread buy should/must
   “because I forgot to buy a bread/that I must/should buy a bread”

(77) a. ich versuchte ihn zu erreichen
   I tried him to reach (at the phone)
(78)  a.  *ich half ihm die Wohnung zu streichen
    I helped him the flat to paint
  b.  ich half ihm dass ich/wir die Wohnung streichen
    I helped him that I/we the flat paint
  c.  ich half ihm sich zu befreien
    I helped him himself to free
  d.  *ich half ihm dass er sich befreit
    I helped him that he himself frees
  d’.  *ich half ihm dass er sich befreien kann
    I helped him that he himself free can
    “I helped him to free himself”

(79)  a.  er hat sich nicht getraut zu fragen
    he has himself not dared to ask
  b.  *er hat sich nicht getraut, dass er fragt
    he has himself not dared that he asks
    “He didn’t dare to ask”

However the detailed analysis of these examples turns out, it is obvious that the free choice between finite and non-finite clause, illustrated in (73b, b’) with the main verbs usage of *vergessen, is not available in its semi-lexical usage. This suffices to show that it is the semantic distinction between the two usages of *vergessen which determines the categorial value of their respective complement — and not some surface oriented syntactic property.

Turning briefly to modality, it seems as if its value is determined by the lexical environment, i.e. according to what seems to be the most plausible scenario, given the lexical choice of the embedded VP. Now, it is well-known that infinitives may express modality without an overt modal. The clearest cases are so-called root-infinitives with a modal interpretation:

(80)  wen fragen?
    who to ask? (who could/should one ask)

(81)  *Nicht hinauslehnen!
    not lean out (one should/must not lean out)
Here again, the value of the modality seems to be set by (discourse-) context. I won’t go further into implicit modality, see Bhatt (1999) for a general treatment of covert modality, Reis (2002, 2003), Grohmann and Etxepare (2003) on (adult) root infinitives. However, in light of these facts we can rather safely assume that in the semi-lexical usage of these verbs there is a hidden modal which has scope over the VP-complement. I will take this as further evidence for the structure postulated above, namely that modals and opc-verbs occupy the same type of position within a complex VP, whereas the main verb usage does not have an inherent relationship to modality, so that it must be expressed overtly in the embedded finite clause if an equivalent semantic interpretation is called for.

Having argued that there are good reasons to postulate a semi-lexical, modal-like character of opc-verbs, we must now show that SG zu-infinitives as complements in the semi-lexical usage behave the same way as the bare (and extraposed) infinitives in Alemannic.

3.3 Coherence properties

Let us have a look at the coherence properties of the zu-less but extraposed infinitives in Alemannic. It will turn out that they behave like monoclausal structures. It will then remain to resolve the ‘contradiction’ of mono-clausal behavior but zu-less extraposed infinitive with the SG syntax of coherent structures.

3.3.1 Long Scrambling

To begin with, there are also well-known cases in SG where the correlation does not hold between intraposition and mono-clausal structure or between extraposition and bi-clausal structure. This is called the “third construction”, also known as “long scrambling” or “remnant extraposition”, see den Besten & Rutten (1989) Broekhuis et al. (1995) for Dutch and Wöllstein-Leisten (2001) for German. Some examples are given below:

(82) a. dat Jan het boek _ probeert [t i te lezen] Dutch
   that Jan the book tries to read
   “that J. tries to read the book”

b. dass Hans das Buch _ versucht [t i zu lesen] SG
   that Hans the book tries to read
   “that H. tries to read the book”

c. dass dr Hans der Brief _ vergesse het [t i lese] ALM
   that the Hans this letter forgotten has read
   “that H. forgot to read the letter”
d. dass er mir des Buches verbote [t₁ les] ALM
   that he me-DAT this book forbidden has read
   “that he has me forbidden to read the book”

e. woasch no wo die d’Schtrooss, aagfange hond [t₁ uffriisse] ALM
   know-you still where they the road started have up-tear
   “do you remember when they started to tear up the road?”

The crucial point is that the NP, occurring in the matrix, originates in the extraposed infinitive clause which is — due to the extraposition — standardly taken to be a clausal projection. Scrambling thus should not be possible, since scrambling is clause-bound in German(ic).

So the question is how (82) can be derived. There are many suggestions in the literature about how to deal with these constructions. Suffice it to say that there are basically two approaches: One is the “traditional” one that retains a basically clausal status for the infinitival complement which is — due to the extraposition — standardly taken to be a clausal projection. Scrambling thus should not be possible, since scrambling is clause-bound in German(ic).

Wöllstein-Leisten (2001) on the other hand suggests an analysis in terms of “projective grammar”, see Haider (1993). This means that there is a unification process at the level of argument structure such that the complex verb (consisting of the main verb and the embedded infinitive) projects the argument positions of both predicates in the syntax.

However, in Haider’s work, this unification process requires adjacency between the two verbs (verb clustering), which is not necessarily found in the third construction:

(83) dass Hans das Buch nun versucht [zu hause t₁ zu lesen] SG
   that Hans the book now tries at-home to read
   “that Hans now tries to read the book at home”

Wöllstein-Leisten (2001:253) attributes the possibility of extraposition (of the infinitive) to the presence of zu: zu-marked infinitives are functionally complete, in the sense that they can license their internal arguments of their own, whereas bare infinitives can not and thus have to unify with their matrix verb; the formation of the verbal cluster is thus forced in the case of a bare infinitive but not with
a zu-infinitive. However, zu-marking is not required in Alemannic. Nevertheless, we find the same phenomena. This again casts serious doubt on the assumption that it is zu-marking which plays the crucial part in licensing the extraposition.

In sum, we have seen that the third construction is expected to occur and does not pose a problem if we follow the hypothesis that a bare infinitive in Alemannic corresponds to a coherent construction in SG, — despite extraposition and zu-marking.

3.3.2 Long Passive
In this section I will consider long passive which — as mentioned in the introduction — is taken as one of the most convincing diagnostics for coherence.18

I will first present the examples and their analyses and then present the Alemannic data which — as will become clear presently — raise some further issues.

(84) a. weil der Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde
   because the-nom tractor to repair tried was
   SG

   b. weil den Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde
   because the-acc tractor to repair tried was

(85) a. weil versucht wurde den-acc Traktor zu reparieren
   "They tried to repair the tractor"

   b. * weil versucht wurde der-nom Traktor zu reparieren

(86) a. den-acc Traktor zu reparieren wurde versucht
   "They tried to repair the tractor"

   b. * der-nom Traktor zu reparieren wurde versucht

According to Wurmbrand (2001), the structure for (84a) is something like the following:

(87)

The infinitival complement consists only of a VP, and since the matrix verb is passivized there is no possibility for the DO to be assigned accusative. Instead, the T-head of the matrix will take the object of the embedded VP as its subject.
(85) is the extraposed version and as one can see, nominative is not possible. The easiest way to account for this is a structure like (88) where the infinitive is of the category CP. There is a clause boundary between the matrix clause and the infinitive, and thus no case-relationship can be established, as illustrated in the simplified structure in (88):

\[
\begin{align*}
(88) & \\
 & \text{VP} \\
 & \text{VP CP/TP/vP} \\
 & t_i \underset{\text{versucht}}{\text{V}} \text{ PRO den Traktor zu reparieren wurde}
\end{align*}
\]

In this case, only accusative can appear which fits very well with the more enriched structure. According to common assumptions, this is at least a vP, since then the subject of the clause, i.e. PRO can be assigned nominative (or whatever special case is assigned to PRO) and this is a precondition for accusative to occur, cf. Burzio’s Generalization. The assumption that two different structures are necessary (i.e. one a coherent and the other non-coherent) to account for this pattern, is shared by nearly all researchers; be their analysis in terms of a unified projection base, see Haider (2003), or in terms of different subcategorization frames, as in Wurmbrand’s analysis.

Turning to Alemannic, we can see that the long passive facts are the same as in SG; but — as expected — the infinitival complement occurs to the right of the matrix verb and the infinitive is a bare infinitive; crucially, this is also true in the case where the complete infinitive is extraposed, cf. (89c):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(89) a. } & \text{der wagge iisch it amol } [t_i \text{ flicke}] \text{ probiert wore ALM} \\
& \text{the car is not even fix tried was} \\
\text{b. } & \text{der wagge iisch it amol probiert wore [t_i flicke].} \\
& \text{the car is not even tried was fix} \\
\text{c. } & \text{es iisch it amol probiert wore [der wagge flicke]} \\
& \text{it is not even tried was the car fix} \\
& \text{“They even didn’t try to fix the car” (passive)}
\end{align*}
\]

Alemannic does not distinguish morphologically between accusative and nominative on nouns, so we must rely on agreement between the subject and the finite verb, in order to guarantee that it is not a case of long scrambling (where the moved NP keeps its case marking).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(90) a. } & \text{weil die wichtige Brief vergesse wore sind [t_i lese] ALM} \\
& \text{because the important letters forget were are read} \\
& \text{“because they forgot to read the important letters” (passive)}
\end{align*}
\]
(90) is a clear case of long passive, since it is the passivized verb (*forget*) that agrees with the plural noun, which is the argument of the embedded verb (*read*) but evidently the surface subject of the passivized verb.

As just mentioned, in all the Alemannic cases, the infinitive is realized as a bare infinitive. This indicates — according to the hypothesis suggested here — that in all these cases we have a coherent construction, i.e. the infinitive is of the category vP. However, as was just discussed for SG, the occurrence of accusative is standardly taken to indicate an incoherent construction, whereas the occurrence of nominative implies a coherent construction. Thus, there are apparently two different underlying structures, which runs counter the Alemannic data. So let us have a closer look at the construction and see whether there are other possibilities to account for the observed patterns.

A first observation is that Alemannic and SG behave alike as soon as the infinitival clause is extraposed with the argument contained in it:

(91) a. dass vergesse wore isch die Brief lese
    that forget was-passive is the letters read
b. * dass vergesse wore sind die Brief lese
    that forget was are the letters read

(92) a. dass vergessen wurde die Briefe zu lesen
    that forget was the letters to read
b. * dass vergessen wurden die Briefe zu lesen
    that forget were the letters to read

“that they forgot to read the letters”

In this case, the DO *die Briefe* stays in its base position and can or must obviously be assigned accusative case there. This does not pose a problem if the proposed structure above is correct, since the category of the embedded infinitive is vP and accusative is thus available. The matrix then has to be analyzed as an impersonal passive — which is an option in German (as well as in Alemannic). So we find accusative in the embedded infinitive, although the structure itself consists essentially only of one clause, but with a rather complex structure for the verb phrase. The question then is how long passive, i.e. nominative assignment, can ever occur if vP can satisfy the case requirements of the argument inside the infinitive. If the Alemannic data are interpreted correctly, to the effect that bare infinitives indicate a coherent construction in all cases, and if the parallel behavior of these constructions in SG can be taken as reflecting the same type of category, then this amounts to saying that the movement of the DO is not case driven, as it is assumed explicitly in Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2005). The occurrence of nominative on the DO in the long passive construction must then be accounted for in a different way.
And this is exactly what I would like to suggest: nominative assignment in the long passive is not due to regular case alternation in the passive construction in simple clauses but rather to an exceptional rule, marking a structurally case marked DP with nominative as soon as it is in its case domain, as will be elaborated below. This may, of course, seem objectionably uneconomical for the grammar, but the ‘exceptionality’ of this rule can eventually account for the attested speaker variation that occurs with this construction: from acceptance to complete rejection, and even to acceptance of the accusative in the higher position, see Wöllstein-Leisten (2001), see also below.

But let us first have a closer look at the further possibilities of an outcome of this clause. Consider (93) from SG (a-d) and Alemannic (e-h). I have chosen for Alemannic a version where the DO is questioned, since these forms are much more readily accepted:

(93) a. *dass die Briefe vergessen wurden zu lesen
   that the letters forgotten were to read

b. *dass die Briefe vergessen wurde zu lesen
   that the letters forgotten was to read

c. dass die Briefe zu lesen vergessen wurde
   that the letters to read forgotten was

d. *dass die Briefe zu lesen vergessen wurden
   that the letters to read forgotten were
   “that they forgot to read the letters (passive)”

e. welle Brief sind vergesse wore lese
   which letters are forgotten was-part read

f. *welle Brief isch vergesse wore lese
   which letters is forgotten was-part read

g. *welle Brief lese isch vergesse wore
   which letter read is forgotten was-part

h. *welle Brief lese sind vergesse wore
   which letters read are forgotten was-part
   “Which letters did they forget to read? (passive)”

(93a) is a combination of long passive and long scrambling, i.e. the DO of the embedded infinitive occurs as a nominative in the matrix and the infinitive itself is extraposed. The matrix verb is passivized and as one can see from the agreement pattern, the “scrambled” DO serves as the subject of the matrix. (93b) shows that nominative assignment is nearly obligatory, i.e., this version shows that long scrambling into the matrix clause without a change of case is judged as very marginal. In (93c), the infinitival clause is intraposed, and the DO is marked accusative, but a nominative is also possible as shown in (93d). As one can see from the
judgements, there is an amount of variation which is not expected if it were a pure matter of case theory and constituent structure. I will come back to this below.

In Alemannic we find the same contrast (and the same uncertainty in judgements) as in SG. As shown in (g,h), topicalization of an infinitival seems to be rather bad in Alemannic, but nevertheless the contrast in terms of agreement holds.

In Alemannic we find basically the same contrast as in SG. As shown in (g,h), topicalization of an infinitival seems to be generally marked in Alemannic, but nevertheless the contrast in terms of agreement holds. As for the clear-cut contrast between (93e,f), see below.

The pattern can be summarized schematically as follows:

\[(94) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \ldots \text{V}_{\text{matr-pass}} \quad \ldots \text{NP}_{\text{nom/acc}} \text{V}_{\text{inf}} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \ldots \text{NP}_{\text{nom/acc}} \text{V}_{\text{matr-pass}} \quad \ldots \text{V}_{\text{inf}} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \ldots \text{NP}_{\text{nom/acc}} \text{V}_{\text{inf}} \quad \ldots \text{V}_{\text{matr-pass}}
\end{align*}\]

(94a) is the schema for the examples in (91) and (92) with the nominative excluded. (94b) corresponds to (93b) and (94c) represents (preliminarily) the examples in (93c,d). How can we interpret this pattern? First of all, according to the traditional analysis, (94b) with accusative should be fine. It would be a simple case of long scrambling, i.e. the infinitive is a TP or vP which is transparent for movement but functionally complete, such that accusative can be assigned to the DO. On this account, case marking happens in the extraposed constituent, and then the (optional) scrambling operation applies. However, as can be seen, nominative seems to be the preferred option, although the contrast is not as strong as one would expect if it were purely a matter of case theory.

A similar problem arises with (94c): nominative marking should be the only outcome if it were true that intraposition indicates a coherent, i.e. a mono-clausal structure. But as can be seen, accusative is the preferred option in this case. Now note that (94c) is ambiguous between a representation where the NP stays in its base position, i.e. adjacent to the infinite verb with the NP in the matrix clause.

We can distinguish between these two representations if we topicalize the infinitive with the NP. The prediction is that the accusative is acceptable, whereas nominative (and thus agreement with the finite verb) should be much worse because in this case the topicalized material is no longer a constituent, the NP having moved out of the infinitive. This is indeed what we find, cf. (95a):

\[(95) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{die Briefe zu lesen wurde/wurden vergessen} & \text{SG} \\
& \quad \text{the letters to read was/were forgotten} \\
\text{b.} & \quad zu lesen wurde/wurden die Briefe vergessen \\
& \quad to read was/were the letters forgotten \\
\text{c.} & \quad die Briefe wurde/wurden zu lesen vergessen \\
& \quad the letter was/were to read forgotten
\end{align*}\]
(95b) — although somehow dubious in its general status — shows that if only the infinitive is topicalized the accusative is rather bad. If only the NP is topicalized, cf (95c.), we see that accusative is completely ruled out. Compare this with the judgements for the Alemannic data in (93e,f) where topicalization took place already because of wh-marking.

So we can revise (94c) as shown in (94c', d):

(94)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c'} & \quad \ldots [\text{NP}_{\text{nom/acc}} \text{V}_{\text{inf}}] \quad \text{V}_{\text{matr-pass}} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \ldots \text{NP}_{\text{nom/acc}} [\ldots \text{V}_{\text{inf}}] \quad \text{V}_{\text{matr-pass}}
\end{align*}
\]

Considering then this revised pattern, the generalization is as follows: as long as the DO is in the domain of the infinitive, it bears accusative case, and as soon as it is undoubtedly in the domain of the finite matrix verb, it bears nominative.

This does of course not exclude the possibility that in SG the infinitive can be of the category CP, in those cases where only accusative can occur. In that case CP would be a barrier for the movement of the DO and thus nominative marking could never occur for independent reasons: it would involve movement of a DP across a CP to a final target position that is not a Spec-CP; i.e. we can exclude it as a case of improper movement. So examples like the following do not necessarily show that if nominative is not possible, we have a non-coherent structure. They only show that — if there is a non-coherent construction, motivated by independent diagnostics like e.g. independent time reference as in the example below, see Wurmbrand (2001:276) — then the DO cannot bear nominative. The presence of the time adverbial indicates that the infinitival clause has a tense specification of its own, implying that it is of a higher (clausal) category.

(95) dass dem Kind nur Kekse (*morgen) zu essen erlaubt wurden SG
that the-DAT child only cookies (tomorrow) to eat allowed were

As expected, Alemannic allows only a finite construction in this case:

(96) a. *dass em Kind nuu Keks erlaubt worre sind morge esse ALM
that the child only cookies allowed Aux-pass are tomorrow eat

b. dass em Kind erlaubt worre isch dass es morge nuu Keks
that the child allowed Aux-pass is that it tmr. only cookies
esse derf
eat may

But the important point is that this implication does not hold in the reverse order: namely that in each case where we find only accusative, we have a non-coherent construction.

To summarize, there is no clear evidence that two different categories of the infinitive are necessary in order to account for the pattern in (94) in SG. The evidence...
from Alemannic points rather to the conclusion that there is a vP in both cases. I will thus conclude that (92a) and, in particular, (93a) show a coherent construction. The question then is how we can account for the observed case patterns without (i) necessarily relying on different input structures and (ii) without giving up the conclusion that accusative is available within the infinitive, given that it is of the category vP, and thus not dependent on the case assignment of the matrix verb.

The grammatical status of long passive and long scrambling has been a matter of debate since it was first discussed in Höhle (1978). Whereas Höhle himself judges only the cases with versuchen (try) as grammatical, other speakers seem to be much more liberal in that they accept it with many more (opc) verbs. There is no doubt that is used in spoken language and that native speakers have intuitions about it. Additionally, the construction can be found in written texts, especially in newspapers — as has been found out by M. Bader and T. Schmid (p.c.) in an examination of the COSMAS corpus.

Wöllstein-Leisten (2001), in her in-depth discussion of the third construction in German, tested its acceptance in a questionnaire study and it turned out that around 80 percent of the informants accepted it as such — with the exception of versuchen, which was accepted by 100 percent of the informants. In the combination with long passive they generally preferred nominative on the DO, but in some cases, accusative was equally acceptable. This variation in speakers’ judgements of long passive has been reported by many researchers, and it should make us cautious about taking long passive as an absolutely regular construction of the grammar.

Reis & Sternefeld (2004) dubbed the construction as “extragrammatical”. One reason for this epithet is that passivization of an opc-verb should turn the infinitive (which is in complementary distribution with a DO of the respective verb) into a subject and as such it should be an island for extraction. They argue that the construction should be ungrammatical from the beginning. It is therefore exceptional (i.e. rare, unstable, and unproductive). The essential claim is that, however ill-formed, a long passive construction (i.e. with nominative assigned to the moved constituent) seems nevertheless to be the best outcome for this marked construction.

A final piece of evidence for the assumption that long passive should be treated in another component than syntax proper is discussed in Bayer et al. (2005). They observed in a questionnaire study that the version with nominative marking is nearly always preferred if the infinitive is intraposed. That means that the judgements in (93c and d) would be reversed. Bayer et al. attribute this effect to parsing strategies which (i) try to integrate encountered material into a clausal structure as soon as this is possible and (ii) that no vacuous structure is built. These strategies have the effect that if a (case-markable) NP occurs within the domain of a case assigning head (matrix T in this case), it will be integrated into this structure. Since there is no other NP occurring in the rest of the construction which could
compete for nominative, it is not necessary to revise this parse. The second parsing strategy accounts for the effect that nominative is preferred over accusative in the intraposed construction because accusative assignment involves (in their analysis) a non-coherent construction, i.e. a clausal projection which would involve more (vacuous) structure. In sum, nominative assignment in the long passive construction can equally well be analyzed as an effect of a parsing strategy and not of the syntax proper.

Following this track, I suggest that the assignment of nominative in the long passive construction is thus a kind of “repair strategy” of the grammar, in the sense that all other possible outcomes would lead to an even less acceptable situation. A construction with an accusative marked NP, occurring in the domain of a potentially nominative assigning head (T in the passivized clause), is much more offending than a nominative assigned to the “wrong” NP, i.e. the scrambled DO, belonging to the embedded infinitive.

So what we need is a slight extension of the configurations where T can assign nominative to a NP. Let us assume the following:

\[(98) \quad T\text{ can exceptionally case-mark an NP iff}
\]
\[\begin{align*}
&i. \quad \text{NP does not bear inherent case} \\
&ii. \quad \text{NP is not included in a projection of a v}
\end{align*}\]

(i) guarantees that e.g. a dative marked NP keeps it case if moved to the matrix. (ii) accounts for the case where the DO stays in its base position. Recall that I assumed that the category of a coherent infinitive is vP and thus the DO is ‘protected’ by v. Since there is no little v in the matrix (because of the passivization), it is ensured that only if the DO moves out of its vP and adjoins to the matrix VP, it will be assigned nominative by this exceptional rule.

In sum, this slight extension of configurations in which case can be assigned, gives us the correct results, and it is not necessary to postulate a different categorial status for the infinitival complement in the context of long passive and long scrambling. Instead, we have in all cases a vP — which is transparent for scrambling — but only if the DO moves out of the vP, it will be assigned nominative. This is in accordance with the Alemannic data where we find a bare infinitive in all those cases.

A last fact should be discussed now; namely that the topicalization of a verbal cluster leads inevitably to nominative assignment — a fact which is taken by many as clear evidence that in the coherent construction (which is always connected with a verbal cluster), nominative assignment is obligatory:

\[(99) \quad \text{zu lesen vergessen wurden/*wurde die Briefe (dann doch)} \quad \text{SG}
\]
\[\begin{align*}
to \quad \text{read forgotten were/was} \\
\text{the letters (in the end)}
\end{align*}\]
Now as already indicated, the flip operation (a precondition for forming a verb cluster, see below) can apply only if the two verbs are adjacent. This means concretely that the DO must move out of its vP and will thus be assigned nominative by the mechanism described above. This gives the same result as the traditional approach. The only difference is that here, the occurrence of nominative, i.e. the obligatory movement to a higher domain, is the precondition for forming the cluster, whereas in other approaches, cluster formation is the triggering factor for nominative assignment.

In sum, an analysis of the various outcomes of long scrambling and long passive as sketched above can handle the data without appealing to categorial differences of the infinitival complements of opc-verbs (in their semi-lexical usage). This is a welcome result, since it is a priori implausible that a verb subcategorizes for different types of complements, depending on the position in which the complement occurs. We will come back to the possible CP-complementation of these verbs, but note that a CP-analysis can hardly capture the data where long passive and long scrambling are combined. At this point we have clear evidence that in the cases discussed so far, only vP complementation is involved. This is corroborated by the fact that Alemannic uses a bare infinitive in all the discussed cases.

3.4 Verbal clusters and the ordering of verbs

The existence of verbal clusters that can be topicalized is traditionally taken as one of the clear indications that the verbs in question form a coherent construction.

(100) zu reparieren gelungen ist ihm der Wagen nicht
     to repair succeeded is him the car not
     “He did not succeed in fixing the car”

(101) a. ?? [flicke glunge] isch em der wagge it
     fix succeed is him the car not
     b. *[glunge flicke] isch em der wagge it
     succeed fix is him the car not
     “He did not succeed in fixing the car”

(102) a. ?? [fuechse verstande] het er si mama immer guet
     annoy managed has he his mother always well
     b. *[verstande fuechse] het er si mama immer guet
     managed annoy has he his mother always well
     “He always knew how to annoy his mother”

As shown by the data in (101), (102), a topicalized verbal cluster is generally rejected in Alemannic. The a.-versions are acceptable in SG, as is well-known, and they
are taken to show that the verbs form a (syntactic) unit in coherent structures, see e.g. Haider (2003) for a detailed examination. Why are these structures excluded in Alemannic? If the analysis I have given above is correct, then it is the Alemannic pattern that is expected: since the verbs are the heads of their respective vPs, topicalization of a “verbal cluster” would require the simultaneous movement of (at least) two heads to Spec-CP. This is generally ruled out in V/2 constructions. The question is then rather: why is topicalization of a cluster possible in SG? As already said, I will assume the same (right-branching) underlying structure for SG as for Alemannic, with the sole difference that there is a “flip”-operation between the matrix verb and the embedded infinitive. So let us consider this operation and its preconditions more closely. I rely here on suggestions made in Williams (2004) and Wurmbrand (2003).

Note that there is no movement of the VP to a specifier position of the higher verb but merely a reordering of the head and its complement. As such it is an operation that does not alter the syntactic configuration, i.e. the hierarchic structure — nor is it part of a derivation that leaves traces (or copies). This is a welcome result, since — as seen in the comparison between Alemannic and SG — the position of the complement is obviously not the relevant factor for coherent behavior in terms of long passive and long scrambling. Furthermore, as is pointed out in Wurmbrand (2003), there is no difference in semantic interpretation between flipped and non-flipped versions. In any case, we must now motivate this kind of operation and work out the precise conditions under which it can apply.

3.4.1 Adjacency between the verbs
As was shown in (101) and (102), Alemannic does not allow the topicalization of verbal clusters with opc-verbs; however, clusters are possible with modal and phase verbs. Note that the order must be inverted just as in the SG cases with opc-verbs:

(104) a. *mösse schaffe hond se scho
   must-INF work have they PRT
   ALM
b. schaffe mösse hond se scho
   work must-INF have they PRT
   “They had to work indeed”
(105)  a. *aafange schaffe sott ma
begin work-INF should one
b. schaffe aafange sott ma
work-INF begin should one
c. aafange mit schaffe sott ma
begin with work should one
“One should start working”

The order in (105c), i.e. the base order, is possible if the complement consists of a nominalized verb introduced by an appropriate preposition. But here we can safely assume that this is not a verbal cluster in the strict sense; rather, it is the topicalization of a complete VP. So let us consider the various outcomes of modal constructions more closely. Below, I have given all the possible reorderings of a modal verb selecting a transitive verb. As can be seen, the possibility of reordering depends on whether the argument intervenes between the verbs to be “flipped”.

(106) shows the basic, unmarked order, which is an instance of Verb Projection Raising:

(106) dass er het mösse sin Bua abhole
that he has must his son pick-up
“that he had to pick up his son”

a. dass er het mösse sin Bua abhole
   dass er sin Bua mösse abhole
   dass er sin Bua het mösse abhole
   (base order: all intermediate positions are available)
b. dass er sin Bua het abhole mösse
   dass er het sin Bua abhole mösse
   * dass er het abhole sin Bua mösse
   (flip between V and MOD if nothing intervenes)
c. ? dass er sin Bua mösse het abhole
   * dass er mösse sin Bua het abhole
   ? dass er mösse het sin Bua abhole
   (flip between AUX and MOD)
d. ?? dass er sin Bua mösse abhole het
   * dass er mösse sin Bua abhole het
   * dass er mösse abhole sin Bua het
   (flip between a simple head and a complex vP, consisting of two non-flipped verbs)
e. dass er sin Bua abhole het mösse
   * dass abhole sin Bua het mösse
   * dass abhole het sin Bua mösse
   (main VP fronted)
The structures where the main verb appears in the first position, i.e. either a V3-V2-V1 (f) order or a V3-V1-V2 (e), can be analyzed as involving a fronting operation of the whole VP, see also Wurmbrand (2003).\(^{30}\)

Considering these data, we can state the following generalization:

i. a flip between two verbs can apply iff there is no overt material intervening between the two verbs.

ii. the operation applies (preferably) from the lowest pair in a successive way.

The second condition is meant to account for (d), which is highly marked but nevertheless not completely unavailable, as is evident from the contrast that results if some other material intervenes, see also Schmid & Vogel (2004), who describe such cases.\(^{31}\) Thus, to treat these cases on a post-syntactic level seems to be more adequate than on a syntactic level that would rule out this order for principled reasons, see e.g. Barbiers (2004, to appear) for a syntactic approach to reordering. On the post-syntactic level, this variation can be captured by language or dialect-specific precedence rules, as formulated explicitly in Williams (2004).

Judging from the data above, it seems reasonable to assume that a flip-operation can only apply if the verbs in question are adjacent from the beginning (in the sense that there is no overt material between them). In Alemannic, this operation can apply to constructions with modals; in SG it applies also to opc-verbs. That there are such language specific restrictions seems to be a property of this kind of operation, see Williams (2004), and in this sense, it is in fact micro-variation. After flipping, the verbal cluster can then be the input to topicalization. This means concretely that the vP of an opc-verb must be emptied in SG before the operation applies, cf. the discussion surrounding the long passive. Note finally that with the base structure that I proposed for both variants, namely the right-branching one, it is not necessary to assume a language-specific condition that specifies whether the maximal projection of a verb can be input to the operation or not. In Williams (2004) approach this must be stated explicitly in order to allow for Verb Projection raising, because he assumes an underlying verb-final order for West-Germanic. In the formulation here, VPR is basic and thus does not need any ‘special treatment’.

3.4.3 Consequences of the flip-operation

Now note that the inverted structure leads to a configuration where the two (or three) verbs are adjacent and in a reversed order. Simultaneously, the arguments of both the matrix verb and the embedded verb are linearly adjacent. This gives f. \(dass \text{ er } \sin \text{ Bua } \abhole \mösset \het\) V MOD AUX

* \(dass \text{ er } \abhole \sin \text{ Bua } \mösset \het\)

* \(dass \text{ er } \abhole \mösset \sin \text{ Bua } \het\)

(main VP fronted, flip between AUX and MOD)
rise to highly ambiguous structures; a situation which leads, according to Haider (2003), to severe parsing difficulties, since we have essentially a center-embedding structure. The problem is solved by forming a verbal complex, i.e. the complexity is shifted to the local domain of the verbal cluster with the arguments located in the matrix. This avoids a center-embedding structure, which is more parser-friendly. In that sense, clustering is a side effect of the flipping operation.

In sum, the flipping operation forms a configuration which leads to parsing problems. These are resolved by cluster formation, as proposed in Haider (2003). This clustering then leads to a re-bracketing and the phrase built by this operation can then be input to topicalization.32

Inevitably the question arises as to why the flipping operation takes place at all if it leads to parsing difficulties which in turn require an additional “repair” operation? I can give no ultimate answer to this, but a look at the historical development of infinitival complement structures in German may help.

3.4.4 Some diachronic considerations

Askedal (1998:242ff) examined the “Predigten von Berthold von Regensburg”, a text written in Middle High German, w.r.t. to diagnostics for the coherent construction. It turned out that e.g. in 3-verb constructions only a small minority of examples (2 out of 19) exhibited the “modern” German order, see the examples in (107, 108) whereas the others display either the Alemannic order or a mixed version, with the main verb (phrase) intraposed but with the finite verb preceding the infinitive.

\[
V^3 - V^2 - V^1 \ (10.5\%)
\]

(107) \textit{die zît, die dû ze brennen verdienet hâst}
the time that you to burn earned have
“The time you deserve to burn (in hell)”

(108) \textit{Sit er uns sô genzlichen z’erkenne gegeben hât übel und guot}
since he us completely to recognize given has evil and good
“Since he showed us to distinguish between good and evil”

\[
V^1 - V^2 - V^3 \ (26.3\%)
\]

(109) \textit{daz ir iuch hundertstunt ê woltet lâzen toeten}
that you-pl-nom you-pl-dat hundred-hours prt wanted let kill

\[
V^3 - V^1 - V^2 \ (63.2\%)
\]

(110) \ldots, \textit{die bekêrt suhn werden}
who converted shall pass.-aux
“who shall be converted”

All rights reserved
In constructions with two verbs, we find both orders, the V1–V2 order being slightly preferred.

Similar findings are reported from Early New High German (eNHG), see Ebert (1976), although the number of examples showing V3–V2–V1 seems to be rising. Hence, this ordering is a rather new development, and — as discussed at length above — it obviously did not evolve in Alemannic and many other West Germanic dialects. The patterns seem to be as follows: the lexical (main) verb appears in final position within its phrase; however, the lexical vP itself is mobile and can surface at another place. Auxiliaries, modals, and opc-verbs seem to insist on their relative ordering, and they still do in many dialects. For example, the AUX-MOD order remains stable over a very long period.

Thus, the variation we find between the West-Germanic contemporary dialects and their various historical stages, and finally the fact that the (rather) strict V3–V2–V1 order in Modern SG is a relatively new development, cast serious doubt on the assumption that West Germanic is strictly OV. This means that the V3–V2–V1 order does not necessarily reflect the underlying hierarchical structure, illustrated in (111), and that the other orders are derived. Instead, the order in (111) seems to be the derived one, resulting from a extra-syntactic flipping operation.

\[
(111) \quad \text{AuxP} \quad \text{ModP} \quad \text{Aux} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{Mod} \quad \text{lexical V}
\]

Given that the flipping rule is not obeyed in many dialects (and over long periods of time in the history of German), the idea that the obligatory application of the flipping operation was acquired under the pressure of prescriptive grammars seems plausible. This is corroborated by Biener’s remark (1922:174)\textsuperscript{33} that the final positioning of the finite verb in dependent clauses is…

“ein verdienst der theoretischen grammatik und der schuldisciplin …, wie sie im 17. Jh. betrieben wurde”
(due to theoretical grammar and school teaching, …, as it was practiced in the 17. century)

Evidently, grammarians were aware that the SG ordering is a kind of “artefact”, and that it does not reflect the “natural” order.
To close this section on extraposition and coherence, it has been shown that intraposition vs. extraposition of an infinitive does not play the crucial role with respect to coherent behavior, that has been claimed for it by Bech (1955) and many others. A slight extension of the configurations which allow nominative assignment has lead to an analysis of long passive and long scrambling which reveals them to be coherent constructions in all those cases where no independent factor forces a non-coherent analysis. This is corroborated by the Alemannic data, which make an overt morpho-syntactic distinction between bare (coherent) infinitives and clausal arguments (finite in Alemannic, non-coherent in SG).

The strict order in the verbal cluster in SG seems to result from prescriptive rules rather than from an independently motivated syntactic difference between SG and Alemannic (and other dialects). The “obligatory” flipping operation leads to a structure which is not parser-friendly and thus we can interpret the strong coherent properties (i.e. the verbal cluster) as a side-effect of this operation.

4. The distribution and function of zu in SG

This section examines the status of the IM zu more closely. Recall that it is standardly claimed that zu-marking seems to be a necessary condition for extraposition — a claim which has been shown above not to be valid for Alemannic. Instead, I suggested that the infinitive in Alemannic is in its base-position, in a right-branching (extended) vP, and that only in SG — due the (nearly) obligatoriness of the flipping rule — the impression may arise that there is indeed movement of the infinitive to the right.

Nevertheless, there exists a pattern from a few verbs in contemporary German that allow either a bare infinitive or a zu-infinitive that seem to indicate that zu-marking correlates with the position. The general consensus among scholars is that the extraposed version requires zu-marking, whereas the intraposed one allows both variants, cf. the following pattern, cited after Askedal (1998):

(112) a. als er Russisch sprechen lernte
when he Russian speak learned intraposed, bare
b. *als er lernte Russisch sprechen
when he learned Russian speak extraposed, bare
c. als er Russisch zu sprechen lernte
when he Russian to speak learned intraposed, with zu
d. als er lernte Russisch zu sprechen
when he learned Russian to speak extraposed, with zu

“When he learned to speak Russian”
However, Bech (1955) himself pointed out that there are examples in the literature where a bare infinitive can occur in extraposed position. He attributes this to an old, archaic style, although the examples are clearly New High German:

(113) *wer mich geheißen hätte, die Türe öffnen*
who me told had the door open
“Who would have told me to open the door”

(114) *daß wir doch lernten, vor allem aushalten und nicht urteilen*
that we yet learned before all wait and not judge
“That we yet learned before all to wait and not to judge”

(115) *wir wollen helfen, die Unterdrückung enden*
we want help the suppression end
“We want help to end the suppression”

(116) *venit mulier de Samaria haurire aquam*  
Quam tho uuib ton Samariu sceffen uuažžar  
came there woman from Samaria scoop water  (Tatian, John 4)  
“There came a woman from Samaria to scoop water”

(117) *venerunt circumcidere puerum et vocabant eum nomine patris eius Z.*  
quämun zi bisnidanne thaz kind, namtun inan sines fater namen Z.  
came (they) to circumcise the child (and) named it after his father’s name  
Zacharias  (Tatian L. 1,59 (4.11))

On the other hand, as has been noted in the literature, *zu*-marking is not a sufficient condition for extraposition. Recall that the infinitival complement of the raising verb *scheinen* is also marked with *zu* — even obligatorily — but it can nevertheless not extrapose, see Section 2.34.

Given this variation and in light of the Alemannic data and the discussion in the previous section, we have to ask whether the correlation between *zu*-marking and extraposition should be treated as a structurally based distinction between two different constructions or whether it should rather be described as a “surface variation” in a sense yet to be clarified.

4.1 Free variation?

We know from from Old High German (OHG) that there was a long period in which *zu*-marking with the verbs under discussion was optional, see e.g. Demske (1995, 2001), and Reis (2001). We even find some ‘minimal pairs’, i.e. constructions with the same matrix verb, where one sentence shows *zu*-marking and the other does not. Note that the data are from the same author:

(116) *venit mulier de Samaria haurire aquam*  
Quam tho uuib ton Samariu sceffen uuažžar  
came there woman from Samaria scoop water  (Tatian, John 4)  
“There came a woman from Samaria to scoop water”

(117) *venerunt circumcidere puerum et vocabant eum nomine patris eius Z.*  
quämun zi bisnidanne thaz kind, namtun inan sines fater namen Z.  
came (they) to circumcise the child (and) named it after his father’s name  
Zacharias  (Tatian L. 1,59 (4.11))
On the other hand, Ebert (1976) cites examples from eNHG where *zu*-marking can be found even in the complements of modal verbs:

(120) **Item Maria bedorfft nit in Tempel zegon zereinigen**  
Maria needs not in temple to-go to-clean  
eNHG  
“Then Maria needed not to go to the temple in order to clean (herself)”

This recalls the Modern Icelandic data, where complements of (some) modals are marked with an IM, cf. (121), repeated from above:

(121) **Umsaekjandann verður ad vanta peninga**  
applicant-the-ACC must to lack money  
Icel.  

This kind of variation is not be expected if the IM would indeed play a crucial role in the constitution of an infinitival construction.

In his examination of the Berthold-Predigten-corpus, Askedal (1998:249) discovered that the complements of the verbs of the type *lernen* (to learn), *lehren* (to teach), *heißen* (to order), *helfen* (to help), and *gehen* (to go), appear as bare infinitives, irrespective of their position (extraposed position seems to be preferred, cf. the Alemannic data). Another important finding in Askedal (1998) is that long scrambling seemed to be much more wide-spread during that time:35

(122) **wan daz er im sîn volk hiez zelen**  
when that he him his people ordered count  
“I when he ordered him to count his people”

Additionally, Ebert (1976) in his detailed study of infinitival complementation in eNHG found only a few verbs which occur solely with a *zu*-infinitive, whereas the other verbs can have either a bare infinitive or a *zu*-infinitive; and again — the position of the infinitival complements also varies to an extent which is not expected if the formulas coherent = intraposed and non-coherent = extraposed were in fact true. So we find a rather unstable situation in the diachrony of infinitival clauses. And it seems — given the variation under the same matrix verb — that the insertion of the IM does not correlate with any unique syntactic property.
4.2 A possible scenario

An interesting finding concerning the IM in MHG is again due to Askedal’s (1998) work. In his counting of IMs in the corpus, he found that zu is rather rare in verbal constructions (only 18.8 percent) whereas the majority of IMs occur in complements of nouns and adjectives.

In fact, only three verbs occur productively with a zu-infinitive (MHG ze):

(123) *dô der almehtige got menschen und engel gedâchte ze machen*  
there the almighty god humans and angels thought to create  
“There the almighty God had in mind to create humans and angels”

(124) *sît ich hiute anhuob ze predigen*  
since I today started to preach  
“When I started to preach today”

(125) *sô man ……gebiutet ze vasten*  
so one orders to fast

Some examples for IM-marked infinitives in the complements of nouns are given below:

(126) *alle die sache, die der mensche ze tuonne hât*  
all the things the human being to do has  
“All the thing that a human being has to do”

(127) *daz sie die zît ze leben habent*  
that they the time to live have  
“That they have the time to live”

(128) *daz waere ze lanc ze sagene*  
that would-be too long to say  
“That would take too long to say”

Recall in this context the Alemannic data presented in Section 2.3.2. There it turned out that one of the few contexts where infinitives occur with an infinitival marker are exactly these contexts, i.e. the complements of nouns and adjectives.

Going back to even older stages, it is fairly safe to state that the first systematic occurrence of zu as an IM can be found in the Benediktiner-Regel.36 There it is used exclusively for the translation of the Latin gerund-construction:

(129) *In secundo dicendum: Domine, …  
In andremu za qhuedane: Lord, …*  
As second to say: “Lord…”

(Ben. 9,2 (H: 9,1))
A further typical example of the attributive use of the infinitive is given below:

(132) qui habet auris audiendi, audiat thie thâr hábe [ôrûn zi hôrenne] hôre

Recall also from the overview of Alemannic infinitival constructions in Section 2, that a productive (and also obligatory) use of an IM is found in this kind of construction. Thus it seems plausible to assume that the source of the (verbal) IM has to be sought in the use of a nominalized verb in an attributive function which corresponds to the Latin gerund-construction.

I will not present a detailed analysis of this construction, but it seems plausible that we have a small clause construction here, see the brief discussion of the Alemannic gerund-construction in Section 2., see Demske (1994) for a similar suggestion.

Let us then assume that zu originates as the head of a small clause and that the verb in these cases is a nominalization. The category of the predicate then is PP and it modifies the head noun with a purpose reading.

As a nominalization, the verb acting as the predicate of the SC can not take arguments or further modifiers (adverbials etc.). This leads to a surface ordering where the IM always immediately precedes the verb, despite the fact that the two are heading different projections:

```
SC
  Sub PP
  ears to NP
  hear (+ dative)
```

Suppose now that this is the input structure for a reanalysis process, such that the original nominalization becomes but one possible realization of a non-finite verb:

(133) non-finite verb = bare infinitive, participle,…, [zu + V_{nomlz.},]

[zu + V_{nomlz.}] \sim [zu + V_{inf}] \rightarrow [zu = prefix]
The usage of the original nominalized form as an infinitive implies that zu was reanalyzed as a prefix, playing no further syntactic role.\textsuperscript{38}

This form then spread in the rather irregular way into the infinitives occurring in the complements of verbs, as illustrated above. It seems to be the case that again standardization factors then led to the rather stable picture we find now in written SG. Essentially then, we have a similar kind of development as with the ordering of verbs in a verbal cluster.

The instability of a configuration is of course not a priori proof that the phenomenon in question should be categorized as a mere surface variation; to be treated in terms of ‘pure’ morphology. However, the discussion in Section 3. of opc constructions in SG and ALM indicates clearly that it is not the IM which can give the language learner a clue to how s/he should analyze the construction.

A final piece of (indirect) evidence is the fact already mentioned, namely that Alemannic speakers seem to have no problem integrating the IM into their grammar. Such a borrowing would not be expected, if it could be analyzed as signaling some deep-rooted differences between the two grammars; however, if it is taken as a surface variation, it can be integrated (or be dropped) easily.\textsuperscript{39}

To sum up, the historical development just sketched leads to an analysis where the IM was reanalyzed as an additional realization of an infinitival form which then could replace the original form (the bare infinitive). This does not imply that there was structure added to these infinitives. It can be interpreted such that one morphological form of an infinitive was replaced by another morphological form whose origin can be found in the gerund-construction. In this sense, we can analyze this process as one of analogy, operating merely in the morphology.

4.3 Replacement of finite clauses with zu-infinitives (in SG)

4.3.1 \textit{Two types of zu}

The core hypothesis to be defended in this paper is that SG has actually two different kinds of \textit{zu}:

i. a prefix-like element which does not contribute to the functional architecture of the infinitival complement. Its distribution in SG and Alemannic and its diachronic development justify an analysis in terms of morphological analogy, one that regards it merely as an alternative morphological form of a non-finite verb.

ii. an element which obviously does license a CP-complement, where all the tests for clausalhood are satisfied.
It then remains to ask how we can find evidence that the second (postulated) type of *zu* exists, how its different nature can be justified and whether we also find a plausible diachronic scenario for its development.

First recall that SG can realize selected (finite) CP-complements with non-finite clauses. This is the case under factive and propositional verbs. As was also noted, this is not possible in Alemannic, cf. the contrasts in (23–26), illustrated here with the verb *erzählen* (tell):

(134)  
\[
\text{er hat allen erzählt in Afrika gewesen zu sein} \quad \text{SG}
\]

\begin{align*}
&\text{he has all told in Africa been to be} \\
&\text{“He told everybody that he has been in Africa”}
\end{align*}

(135)  
\[
\text{er het allene verzellt in Afrika gsii sii} \quad \text{ALM}
\]

\begin{align*}
&\text{he has all told in Africa been be} \\
&\text{“He told everybody that he has been in Africa”}
\end{align*}

In sg a finite clause is of course also possible. To illustrate the same point with a factive verb, consider (136,137):

(136)  
\[
\text{er hat (es) bereut} \quad \text{SG}
\]

\begin{align*}
&\text{he has (it) regretted} \\
&\text{[dass er das Geld gestohlen hat]} \\
&\text{that he the money stolen has} \\
&\text{[das Geld gestohlen zu haben]} \\
&\text{the money stolen to have} \\
&\text{“He regretted that he has stolen the money”}
\end{align*}

(137)  
\[
\text{es het en duuret} \quad \text{ALM}
\]

\begin{align*}
&\text{it has him regretted} \\
&\text{[dass er z’schpoot kumme isch]} \\
&\text{that he too late come is} \\
&*\text{[z’schpoot kumme gsii sii]} \\
&\text{too late come been be} \\
&\text{“He regretted that he has not been in time”}
\end{align*}

As is well known, factive and propositional verbs only construct non-coherently, i.e. they do not show the ambiguous behavior which was found with opc verbs — nor do they show any signs of a mono-clausal structure. The type of the complement they select for is thus always CP. This implies that the *zu*-infinitive corresponds to a functionally complete CP, which in turn implies that *zu* in some sense licenses the functional architecture of the non-finite CP, since there is no other functional element present in the clause.

I will first discuss a possible diachronic scenario that explains how the marked infinitival form, the *zu*-infinitive, could have started to replace full clausal
complements. In the next section, I will discuss the tests for non-coherence and we will see that Alemannic does not have this type of zu in its functional inventory.

4.3.2 Diachronic development
As Paul (1920:98), and Los (1998) have shown, the use of a zu-infinitive under propositional verbs is a rather late development in the history of West German(ic).

In her detailed study of the development of to-infinitivals in Old English and the later stages, Los (1998) claims that the development from the [to + nominalization] structure to verbal complementation (i.e. the spreading of marked infinitives into the domain of bare infinitives) is not the only relevant phenomenon in the development of infinitival constructions. Another environment where IM-marked infinitives occur, are the complements of propositional (and manipulative) verbs which took finite clauses as their complements. The crucial property of these finite clauses is that the finite verb shows in many cases a subjunctive form. Subjunctive is always dependent on the matrix tense, i.e. it does not refer to an absolute point in time. This property is also characteristic of the infinitive. The idea to be proposed then is that, because of the similarity of subjunctives and infinitives in terms of (lack of) absolute time reference, subjunctives can be replaced by to/zu-infinitives without losing relevant semantic information.

The formula is something like the following:

subjunctive ~ non-finite
non-finite verb form = zu-infinitive
subjunctive = zu-infinitive

The important difference from the use of the IM as a pure formative (as in the cases discussed above) is that the IM in this environment obviously licenses a functional projection which must be of the category CP — since otherwise the selectional restrictions of the matrix verb would be violated. A good candidate is obviously T(ense), hosting the information about tense (-dependencies). If we further assume that TP is not complete, in the sense that it cannot be selected by a matrix verb, the fact that a CP layer must be (additionally) projected is plausible. The only “exceptional” property is the fact that the C-head can be empty in this case.41

A brief survey of the OHG Tatian texts revealed a pattern similar to that found by Los (1998). To illustrate, consider (138). It gives first the Latin original where we have an ut-clause with a subjunctive, followed by Tatian's translation which also uses a subjunctive. The following line then is from Luther's translation (16th Century) where we still find a subjunctive in most cases and the last line is from the Modern translation of the bible with an infinitive.
(138) a. Sicut filius hominis non venit, ut ministraretur ei, sed ut ministraret et dare animam suam redemptionem pro multis. (Mt.20,26)

b. Sô ther mannes sun ni quam, thaz man into ambahêti, ouh her as of-the mankind-gen son not came than one him serve-subj but he ambahêti inti geban sin fera dî zi lôsungu furi manegê (Tatian) would serve and give his life to salvation for many

c. so wie der Menschensohn nicht gekommen ist, daß er sich dienen as the mankind-son not come is that he himself serve lasse sondern daß er diene und gebe sein Leben zu einer let-subj but that he serve-subj and give-subj his life to a Erlösung für viele (Luther, Mt, 20.28) salvation for many

d. gleichwie der Sohn des Menschen nicht gekommen ist, um bedient as the son of mankind not come is in order served zu werden, sondern um zu dienen und sein Leben zu geben als to be but in order to serve and his life to give as Lösegeld für viele ransom for many (Schlachter) “Just as the son of Man did not come in order to be served but to serve and give his life for the salvation of many”

(139) a. Et rogabant eum, ne expelleret eos extra regionem et ne imperaret illis, ut in abyssum irent.

b. Inti bâtun in, thaz her siè ni tribi úzan thero lantskefî, inti thaz and asked him that he them not drive out their region and that her in ni gibuti, thaz siè in abgrunti fuorîn he him not order that they in abyss fare (Tatian 53,8)

c. Und er bat Jesus sehr, daß er sie nicht aus der Gegend vertreibe. and he asked Jesus prt that he them not out the region drive Und..., daß er ihnen nicht gebiete, in den Abgrund zu fahren and..., that he them not order into the abyss to fare (Luther, Mk.5,10 L.8,31)

d. Und er bat ihn sehr, sie nicht aus dem Lande zu verweisen. and he asked him prt them not out of the region to expel Und..., er möge ihnen nicht befehlen, in den Abgrund zu fahren and he may-subj them not order in the abyss to go (Schlachter)

In sum, there is good evidence that full-fledged subjunctive CP-clauses can be replaced by zu-infinitives in German as well. It is thus not necessarily the case that bare infinitives developed more and more function layers to turn into CPs in the diachronic development. Instead, these infinitives were always CPs. The only thing
that happened was that — because of their special tense properties (subjunctive) — they could be alternatively realized as (IM-marked) infinitives. But in this case the prefix zu took over the role to indicate the functional structure. This then lead to the highly complex situation which we find in Modern SG, namely that one ‘surface construction’ can realize different categories: vPs developed their surface structure via morphological spreading of the zu-particle, whereas CPs could be replaced by zu-infinitives via the route just discussed. Since opc-verbs can select either for a vP (semi-lexical usage) or a CP (main verb usage), the situation with these verbs is particularly confusing.

Given that the subjunctive lost its specific meaning relatively early, we can assume that the use of the zu-infinitive instead of a finite clause became a general possibility. Therefore, the often observed clausal behaviour of zu-infinitives under opc-verbs (in terms of binding, negation and independent time reference, see next section) has its source in the (originally finite) CP-complement that these verbs can take too, as was demonstrated in Section 3.2.2.

Since in Alemannic, this development did not take place, it is predicted that Alemannic switches to finite clauses as soon as more structure is needed. And this is exactly what we find — as will be demonstrated in the next section.

4.4 The non-coherent behavior of opc-verbs

So far I have only discussed long passive, long scrambling, and the verbal cluster as diagnostics for coherence. But there are of course further constructions which are relevant for the issue of (non-) coherence. In this section, I will show that if we detect non-coherent behavior of opc-verbs, there are good reasons to assume that we have indeed a CP. The evidence comes mainly from the fact that in these constructions, Alemannic does not allow a non-finite version.

4.4.1 Scope of negation

The scope ambiguity observed in SG negation in coherent structures does not occur in Alemannic because there is no intraposition and thus the precondition for a structural ambiguity is simply not given.

However, as expected, a narrow scope reading requires a finite clause because vP by itself cannot establish the NEG-head, which is a precondition for clausal negation.

(140) a. ?? dass er probiert het de Droht it aalange
    that he tried has the wire not touch

b. ? dass er probiert het de Droht it zum aalange
    that he tried has the wire not touch
c. * dass er probiert het dass er de Droht it aalangt
   that he tried has that he the wire not touches
   “He tried to not touch the wire”

It is not entirely clear, whether the b.-version reflects an interference effect,\textsuperscript{43} but it is important that the bare infinitive seems to be the least preferred variant, although this is the standard type of a complement of a verb like \textit{probieren} (\textit{try}) without a negation; see the discussion in Section 2.

4.4.2 Scope of time adverbials
The same kind of effect can be found with time adverbials in infinitives. The common assumption is like the one assumed for negation: an independent time reference of the infinitive is only possible if the functional layers of a clause are present, especially the T-node. As expected, only a finite clause is possible if a time adverbial occurs:

\((141)\)
\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. * sie hond em erlaubt morge nuu Kueche esse
        they have him allowed tomorrow only cake eat
  \item b. sie hond em erlaubt dass er morgen nuu Kueche esse darf
        they have him allowed that he tomorrow only cake eat may
        “They allowed him to eat only cake tomorrow”
\end{enumerate}

Again we have evidence that these cases of SG \textit{zu}-infinitives correspond to a full CP-structure, since the only possible outcome in Alemannic is a finite clause. An additional piece of evidence for the proposed analysis is the following contrast in SG:

\((142)\)
\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. * Hans hat gestern vergessen morgen nach Stuttgart zu fahren
        Hans has yesterday forgotten tomorrow to Stuttgart to drive
  \item b. Hans hat gestern vergessen morgen nach S. fahren zu müssen
        Hans has yesterday forgotten tomorrow to Stuttgart drive to must
        “Hans forgot yesterday that he must drive to Stuttgar tomorrow”
\end{enumerate}

Whereas the time adverbial is impossible in the simple infinitival complementation under an opc-verb, it can get an independent interpretation if an overt modal appears additionally (which can occur in the infinitive), cf.(142b). As was discussed in Section 3.2.1. (example 74 ff), the appearance of an overt modal in the non-finite complement of an opc-verb gives us good reasons to assume that the opc-verb is used in its main verb usage and, thus, the infinitive in (142b) is a ‘disguised’ finite clause — a possibility which is only available in SG.
4.4.3 Binding
The last diagnostic for non-coherent behavior of opc-verbs is the reduced binding possibilities in the coherent construction.

In passivized, ergative structures there is no binder besides the dative argument, which, however, cannot act as a binder for independent reasons, see Haider (2003) for detailed discussion.

(143) a. weil es ihm gelungen ist [PRO sich zu befreien]
because it him succeeded is himself to free
b. *zu befreien gelungen ist es ihm sich
to free succeeded is it him himself
“He succeeded in freeing himself”

Obviously, binding is only possible via the PRO subject in the embedded clause, which must thus consist of a full clausal structure. Leaving many details aside, we can see again that in Alemannic, a finite clause shows up:

(144) a. *ma het ihne grote sich in Radolfzell treffe
one has them advised themselves in R. meet
b. ma het ihne grote dass se sich in Radolfzell treffet
one has them advised that they themselves in R. meet
c. ?ma het ihne grote zum sich in Radolfzell zum treffe
one has them advised to themselves in R. to meet
“They advised them to meet in Radolfzell”

(144c) was offered as a possibility by some speakers, but it was not judged as really grammatical. Rather, it seems again to be a kind of concession to the standard variety. So in sum, in case a full clausal structure is needed, (be it for reasons of local binding, negation, or independent time reference), Alemannic switches to a version with a finite clause. Alemannic does not have zu with this specific functional property (i.e. to represent Tense) in its inventory and thus the difference between Alemannic and SG finds a rather natural explanation.

4.4.4 Floated quantifiers again
A point I would like to take up briefly again is the issue of floated quantifiers. Recall from above that I used it as a diagnostic for (underlying) subject positions, and that it turned out that in Alemannic a floated quantifier can appear in all the possible underlying subject positions:

(145) dass se (alle) hond (alle) mässe (alle) homgoa
that they (all) have (all) must (all) home-go
Now in the structures with opc-verbs note that the order of verbs is AUX-opc-verb-V, i.e., the verbs are in their base order:

(146) a. \(\ldots wo \ se \ hond \ probiert \ alle \ gleichzittig \ losrenne \) ALM
    when they have tried all at-the-same time start-run
b. \(\ldots wo \ se \ hond \ alle \ probiert \ gleichzittig \ losrenne \)
    when they have all tried at-the-same time start-run
   “…when they (all) tried (all) to start with running at the same time”

(147) a. \(wo \ se \ denn \ hond \ aagfange \ alle \ rumplärre \) ALM
    when they then have started all around-cry
b. \(wo \ se \ denn \ hond \ alle \ aagfange \ rumplärre \)
    when they then have all started around-cry
   “…when they (all) started (all) to cry”

However, if we use the SG order, with the order AUX-opc-verb reversed — which even in Alemannic is the preferred order with opc-verbs, see the examples in Section 2, and the discussion in 3.4.1, the presence of a floated quantifier leads to a bad result.

(148) a. \(?^*\) \(wo \ se \ vergesse \ hond \ alle \ s’Geld \ mitbringe \)
    when they forgotten have all the money with-bring
b. \(^*\) \(wo \ se \ s’Geld \ vergesse \ hond \ alle \ mitbringe \)
    when they the money forgotten have all with-bring

But in SG, a floated quantifier can show up with this order of opc-verb and AUX without a problem cf. (149a):

(149) a. dass die Kinder vergessen haben [alle das Geld mitzubringen] SG
   that the children forgotten have all the money with-to-bring
b. \(^*\) dass die Kinder [das Geld] _i_ vergessen haben
   that the children the money forgotten have
   [PRO alle _i_ mitzubringen]
   all with-to-bring

The solution to this puzzle lies in the two different structures that SG can use, as already indicated in the example. According to the analysis proposed here, the order AUX-opc-verb is the result of a flipping operation. A precondition for flipping is PF-adjacency of the two verbs. Flipping is ruled out if a floated quantifier intervenes, cf. the Alemannic examples in (148). The acceptance of SG (149a) can find a natural explanation if we have here a clausal version of the infinitival complement. The floated quantifier is not involved in any (flipping) operation because the flipping happens in a different clause. The presence of a CP-boundary between
the two clauses can be seen in the b.-example: Long scrambling leads to ungrammaticality.

Although there may be open questions concerning these examples, the contrasts observed (between the base and flipped order in Alemannic) and the acceptance of (149a) in SG give further evidence that there seems to be in fact a difference in the grammar between these two variants: Alemannic cannot use IM marked infinitives to replace finite clauses.

5. Summary

The comparison between a standardized language and one of its dialects can reveal new insights into syntactic phenomena which — if looked at in isolation — seem quite idiosyncratic, as it is the case with the syntax of infinitives in SG. This article has shown that opc-verbs indeed can select for different types of complements, namely either vPs or CPs. In Alemannic these are marked overtly as such (bare infinitive vs. finite clause), whereas in SG both types of complements can have the same surface realization. This was traced back to the historical development of the infinitival marker zu. Starting from a small clause structure in an attributive configuration, zu was reanalyzed as a pure infinitive marker which spread into those infinitival constructions where bare infinitives would represent the structure more adequately (vP-complements), since there is no further functional structure present. The diagnostics for vP complementation (long passive and long scrambling) were shown to occur in both variants, despite the fact that in Alemannic the (bare) vP complements occur preferably in extraposed position. This was taken as a starting point for an analysis (also for SG) in which extraposition is not necessarily a diagnostic for a bi-clusual structure. This step led to a more straightforward analysis of long scrambling and especially of the combination of long scrambling and long passive. The widespread use of extraposed bare infinitives in earlier stages of German lends further support to the claim that extraposition is not the decisive factor for the clausal status of an infinitive.

Another route that was taken in some variants of German was the replacement of (subjunctive) embedded clauses by a zu-marked infinitive. These then occur instead of finite CPs and show all the diagnostics for a bi-clausal structure in terms of binding and operator scope. If it is true that these structures are basically “disguised” finite CPs, then we could also explain why extraposition still seems to be a strong indicator of clausal status. Finite CPs originate to the right of the selecting verb and thus extraposition is a necessary condition for this kind of structure — but as seen — not a sufficient one.
So the dual status of the complements of opc-verbs is corroborated and finds a quite plausible explanation in historical terms. Coming from two different historical routes, the idea that there are two different kinds of the IM in SG gains some plausibility — especially in the light of the fact that the “richer” zu does not occur in all variants of German. The idea of having the same functional item with two different lexical entries may at first sight appear unattractive and has somehow a flavour of redundancy. However, in light of the many (not really successful) attempts in the literature to find a unified analysis of the IM, I think the solution in terms of two different items is preferable. Additionally, that a single lexical item serves different functions in the grammar is not unique to the case discussed here. For example, elements like le, la in Romance can be either clitics or determiners. Clearly these functions are very close to each other; nevertheless, their behavior in syntax is different — just as in the case of the IM in German(ic).
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1. We have 10–15 native speakers from around lake Constance and some speakers in the Klettgau area (in the very south of the Black forest, near the Swiss border) who we consult regularly and ask for detailed grammaticality judgements. All speakers were made aware that we are interested in judgements reflecting native speaker intuitions rather than prescriptive notions of correctness.

2. It is also worth noting that the SG phonological form zu does not exist in Alemannic. It is realized either as a clitic form z’ or as the complex form zum. But this is probably due to the different phonological system (there seems to be no tense /u/ in word final position). So if native speakers ‘translate’ SG infinitivals into their dialect, they use either z’ or zum — as it is indicated in the examples.

3. zue in this particle verb construction is an adverbial usage of zu and means “closed”. It can be distinguished from other usages of zu in Alemannic since it always appears with a diphthong, as indicated in the example.

4. However, it is not the case that zu-marking (realized either as z’ or as zum) is completely excluded in these cases. Rather the informants quite often accept both variants with the clear tendency that younger speakers use an IM more often whereas older speakers prefer the bare versions (judging these as “old-fashioned” but clearly belonging to their dialect).
5. This does not mean that other orders are completely ungrammatical. E.g. if the main verb is focused, it can appear before the modal verb:

(i) dass man die Öpfel het SCHÄLE mösse
   that one those apples has peel must
   'That one had to peel these apples'

This observation is discussed in Schmid & Vogel (2002) where the varying orders in the verbal cluster in various German dialects is traced back to information structural conditions. I will come back to the syntactic preconditions for this kind of variation in Section 3.

6. Habituality is expressed in Alemannic with the adverb alls, as in:

(i) er goht alls um nüüne i’s Bett
   he goes usually at nine (o’clock) in the bed

see Noth (1983) for more examples.

7. There is another possibility in Alemannic to realize an adverbial infinitive introduced by ohne, namely with a preposed participle:

(i) oni gfroget hed er s gnumme
   without ask-participle has he it taken
   "He took it without asking"

(ii) er isch ugessa fuet
    he is un-eat-part away
    "He left without having eaten"

As is obvious from (ii), with the negation affixed to the participle, this is clearly not a clausal projection but the participle is used as an adjective, although obviously in a kind of small clause configuration. I will not go further into this.

8. Wurmbrand (2001, ch. 5) is more cautious in recognizing extra-/intraposition as a diagnostic, taking the attested speaker variation seriously into account. We will see in the following that this view is corroborated by the analysis I will put forward.


10. I will not commit myself to any specific analysis of floated quantifiers, see Bobalijk (2003) for a recent overview of the problematic aspects of a (simple) movement analysis; however I think that it is nevertheless safe to take floated quantifiers as an indication that the subject is connected to this position at some point of the derivation.

11. Note that in the Alemannic examples with phase verbs and opc-verbs, the order corresponds to the underlying one, i.e. the auxiliary precedes the opc-verb. I will postpone the exact analysis since we need more ingredients in order to account for this.

12. A reviewer points out that if it were true that floated quantifiers indeed mark the (base) position of the subject, one would expect that it can topicalize with the non-finite verb. However, this yields an ungrammatical result:
(i) *alle mitzubringen haben die Kinder das Geld vergessen
alle with-to-bring have the children the money forgotten

I agree with the judgement, however, I am not sure whether this shows that the floated quantifier is not situated in Spec-vP since floated quantifiers obviously never can cross the NP they belong to, even if it is the object:

(ii) die Bücher habe ich alle gelesen
the books have I all read

(iii) *alle gelesen habe ich die Bücher
all read have I the books

I cannot offer an explanation for this effect which reminds on a cross-over violation but whatever explains the ungrammaticality of (iii) will also account for (i), independently of the constituency of the fronted phrase.

13. As Josef Bayer (p.c.) informs me, there are some Bavarian dialects where vergessen can even select for a PP-correlate:

(i) er hat drauf vergessen [ihn anzurufen]
he has there-on forgotten [him to call]

14. A possible paraphrase would be:

(i) sie hat das Aussehen seines Gesichtes vergessen
she has the look of his face forgotten

But note that (i) this is again a nominal structure and (ii) this cannot be the input for an elliptical structure because of the case-marking. Another possibility would be to paraphrase it with an adverbial clause:

(ii) sie hat vergessen [wie sein Gesicht aussieht]
she has forgotten how his face looks like

But again, this structure is rather unlikely to be the input for ellipsis, since adverbial clauses are obligatorily extraposed and thus we would have a problem with the word order.

15. A possible outcome for a finite version with the verb help is the construction of an ‘adverbial correlate’:

(i) ich half ihm derart dass er sich befreien konnte
I helped him in-such-a-way that he could free himself

16. This does not exclude the possibility that an opc-verb may be itself selected by a modal verb, cf.

(i) weil man unter diesen Umständen schon vergessen darf ein Brot mitzubringen
because one under these circumstances prt forget allowed-is a bread to-bring
“because under these circumstances it is permissible to forget to bring some bread”
Note that the modal of the matrix does not have any influence on the interpretation of the embedded modality which is still necessity, i.e. there seems to be a kind of minimality effect in terms of scope of the modal.

17. Broekhuis et al suggest that governed PRO is (only) anaphoric which leads to (i) obligatory control and (ii) that only the matrix subject can be a binder (via anaphoric PRO in the complement). So we have essentially the same effects as from a movement theory of Control, resp. that there is no PRO at all, i.e. VP complementation.

18. However, we will see below that its status with respect to grammaticality judgments as well as its diagnostic value can be doubted in light of the facts to be discussed.

19. Since the analysis vary w.r.t. category type of the extraposed infinitive, I merely list here the various possibilities. It is important that there is "more structure" than in the intraposed version.

20. It should be noted that passive in general is not much used in this dialect. This is probably a general feature of varieties with no written standard. Therefore I have marked the examples with '?'. All the informants judged an alternative with an active clause as being perfectly acceptable. This may also have to do with the fact that Alemannic is one of those dialects that has lost the preterite forms, which leads — in case of past tense — unavoidably to (at least) three verbs in one row in the embedded case. What is important is that the contrasts between the various versions varying in case and agreement, to be discussed below, were confirmed by all informants, so that we can nevertheless draw conclusions about the underlying structures.

21. Note that if we would — in Wurmbrand’s system — simply allow VP to extrapose, as suggested by a reviewer, then it would be impossible to have accusative in the extraposed version, since the matrix is nevertheless passivized and thus there is no v that could assign accusative. I will take thus the possibility of (91a) and (92a) as further evidence for the proposed structure, i.e. that the infinitive consists of a vP (with the subject base-generated in Spec-vP).


23. Note that this wouldn’t pose a problem in the approach here, since it is explicitly assumed that these verbs have two different usages and in the semi-lexical usage, they never can select for a DO but are rather a ‘functional’ extension of the main verb.

24. That such “repair strategies” are indeed operative in the grammar can be seen by an example, first discussed in van Riemsdijk (1998). He observed that if a pre-nominal adjective is followed by a (degree) adverb, then it is the adverb which bears the inflection, although adverbs do not inflect. The example is from a recent discussion of this phenomenon in Bayer et al. (2005):

(i)  ein genug gross-er Teller

(ii) *ein gross-er genug Teller

(iii) ein gross genug-er Teller

“a big enough plate”

The form *genug-er (i.e. adverb with an inflection) is normally starred; however, it seems as if the requirement that the inflecting element is immediately adjacent to the modified noun is more important for the grammar than the fact that an item of the “wrong word class” is inflected.
25. In essence, this is a consequence of Burzio’s generalization — if it is rephrased in terms of priority of nominative over accusative, as has been suggested by e.g. Sigurdsson (2003), Woolford (2003), see also Haider (1993) and Brandner (1993,1995). The important point is that it is not the lack of accusative per se which triggers the assignment, rather that nominative “out-ranks” accusative if the necessary structural conditions are met, see Sobin (1985), Borer (1986), and Glinert (1989) for supporting data from Ukrainian and Hebrew. However, a detailed discussion of these matters is beyond the scope of this paper.

26. Recall that opc-verbs can also select for an NP, see Bayer & Kornfilt (1990), Haider (1994, 2003).

27. as in:

(i) weil dem Kind versucht wurde zu helfen  
because the-dat child tried was to help  
“Because they tried to help the child (passive)”

This is also the case in simple passives, cf.

(ii) weil dem Kind geholfen wurde  
because the-dat child helped was-pass

28. However, in Dutch this order is apparently acceptable in topicalization constructions. I do not have an answer to this at the moment.

29. Note that e.g. movement of the whole vP to a specifier position of a higher vP would first lead to the problem that the subject (or a trace of it) is already situated in this position and secondly the vP should then be opaque because of the Left Branch Condition.

30. I will discuss below diachronic data which show that the VP-fronting operation was a much used possibility.

31. It may very well be that the motivation for flipping or non-flipping can be found in prosodic restrictions, see Truckenbrodt (1995), which would very well fit with the assumption that flipping is basically a PF-operation. However, whether flipping is in general motivated by prosodic reasons or not is hard to decide, since it would imply that Alemannic and SG differ systematically in their prosodic patterns. I will not take a stand on this. See below for some speculations on the origin of the flipping operation in SG.

32. This analysis implies that V/2 movement is a PF-operation, as has been suggested by Chomsky (2001). In Brandner (2004) I have argued explicitly against this position; however, it is not to deny that there are some cases of ‘quirky’ topicalizations in German. One is the so-called split-topicalization, see for a recent treatment, Bayer et al (2005).

(i) Bücher hat er keine gelesen  
books has he none read

This construction shares with verbal clusters one property that distinguishes them from ‘ordinary’ (non-wh) constituents that can be topicalized: they can never occur in the ‘internal topic position’, the position immediately following the complementizer in embedded clauses, see Frey (2000).
(ii) *dass arbeiten müssen Peter nicht hat
   that work must-INF Peter not has

(iii) *dass Bücher Peter keine gelesen hat
   that books Peter none read has

So it seems that these ‘constituents’ can only surface in Spec-CP; I can not offer a solution to this but the data show at least that movement to Spec-CP is ‘more liberal’ than other types of movement (for example scrambling).


34. It is also worth noting that the scheinen-construction is a rather late development in the history of German, see Ebert (1976:41ff). A very early example is cited in Demske (2004):

   (i) Tännan skînet öffeno éin ding wwsen
       therefore seem certain a thing (to) be
       'Therefore something seems to be certain'

Note that there is no zu-marking in this case. According to Ebert (1976) scheinen occurred productively not until the 18th century with all types of verbs in the embedded clause whereas in former times, basically only the stative verb ‘to be’ could be embedded.

35. Askedal himself judges the long scrambling cases as ungrammatical, or very marginal in current German and takes it thus merely as a possibility in ‘older stages’, cf. the discussion about the variation in speaker judgements concerning the grammaticality of third construction and long passive.

36. We used the TITUS database for the search for zu-infinitives in the Benediktiner-Regel.

37. That this is a nominalization is corroborated by the inflectional dative ending of the nominalized verb; an analysis which has been accepted by most researchers since Behaghel (1923); however, there are good arguments that the verbal use of an inflected infinitive did not inherit the nominal specification in the verbal complementation — despite its case-marking, see Demske (1994: 53ff) and below.

38. But recall that zu still can be inserted in the head of a small clause, see Section 2. Maybe the term ‘reanalysis’ is too strict in this context, we have rather an ‘extension of distribution’.

39. The same type of phenomenon can be observed with the participle marker ge-: it also has a different distribution in Alemannic from that in SG. The rule seems to be that it does not occur with verbs starting with a stop, i.e. there seem to be pure phonological reasons at stake, (Astrid Krähenmann, p.c.). The parallel to the case of zu is even closer if one considers that ge- entered the grammar as a meaningful element (marking aspect), but developed into a pure formative, see for similar considerations Abraham (1998).

40. Paul (1920:98) notes that the use of a ‘perfective infinitive’ exemplified in (136), i.e. the non-finite form of the temporal auxiliary (zu haben) was completely impossible until after MHG. The availability of this form is a precondition for the expression of independent time reference. This fits very well with the claim made here that the replacement of finite (subjunctive) clauses with an infinitive is (i) a rather late development and (ii) did not occur in all variants.
41. I will leave open here whether an analysis of *zu* as a right-peripheral complementizer, as suggested in Wilder (1988), is “less exceptional”. There are clearly languages that do have right peripheral complementizers, e.g. Korean and Hindi. However, their syntax of the left periphery in (wh-movement, topicalization etc) differs fundamentally from the German(ic) one. It is argued in Brandner (2004), that the position of the complementizer and the syntax of the left periphery correlate in a non-trivial way.

42. Palmer (2001:142) cites examples from Latin where the subjunctive has obviously only the function of marking subordination with no irrealis meaning whatsoever.

43. The informants insist on the insertion of *zum* only if there is narrow scope negation. So it could very well be that there is a copying of the SG version of this clause with a CP-infinitival.

44. Note that there are again two occurrences of the IM which indicates that speakers are aware of the fact that there must be a full clausal structure; however, as shown above, IM-introduced clauses are apparently not a possibility in the verbal domain. I cannot offer an explanation for this.
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