0. Abstract
This paper discusses various infinitival constructions in Standard German (SG) and their realizations in an Alemannic dialect (ALM), spoken around the Lake Constance. The interesting thing is, that in ALM, the realization of infinitival complements differs from the SG one (at first sight) to a great extent. On the one hand, bare infinitives are much more wide-spread and on the other hand, finite clauses are used in contexts where SG has infinitives. This dialectal variation is also attested e.g. in the northern part of Switzerland and in the Kaiserstuhl-area. A detailed analysis may help to shed some new light on the behavior of SG infinitives which are known to pose a challenge for a unified analysis. The bare infinitives occur additionally preferably in an extraposed position where they should not be allowed - according to standard analysis. It will be shown that these bare infinitives nevertheless should be analyzed as building a monoclausal structure with the embedding verb. This will be brought together with the fact that Alemannic is a language which makes extensive use of verb projection raising. These data and the monoclausal behaviour of the “extraposed” bare infinitives speak for a a Kayne-style right-branching structure of the VP in both variants whereby Alemannic keeps the base order. Standard German can be accounted for if we assume additional leftward movement of (parts of) the embedded VP. It will be shown that despite their surface differences, the two variants have important properties in their infinitival syntax nevertheless in common.

In the second part, data will be presented which show that Alemannic has left peripheral infinitival complementizers that do not occur in Standard German but which are more known from other languages. These infinitives should be analyzed as CPs. A claim that is supported by the fact that this dialect allows wh-infinitivals which are not attested in Standard German. These data and contrasts between so closely related languages will be taken as a starting point for the discussion of the term “microvariation” as it is used in recent generative grammar.

1. Microvariation
Microvariation has become an important notion in recent years in generative grammar. However, it does not seem entirely clear on which theoretical basis microvariation and macrovariation are to be distinguished. On the one hand microvariation has become a cover term for the investigation of dialects or non-standard varieties in contrast to the well-documented and described standard written languages, say like English, German, or French. But then, microvariation is defined via the 'object' of investigation and, beside the fact that it faces the same problem as in all traditional approaches, namely to properly distinguish between language and dialect, the distinction is a theoretically not very appealing in a theory about grammar which has the 'human language faculty' as its object of investigation. On the other hand, the intuition that the variation between (genetically) very close languages should be treated on another level than for instance that between English and Japanese is surely justified. As Kayne (2003) puts it, we expect to find more 'dramatic' differences between languages that are rather distant (genetically or areal) than with those which are more closely related, but surely: 'dramatic' is a very imprecise notion. Kayne suggests a distinction between micro- and macrovariation in a relative way and not in an absolute one. The more parameter values
two languages share the more they vary on a micro-level – and the other way round of course. This view leads to the welcome result that it is not necessary to separate micro- from macroparameters in the sense that they differ in 'quality' which means that they theoretically different things, see e.g. the suggestion in Holmberg & Sandström (1996). They make a distinction between different types of functional categories, assuming that parameters act on functional categories. On the one hand there are those that have a general distribution (major parameters) and on the other hand there are functional categories that have only a restricted distribution (minor parameters). Major parameters act cross-linguistically and are thus rather stable whereas minor ones are the typical place for dialectal variation. But note that there are functional categories which may also affect only one distinction between languages but which are nevertheless felt intuitively as being 'dramatic', e.g. the V/2 property. It is known that it does not exclusively correlate with any further property, be it e.g. scrambling (only German but not the other Germanic V/2 languages) or subject-licensing (cf. Old French, see Adams (1986) vs. the Germanic V/2 languages) etc. Nevertheless, the V/2 phenomenon is (i) historically stable (disregarding English) and (ii) to my knowledge we do not find the same amount of dialectal variation as it is e.g. the case in infinitival constructions, to be discussed below. So in a sense, the attempt the define micro- and macrovariation in an absolute sense by defining different kinds of parameters may overshoot the mark. In my view it is questionable whether such a distinction can or even should be built into the general model of the grammar.

Another issue in the area of microvariation is optionality in the sense that one individual speaker can use freely two (or even more) versions of a construction. This problem is discussed in Henry (1996, 2002) in great detail. This is found especially in dialect variation but also in the diachronic development where it is known that two different versions can exist over hundreds of years, side by side. The problem is that in Minimalism, there is no way to capture optionality; in that sense the predictions of Minimalism are too strict. The mechanisms used are such that there is movement or not and there cannot be a choice. This means that a speaker who optionally uses two different variants of a construction must have internalized two (or even more) grammars simultaneously, see e.g. Hoekstra (1993) for such a view on dialect variation and Kroch

---

1 It has been claimed that there is variation w.r.t. V/2 in wh-questions in some Norwegian dialects, see Westergaard/Vangsnes (to appear) for discussion. Without going into this, I think the point I want to make here can nevertheless be upheld, since the variation in the area of infinitives is by far more attested among the Germanic languages.
and Taylor's (1994, 2000) conception of 'competetive grammar' for diachronic variation. Another possibility is to assume that there are certain (well-defined) areas in the syntax of a language which are simply undetermined and are thus subject to dialectal, diachronic, and intra-speaker variation. I will argue that this is the case in (some parts) of the infinitival syntax in West-Germanic.

The question then is how we can detect and independently justify these areas. In Minimalism, the place of variation is the lexicon whereas syntax itself is inert, see Longobardi (2001). So the only place where we can situate optionality in the grammar are lexical items and their internal featural structure. With this focus on the lexicon we can formulate the following as a general statement:

i. If two languages differ in the availability of a lexical item and its featural content, then we expect to find a correlate of this difference in the syntax of these languages.

ii. If two languages differ in their syntax, we expect to find a difference in the availability of a lexical item and its featural content in the lexicon of these languages.

If we can detect this kind of correlation, we can rather safely assume that there is a parameter at stake, even if it only applies to one construction, cf. the discussion of Holmberg/Sandström's proposal. Let us call this macrovariation and assume that it corresponds to the classical idea of a parameter. The intuition that we find 'less dramatic' differences between closely related languages can then be attributed to the fact that closely (genetically) related languages share a large amount of their vocabulary and therefore the probability that they also share a large amount of syntactic outcomes is very high. However, as is well known, lexical items (especially function words) can change their featural structure and thus even closely related languages can differ in some areas to a 'dramatic' extent. I will show that this is the case with the availability of wh-infinitivals in Alemannic and SG and that this correlates with the differing functional structure of the infinitival markers.

If we find on the other hand either lexical items or a specific syntactic outcome which do not correlate, then this seems to be a place where optionality can arise. These phenomena are those that are intuitively labeled as 'microvariation' and do not correspond to the classical notion of a parameter. This kind of variation should then be explained with different tools than those that are used in the explanation of narrow syntax; instead we have here a kind of surface variation that should find its explanation
in lexical, phonological, (purely) morphological or even stylistic terms that do not affect the syntactic structure.

In the following, I will show that the differences between Alemannic and SG infinitival syntax exhibit both kinds of variation and that the distinction between micro- and macrovariation suggested here is empirically well-founded.

2. Infinitival marking in Germanic

2.1. The space of variation

It is well-known that infinitival marking in Germanic varies to a great extent. We have variation in the form of the infinitival marker: \(zu/to/te\) in West-Germanic, which derives from a directional preposition, and \(att\) and its variants in the North-Germanic languages, having the Latin preposition '\(ad\) = a/to' as its source. Additionally, the markers vary w.r.t. their position. On the one hand we have languages that posit the infinitival marker very close to the infinitival verb, e.g. German where it occupies basically the same position as the past participle formative \(ge\)-, suggesting already that this type of functional element does not occupy a functional head position. On the other hand it is general wisdom that the infinitival marker occupies a higher position in e.g. English but probably also in the North-Germanic languages, see Thrainsson (1998), Johnson/Vikner (1998,1994).

A third area where we can detect variation is the distribution of the infinitival marker, i.e. in which type of constructions an infinitival marker is used. One particular example will be discussed below in detail, but a brief survey of the Germanic languages shows that there is a huge amount of variation. E.g. Icelandic uses an infinitival marker with nearly all kinds of verbs, even with most of the modal verbs. This does not occur in the other Germanic languages\(^2\).

(1) Hann verður að lesa bækur
    He must to read books

In SG we find even variation within one verb, depending on the actual position of the complement, cited from Askedal (1998):

\(\text{(i) Item Maria bedorft nit in Tempel } \text{zeugen zereinigen} \quad \text{EarlyNHG,}
\)

\(\text{thus Maria needs not in temple to-go to-clean}
\)

"Thus, Maria did not need to go to the temple in order to clean (herself)"

This corroborates the claim to be justified below that the insertion of this marker should be treated on a (derivational) morphological level.

\(^2\) Although Ebert (1978) cites some examples from Early New High German where we find modal verbs with a \(zu\)-marked complement:

\(\text{(i) Item Maria bedorft nit in Tempel zegen zereinigen EarlyNHG,}
\)

\(\text{thus Maria needs not in temple to-go to-clean}
\)

"Thus, Maria did not need to go to the temple in order to clean (herself)"
A zu-marked infinitive is possible in all positions whereas the bare infinitive is only allowed in intraposed position. But as will become clear very soon, this restriction does not hold in Alemannic.

Given this range of variation, the question is how to treat this element. Standardly it is assumed that the infinitival marker heads some functional projection above VP, either a TP or CP. The lack of the infinitival marker in e.g. modal constructions therefore is taken as an indication for the non-clausal status of the complement of the modal, i.e. that in these cases there is a mono-clausal structure and that this is reflected by the lack of the infinitival marker. This fits very well with the semantics of modals which do not constitute an event of their own and a mono-clausal structure is thus an adequate syntactic representation. However, the Icelandic facts just cited can then be interpreted only in such a way that either the semantics of modals differs in this language from the other ones (which is rather implausible, given that modals in Icelandic and the other Germanic languages have the same semantic content) or that the infinitival marker does not play the important role in syntax which is attributed to it. So the question is – in light of the discussion on microvariation above – whether we are dealing here with deep-rooted differences between the languages or whether this is a kind of 'surface' variation which should find its description (and possibly explanation) also on a surface level of the grammar.

I will be concerned in this paper mainly with the distribution of the infinitival marker and I will discuss a Southern German dialect which deviates remarkably from Standard German in that it does not use the infinitival marker in many contexts where it is obligatory in Standard German. However, it will turn out that the presence or absence of the infinitival marker does not lead to co-variation in the syntactic behavior of Alemannic and SG in this construction and thus I will claim that the use of the infinitival marker (at least in these contexts) is a case of microvariation in the sense discussed above and that we are dealing here with a surface phenomenon. I will not be able to discuss in detail whether the proposed solution can also be applied to variation
across the Germanic languages mentioned above but the discussion may serve as a starting point how to treat this variation. So let us now have a look at the data in Alemannic and SG.

2.2. Bare infinitives

In the Alemannic dialect, spoken in the region around Lake Constance, also the northern part of Switzerland and the Black Forrest in South Germany, there are no infinitives with *zu* corresponding to the Standard German infinitive constructions. This is shown in the following set of data with matrix verbs that take a *zu*-infinitive in SG:

(3) *er probiert grad* [die obere öpfel o no abehole] ALM
he tries at the moment the higher apples also get

(4) *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"

(5) *etz het der doch vergess* [de Block zuemache] ALM
now has he PRT forgot the greenhouse closed-make

(6) *jetzt hat er doch vergessen* [das Gewächshaus zu machen] SG
now has he PRT forgot the greenhouse closed-to-make

"He has forgotten to close the greenhouse"

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

(8) *weißt du noch als sie angefangen haben* [die Strasse auf zu reissen] SG
know you still when they started the road up-tear

"Do you remember when they started to tear up the road?"

Further verbs that have a bare infinitival complement are:

(9) *glinge* (succeed) *verschtoh* (know) *helfe* (help) *heiffe* (order, lit. to name) *afange* (begin),
*traue* (dare)…

The matrix verbs used in these examples are so-called 'optional coherent verbs', see Bech (1955) for an early treatment. Their most distinguishing property is that they behave ambiguously w.r.t. certain tests which distinguish between a restructuring (coherent in Bech's terms) and a non-restructuring (non-coherent) configuration, see

---

3 This claim may seem at first sight too rigid since native speakers (nowadays) also produce infinitives with *zu*. However it can be shown quite easily that this is obviously an interference from SG, since (i) only younger speakers use it productively and (ii) if one requests detailed judgements, it turns out that the version without *zu* is taken as the "old, genuine" Alemannic version. Additionally, in traditional grammars and descriptions of this dialect, see, e.g. Stuedele (1927) and Noth (1983), versions without *zu* are always cited as the 'norm', but, as Noth (1983:340) notes, there seems to be a kind of "free choice" for some speakers nowadays.

4 *zu* in this particle verb construction is an adverbial usage of *zu* and means “closed”, e.g. *the closed window* = 'es zuene Fenschter'. It can be distinguished from other usages of *zu* in Alemannic since it always appears with a diphthong, as indicated in the example.
Wurmbrand (2001) for a detailed overview and a much more complete list of the various types of verbs\(^5\). Which structure is chosen can be detected only indirectly – at least in SG – because in both constructions we have a parallel surface outcome, i.e. both infinitival complements consist of a \textit{zu}-marked infinitive. I will discuss the properties and tests that distinguish between the two constructions in detail below and we will see that Alemannic marks this distinction overtly: the coherent one is realized as a bare infinitive and the non-coherent one as a finite clause.

In SG, this distinction is blurred (on the surface) because in its historical development
(i) SG (or the dialects on which it is based) replaced bare infinitives with \textit{zu}-marked infinitives, as it happened also in English and many other Germanic languages, see e.g. Fischer (1995), Miller (2002) among many others and (ii) SG additionally replaced finite (often subjunctive) complement clauses with \textit{zu}-marked infinitives, see Los (1998) for the similar development in English. I will not discuss the historical development in detail here and refer the reader to Brandner (subm.). However, what is important here is that both infinitives nevertheless kept their underlying structure, i.e. bare VP in coherent and CP in non-coherent structures\(^6\), cf. the inertness hypothesis, Longobardi (2003). This amounts to say that SG has two different kinds of \textit{zu}; a hypothesis that is defended in detail in Brandner (subm.).

To prepare the ground for this, it is important to note afore that in Alemannic, the complement of a propositional verb can be realized only as a finite clause - either introduced by the complementizer \textit{dass} or as an embedded V/2 clause and never by an infinitive:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{(10)}er het versproche \[ dass er zittig komme/er kummt zittig/ *zittig kumme ] \hspace{1cm} \text{ALM}
  \begin{align*}
    \text{he has promised} & \text{ that he on-time comes/he comes on-time/on-time come} \\
    \end{align*}
  \\
  \item \textit{(11)}er hat versprochen \[ rechtzeitig zu kommen ] \hspace{1cm} \text{SG}
  \begin{align*}
    \text{he has promised} & \text{ on-time to come} \\
    \text{"He has promised to come on time"}
  \end{align*}
  \\
  \item \textit{(12)}er het gseet \[ dass er se gseene het/ er hei se gseene/ *se gseene hon ] \hspace{1cm} \text{ALM}
  \begin{align*}
    \text{he has said} & \text{ that he them seen has/he has-subj them seen/them seen have} \\
    \end{align*}
  \\
  \item \textit{(13)}er behauptet \[ sie gesehen zu haben ] \hspace{1cm} \text{SG}
  \begin{align*}
    \text{he alleged} & \text{ them seen to have} \\
    \text{"he alleges that he has seen her"}
  \end{align*}
\end{itemize}

---

\(^5\) One should note that several verbs that are listed in Wurmbrand (2001) (but of course also in other work on this topic) simply do not exist or are not in use in this dialect, e.g. \textit{erwägen} (contemplate), \textit{gestatten} (permit), \textit{beabsichtigen} (intend) and many more. This means that the amount of verbs which can be classified as 'optional coherent' is not more than about 10 verbs in Alemannic (including the phase verbs).

\(^6\) See Cremers (1983) for an early suggestion along these lines.
It is also important to note that SG allows finite clauses in this environment too:

(14) *er behauptet [dass er sie gesehen hat]
    he alleges that he them seen has

So it is not the case that these verbs c-select for an infinitive in SG, rather the infinitive seems to be an alternative realization of the clausal complement, provided of course that the subjects of the two clauses are identical in referential terms, i.e. that a control relation can be established. SG can thus "freely" choose between a finite clause and an infinitive and the two variants have an equivalent interpretation.

This is not the case with opc verbs and the other (obligatory) restructuring verbs:

(15)a. *er hat angefangen zu lesen
    he has started to read
b. *er hat angefangen dass er liest
    he has started that he reads

(16)a. sie muss das Buch lesen
    she must the book read
b. *sie muss dass sie das Buch liest
    she must that she the book reads

(17)a. sie vergaß ein Brot zu kaufen
    she forgot a bread to buy
b. *sie vergaß dass sie ein Brot kauft
    she forgot that she a bread buys

However, in case of opc verbs there is a 'repair strategy' which allows a finite construction; a finite clause is possible if a modal is additionally inserted:

(18) sie hat vergessen dass sie ein Brot kaufen soll/muss
    she has forgotten that she a bread buy should/must

The actual choice of the modal depends on the context and/or the lexical content of the clause⁷ and I will not go further into this. What is important to note is the fact that opc-verbs obviously can have finite clauses, i.e. CPs, as their complements in contrast to modal verbs, but there is not a "free" choice as with the propositional verbs discussed above. In order to get an equivalent interpretation, additional lexical items (modals) have to be inserted. This shows that a 'classical' restructuring analysis in the sense that the complement of the opc verb starts out as a CP and is then 'restructured' to some smaller category, e.g. a VP, cannot be on the right track, as in the analyses that began with Evers (1975).

In the following section, I will discuss the tests that are usually taken in the literature to distinguish between the coherent and the non-coherent structures and as already hinted

---

⁷ Note that apparently root modals but not epistemic modals are possible in this construction. I can not say anything interesting on this at the moment.
at: there is no deep-rooted difference in the syntactic behavior of these complements in SG and Alemannic despite their 'surface' distinctions.

2.3. Tests for (non-)coherence

As already said, there are several diagnostics discussed in the literature, see e.g. Haider (1994, 2003) and Wurmbrand (2001) for an overview and detailed discussion. Beside the more indirect tests in terms of scope ambiguity of negation, various binding (im-) possibilities, long passive, and long scrambling, the (surface) position of the infinitival complement as well as the presence of the infinitival marker is taken generally as an indication for its categorial status. So let us have first a look at these and discuss then in the next section the more indirect ones.

2.3.1. Surface diagnostics

2.3.1.1. Extraposition

According to traditional analyses, which assume an OV base for German (and also Dutch), the complement originates in the position to the left of the matrix verb. If it appears to the right (extraposed position), then it must have moved out of its base position and since movement can apply only to (functionally) complete phrases, it must be a CP in this case. So, extraposition is taken as a diagnostic for the CP-status of the infinitival complement, see Reis/Sternefeld (2004). This implies that the intraposed version corresponds to a coherent construction.

This diagnostic is important in the analysis of the opc verbs because - as already said - opc verbs are ambiguous and if it were true that extraposition is a clear indication for the non-coherent structure (and vice versa) then the task to distinguish between the two would be easy. However, as can already be seen from the data in (3-8), Alemannic has the (bare) infinitives in extraposed position (which is not possible in SG, see the examples in (2)). Additionally, intransposition of an infinitive is considered in this dialect as highly marked, see also below.

(19)a. ??woasch no wo die [d'schtrooss uffriisse] aagfange hond ALM
know-you still where they [the road up-tear] started have
b. ?? woasch no wo se [de Block zuemache] vergessen hond
know-you still where the greenhouse close forgotten have

So it seems that extraposition is not a solid criterion for the CP-status of an infinitival complement. I will return to this issue briefly in section 2.3.3.
2.3.1.2. Zu-marking

But let us first turn to another rather surface-oriented diagnostic which is formulated by
Bech himself in the following way:

(20) Bech’s (1955) rule of coherence
If a verb V1 selects a verbal complement V2 in first (bare infinitive) or third
(participle) status, then the construction is coherent

Generally, it is assumed that status government, i.e. of which type the selected infinitive
is, is an "irreducible lexical property" of the verbs in question, see Stechow (1990:170).
So the use of a bare infinitive implies a monoclausal structure and at the same time an
obligatory intraposed one, see above. This captures very well the behavior of modal and
perception verbs in SG since in these cases the two properties indeed coincide, cf:

(21)a. dass er das Buch lesen will
     that he the book read will
b. * dass er will [das Buch lesen]
     that he will the book read

(22)a. als ich ihn kommen sah
     when I him come saw
b. *als ich sah [ihn kommen]
     when I saw him come

Note that this accounts also for the pattern in (2), since being a bare infinitive and not
being able to extrapose seems to be closely connected.

However, if we look at the Alemannic data, we see that this correlation does not hold,
one example is repeated here for convenience:

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

As already noted above, an intraposed version is clearly dispreferred albeit not fully
ungrammatical:

(24) ??woasch no wo die [d'schtrooss uffriisse] aagfange hond ALM
    know-you still where [the road  up-tear] started have

The Alemannic data thus contradict the correlation that has been taken for granted,
namely that extraposition is not compatible with a bare infinitive. So again, if we were
to take the infinitival marker as a functional head which projects a full clausal structure
and if this were to correlate with the semantics of the verb or its selectional properties
we would have to state that Alemannic and SG differ rather 'dramatically'. But as will
be discussed immediately, their syntactic behavior is nevertheless parallel w.r.t. other
diagnostics.

2.3.2. Other syntactic tests
2.3.2.1. Long passive

One of the most convincing diagnostics for a mono-clausal structure is the so-called long passive, first discussed in detail by Höhle (1978). An example from SG is given below:

(25) a. weil der Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde
   because the-nom tractor to repair tried was
b. ?weil den Traktor zu reparieren versucht wurde
   because the-acc tractor to repair tried was

As one can see, the direct object of the embedded verb is the subject of the matrix which is passivized. These data show clearly that there is no clause boundary between the matrix and the infinitival complement since case-driven movement is possible only clause-internally. Now the data in (25) are standardly taken as a clear indication that the extraposed infinitive is of a different category (CP) since it does not allow long passive, i.e. the direct object remains as an accusative.

(26) a. weil versucht wurde den Traktor zu reparieren
   because tried was the-acc tractor to repair
b. *weil versucht wurde der Traktor zu reparieren
   because tried was the-nom tractor to repair

In line with the 'surface indication' from above, extraposition coincides with the clausal status of the infinitive which accounts for the impossibility of long passive. If we now look at Alemannic, we see that it patterns w.r.t. (25) the same way:

(27) a. dass vergesse wor is die Brief lese
   that forget was-passive is the letters read
b. *dass vergessewor sind die Brief lese
   that forget was are the letters read

Recall that Alemannic prefers the extraposed position for the infinitive. So it is expected that a structure like in (24a) should be dispreferred, simply because if the intraposition and thus long passive should be impossible in general, i.e. the structural precondition is not given. The first prediction turns out to be correct, cf. (27a) but (27b), i.e. a long passive is possible nevertheless:

---

8 Since Alemannic does not have an overt distinction between nominative and accusative, I took examples with a plural subject such that the agreement pattern can tell us whether we have a subject or not.

9 Passive constructions are avoided in this dialect if possible. Therefore I marked them generally with a question mark. However, the contrasts between real ungrammatical versions like in (26b) and below and the slightly marked ones is very sharp. Note also that Alemannic is one of those Germanic dialects that has lost its preterite and therefore a construction like (27b) unavoidably leads to a sequence of four adjacent verbs, which leads (not only in Alemannic) to a rather marked construction anyway – which is probably due to prosodic reasons.
(28) a. weil die wichtige brief lese vergesse wore sind, isch der ganz Irger kumme ALM
    because the important letters read forget were are, is the whole annoyance come
b. weil die wichtige brief vergesse wore sind lese, isch der ganz Irger kumme
    because the important letters forget were are read, is the whole annoyance come

"Because they forgot to read the important letters, the annoyance appeared"

So long passive is possible despite the extraposition of the infinitival complement. The important point now is that this is possible even in SG:

(29) a. dass der Traktor versucht wurde zu reparieren SG
    that the tractor-nom tried was to repair
b. *dass den Traktor-acc versucht wurde zu reparieren
    that the tractor tried was to repair

These data are much debated in the literature, e.g. Wurmbrand (2001:293) judges (28a) as quite bad whereas Wöllstein-Leisten (2001) tested this construction with several informants (and with various verbs) and it turned out that the a.-version, i.e. with a nominative marked NP is much more preferred. I will not go into a detailed analysis of this construction here, see Brandner (subm.); what is important to note in the context here is that long passive is possible with an extraposed infinitive in Alemannic and in SG. From this we can conclude that extraposition is not per se a configuration which precludes movement, i.e. that there is a CP-barrier. The data just discussed give evidence thus for a mono-clausal structure in both variants.

2.3.2.2. Long scrambling

(29) is a combination of long passive and long scrambling. The latter is also referred to in the literature as the 3rd construction, see Broekhuis et al (1995) for an extensive discussion:

(30) weil Hans den Wagen versucht zu starten
    because H. the engine tries to start

The construction is extensively discussed in the literature and so I will restrict myself to a few remarks. The point is that the movement of the direct object of the infinitival complement into the matrix shows all signs of scrambling, or at least the (maybe sometimes string-vacuous) movement in the 'middle-field' which is triggered by definiteness or other more information structural properties, see Wöllstein-Leisten (2001) for detailed discussion. Now scrambling is clause-bound in German. This is in sharp contradiction to the assumption that extrapos ed infinitives are (always) CPs. There are various solutions to this problem that have been proposed in the literature; from a strict derivational approach which assumes that the NP scrambles out of the infinitive before it is extraposed, see Broekhuis et al. (1995) to the assumption that the category of this infinitive is somehow in between a bare VP and CP such that it is transparent for
movement but still 'complete enough' to extrapose, Wurmbrand (2001). However, in light of the Alemannic facts and the long passive with an extraposed infinitive, it seems more promising to assume a unified structure for all the constructions under discussion. The easiest solution would be to assume that in all the cases discussed we are dealing merely with a VP, selected by the opc-verb, i.e. that the opc verb is taken as a semi-lexical verb which occupies basically the same type of position as e.g. a modal verb. The problem then is how to account for the possibility of extraposition if we do not want to give up the idea that movement is only possible for functionally complete phrases. I will claim in the following that the VP-solution is nevertheless on the right track and that an underlying right-branching VP-structure (with the additional possibility of leftward inversion in SG) will give us the right results. But let us first finish the discussion of the other coherence-tests.

2.3.2.3. Verbal cluster

Another important test for the coherent construction is the possibility of the building of a verbal cluster and here we see a further difference between SG and Alemannic:

(31) zu reparieren gelungen ist ihm der Wagen nicht
    to repair succeeded is him the car not SG

(32)a. ?? [flicke glunge] isch em der wagge it
    fix succeed is him the car not ALM

    b. * [glunge flicke] isch em der wagge it
       succeed fix is him the car not

(31) is the SG construction, as it is well documented in the literature and as one can see from the Alemannic data, this possibility does not exist or is at least very marginal. The possibility of a verbal cluster is taken as an argument that the verbs in a coherent construction form a syntactic unit because otherwise they could not form one constituent – which is a precondition for topicalization in a V/2 language like German. So it seems as if this process would not happen in Alemannic such that this precondition is not met. Instead the two verbs seem to head their own projection which then precludes movement to Spec-CP. I will come back to this difference in section 2.4. where we will see that this contrast is direct consequence of the non-altered right-branching base structure that Alemannic uses.

2.3.3. Tests for non-coherence
Until now I have discussed mainly tests which give evidence for a mono-clausal structure. These are the tests (as far as applicable) which would also be passed by verbs which undoubtedly form a mono-clausal structure, i.e. modals, phase verbs and perception verbs. But – as already noted above – opc verbs are special because they also pass tests for non-coherence, i.e. a bi-clausal structure. W.r.t. to the logic of the (traditional) argument on extraposition, these tests should be passed if the infinitive is extraposed and they should fail if it is intraposed. The idea behind these tests is that they give evidence for a full clausal structure of the infinitive in the sense that it forms a domain of its own for negation, time reference, and binding. Let us consider how the two variants behave w.r.t. these diagnostics.

2.3.3.2. Scope of Negation

The idea here is that in a coherent construction, negation should have wide scope since there is only one clausal domain. In the extraposed version on the other hand, independent negation should be possible. This is the pattern that we find in SG:

(33) weil sie versucht haben, den Teppich nicht zu beschmutzen
    because they tried have the carpet not to spoil
    weil sie gar nicht erst versucht haben den Teppich nicht zu beschmutzen
    because they prt not prt tried have the carpet not to spoil
    (two sep. neg.)

(34) weil sie nicht den Teppich zu verschmutzen versucht haben
    because they not the carpet to spoil tried have
    (one negation)

Now in Alemannic the intraposed version does simply not occur, see above the examples in and so in this case, Alemannic can't tell us anything because it always marks the scope of negation overtly. The corresponding sentences in Alemannic would thus always be of the type seen in (33).

2.3.3.2. Independent time reference

More interesting are the cases with independent time reference. The phenomenon is discussed in detail in Wurmbrand (2001:79ff) so I will again confine myself to some essential remarks. The background is essentially the same as with clausal negation, i.e. in order to refer independently to some point in time, an infinitive needs a clausal projection, especially a T-node. Whereas some opc-verbs never allow for independent time reference, cf. (35) but see below, there are some opc verbs that can have a time adverbial which modifies only the event expressed by the infinitive, cf (36a) but only if the construction is a non-coherent one. This can be seen by the fact if long scrambling has applied, the independent time reference is no more possible, cf. (36b):
(35) *er hat vergessen morgen nicht zu spät zu kommen
   he has forgotten tomorrow not too late to come

(36) a. sie haben ihm erlaubt [morgen nur Kuchen zu essen]
      they have him allowed tomorrow only cake to eat
   b. *sie haben ihm nur Kuchen erlaubt morgen zu essen
      they have him only cake allowed tomorrow to eat

If we now look at the Alemannic version of this sentence, we can see that only a finite clause is possible:

(37) a. *sie hond em erlaubt morge nuu Kueche esse
       they have him allowed tomorrow only cake eat
   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"

Now recall from above that Alemannic allows propositional and factive verbs generally only in finite clauses whereas SG seems to be able to switch freely between the two versions. I would thus like to claim that the contrast between Alemannic and SG seen here should be attributed exactly to this difference. Recall also from above that under an opc verb like forget, a finite version is only possible if additionally a modal is inserted.

This makes the prediction for SG that a non-finite clause with a modal in it under the verb forget should be able to express an independent time reference, because then we have underlingly a full CP which is realized as a zu-infinitive, due to the free choice that SG has. This is exactly what we find and note that if long scrambling applies (i.e. if the coherent structure must be chosen), the same effect can be seen as with the examples in (36), Alemannic again switches to a finite clause:

(38) a. er hat vergessen morgen zur Sitzung nicht zu spät kommen zu dürfen
      he has forgotten tomorrow to-the meeting not too late come to must
   b. *er hat zur Sitzung vergessen morgen nicht zu spät kommen zu dürfen
      he has to-the meeting forgotten tomorrow not too late come to must
      "He has forgotten that he must not be too late for the meeting tomorrow"

(39) er het vergesse dass er hett dürfe morge it z’schpoot kumme
    he has forgotten that he had-subj. must tomorrow not toolate come

If this analysis can be upheld, then we have a rather obvious explanation for the extraposition effects in SG, i.e. the fact that an extraposed infinitive shows bi-clausal behavior: I will assume without further discussion here that selected CPs are base-generated to the right in German, see Haider (1995), despite its (lexical) OV-structure. Evidence for this assumption is e.g. that they can 'intrapose' only if this is signalled via a prosodic break, indicating they are not integrated into the clause. The same holds for an intraposed version of (36a) with a narrow scope reading of the time adverbial. Now if this is true, it is easy to see why extraposition and bi-clausal behavior fall together in most cases. If this infinitive is underlingly a CP, it is base-generated to the right and
thus surfaces in the extraposed position. However, as we have seen in the discussion of long scrambling and long passive, extraposition is not necessarily an indication for CP-status. The implication holds only one way: if it is a CP, then it will be extraposed but not that if it is extraposed it is a CP. Although there is surely much more to say about this phenomenon, we have clear evidence that in the case of independent time reference, we have in fact a clausal projection of the infinitive. The ambiguity only arises in SG since SG can freely replace finite CPs with infinitival CPs.

2.3.3.3. Binding

The same pattern w.r.t. finite clauses and clausal infinitives is found in binding phenomena. Consider the contrast in (39):

(40)

(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 himself

"He succeeded in freeing himself"

As indicated in the a.-example, the infinitive consists of a full clause, containing a PRO-subject in order to bind the anaphor. In the coherent construction, (40b), binding is not possible since the dative argument does not qualify as a binder for independent reasons, see Haider (2003) for detailed discussion. Since there is obviously no other possible binder present, it must be the case that the infinitive consists only of a VP. Now again, if we try to construe such a sentence in Alemannic, we get as the only outcome a finite clause:

(41)

(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

So again, as soon as a clausal structure is needed, Alemannic switches to a finite clause whereas SG also has a full clausal structure in these environments but these can be realized with a zu-infinitive clause. The question now is whether we should attribute this different behavior to micro- or macro-variation, i.e. is it necessary to posit different values for a parameter in order to account for the differences?

Let us first summarize the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>properties of opc verbs</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>ALM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbal cluster (coh.)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are basically two major issues where the two variants differ obviously fundamentally:

- replacement of finite clauses with infinitives
- *zu*-marking and verbal cluster

I will not discuss in detail the replacement of finite clauses with infinitives but merely suggest that the CP in these cases in SG is licensed via the selection of the matrix verb and that the C-head of this projection may remain empty, see also Sabel (1996). It seems as if we have to take this alternation in SG as a kind of "stylistic variant", see also Los (1998) for the same point for English. In case of propositional verbs there is (i) no difference in interpretation and the two versions are thus semantically equivalent Why this alternation is possible in SG is unclear. Los (1998) suggests for English that these infinitives replaced finite clauses marked with subjunctive. The intuition is that subjunctive and infinitive share the property that they are dependent on the matrix in their time reference and that they are therefore at least very close in their semantic interpretation. Since Alemannic uses the subjunctive productively, cf. the examples in (12 and 38) with the embedded V2 clause, it may very well be the case that the scenario described above simply did not happen. I have to leave this topic for future research but see Brandner (subm) for some further speculations.

If we look at the extraposition facts, the table above suggests that intraposition seems to be an additional possibility in SG rather than a defining property of the coherent construction; especially in light of the discussion above. So let us turn to this problem first and we will see that the solution to be proposed can also account for the possibility of a verbal cluster in SG. As a last issue then the (lack of) *zu*-marking remains and we will see that it does not correlate with any further property which suggests that it is a genuine case of microvariation in the sense defined above.

### 2.4. Verb raising and Verb projection raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>no</th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zu-marking (coh.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long passive/scrambling (coh.)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extraposition (non-coh.)</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>only extrapos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binding(non-coh.)</td>
<td>poss. with extrapoed</td>
<td>poss. with finite clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent time reference (non-coh.)</td>
<td>poss. with extrapoed</td>
<td>poss. with finite clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alemannic is one of those West Germanic dialects that has verb raising and verb projection raising, as exemplified below.

(42) dass er des buch it hett welle lese
    that he the book not has want read
This is the normal, unmarked order of infinitival verbs, i.e. the modal is before the lexical verb (preceded by the auxiliary). This holds also for modal constructions without auxiliaries, cf. (42). As seen in (43) this is not possible in SG; however, we know that the Alemannic order is possible in a variety of West Germanic dialects, including Dutch, West Flemish, Swiss German among many others.

(43) dass er des Buch it will lese
    that he the book want read

(44) dass er das Buch nicht (*will) lesen lesen will
    that he bokk not will read will

The same pattern is also found in Kaiserstuhl Alemannic, discussed in Noth (1993:335) who considers it the normal order. Verb projection raising occurs also very frequently. It seems again to be the unmarked order. Nominal and other non-verbal constituents can occur rather freely between the verbs (dependent on information structure), but the relative order of the verbs is constant, as indicated in (44).

(45)a. daß die hond künne die Knoche ofach uff d’Dilli uffituo
    that they have can the bones simply on the-attic up-do (put)
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

Without going into a detailed discussion of verb (projection) raising, these data show that extraposition in Alemannic is generally not dependent on the presence of the infinitival marker but instead seems to be the normal, unmarked order. For this reason I will assume that this is the basic order which leads us to the postulation of the following, right-branching structure for the VP in German, see also den Dikken (1996) and Zwart (1993,1996) for similar proposals:
I assume here without further justification that lexical Vs are posited to the right in German, but that the functional (aux) or semi-functional (modals and opc) verbs are situated to the left. The assumption now is that Alemannic keeps this basic order with the possibility of adjoining the non-verbal constituent to intermediate VP-projections, as it is familiar from the scrambling operation in German, giving us the various possibilities in (44). The question is now what is going on in SG? I would like to suggest that the surface order in SG is derived via a 'PF-flipping rule', as suggested in Williams (2004), Wurmbrand (2003). As discussed in more detail in Brandner (subm.), flipping requires PF-adjacency between the verbs which means concretely that SG must move out of the VP all the non-verbal constituents. Since Alemannic does not apply this PF-reordering in the unmarked case, no verbal cluster is built and thus we get the contrast that SG has verbal clusters but Alemannic does not. Since clustering proceeds in a successive way from the lowest verb to the higher ones, the unattested order MOD-AUX-LEXICAL VERB does not arise. So essentially, I follow those proposals which treat the different orders in the verbal cluster on a PF-level, see also Vogel/Schmid (2004) for an OT treatment. The important point is that there are good reasons to assume that it does not belong to the core syntax and in this sense it is a clear case of microvariation.

This leaves us now with zu-marking. As already mentioned, the presence of the infinitival marker does not prevent SG from exhibiting clear cases of clause-bound movement, which casts doubt on the assumption that it always projects clausal structure. Additionally, if we have a look at the historical development of this infinitival marker, there seems to be no clear pattern, see Demske-Neumann (1995) and Askedal (1998) for a detailed discussion. Both authors come to the conclusion that there is neither a clear syntactic nor a semantic property which correlates exclusively with the insertion of the infinitival marker; rather it seems as if it had spread rather irregularly into the domain of opc verbs. I will not discuss the historical evidence here, see Brandner (subm.). But in view of the facts discussed in this section, it seems rather plausible that the infinitival marker in this domain should be treated on a morphological level. This would also account for the rather easy borrowing of this marker in the
Alemannic dialect, see fn. 1. We will see cases from Alemannic below which cannot be analyzed in another way than to assume that it is simply a marker of a non-finite verb form and that it doesn't project any functional category.

To summarize: opc verbs can have two different complements, as has been assumed traditionally, either a VP or a CP. In Alemannic, we can see this difference overtly in that the VP-complement is realized as a bare infinitive and the CP-complement as a finite clause. In SG, both types can be realized as a zu-marked infinitive, but they have underlyingly the same difference in structure. In the VP-case, I suggested that the infinitival marker is a mere formative-like type of element which does not project functional structure. The CP-case is an instance of the "free choice" between finite clauses and zu-infinitives in SG. Extrapolation and zu-marking have been shown to be not decisive w.r.t. whether a construction is coherent or not. Instead, these are typical cases of microvariation in the sense that the different outcomes correlate neither with a different semantic nor a syntactic property. Although many details remain to be discussed in more detail, the important point of this section was to show that – although there seem to be many differences in the syntax of infinitives between SG and Alemannic at first sight – the underlying syntactic configuration is the same and that therefore the syntactic tests, i.e. long passive and long scrambling give us the same results.

3. Complementizer introduced infinitives in Alemannic

In this section, I will show that Alemannic has infinitival clauses that are introduced overtly by a complementizer in contrast to SG and that this correlates with a further syntactic property, namely that Alemannic allows wh-infinitives productively. The form of this complementizer is zum which is standardly assumed to consist of a contracted form of the preposition zu and the definite dative determiner dem, which gives us zum.

This kind of contraction of a preposition with a determiner is common in German. It is not restricted to infinitival constructions but occurs also regularly in PPs.

(46) a. er muss ins Krankenhaus
    he must in-the hospital
b. er geht zur Schule
    he goes to-the school
c. ich geh zum Einkaufen
    I go to-the shopping
The c.-example is a typical instance of a nominalized verb and it occurs in this form in SG as well as in Alemannic. So I will not say anything more to these forms. What will be of interest here is nominal complementation.

### 3.1. Complements of nouns

We have to distinguish two cases: if there is a simple nominalized verb, then it can be introduced in both variants with *zum* and their structure can be assumed to consist of a simple PP with the nominalized verb as the noun:

(47) a. *ich habe keine Zeit zum Spielen*  
    I have no time to play

b. *ich brauche mehr Platz zum Üben*  
    I need more space to practice
d. *I ha koa Zii zum schpile*  
    I have no time to play
c. *I bruuch mee Platz zum übe*  
    I need more space to practice

As soon as we choose other prepositions, SG switches to a clausal construction (with an optional correlate in the matrix) whereas Alemannic can use a contracted preposition but also to a finite clause.

(48) a. *er hat Angst (davor) [nass zu werden]*  
    he has fear (prep) wet to get

b. *er hat Angst (davor) [dass er nass wird]*  
    he has fear that he will get wet

d. *er het angscht voerm nass werre*  
    he has fear of+Det wet get

c. *er het angscht dass er nass wird*  
    he has fear that he will get wet

In the prepositional construction, the usual restrictions on nominalizations hold, namely that only incorporated objects, i.e. only indefinite or unspecific NPs are allowed:

(49) a. *er het angscht voerm des buech lese*  
    he has fear of+Det books read

b. *er het angscht vorem Buecher lese; s'künnt em z'lang goh*  
    he has fear of+Det books read, it could him too long last

However, interestingly, with the element *zum*, this restriction does not hold, cf:

(50) a. *i ha koa Ziit zum mit dir an de See goh*  
    I have no time to-the with you to the lake go

b. *i ha koa Lascht zum des buech lese*  
    I have no desire to-the this book read

In (49) *zum* appears in a left-peripheral position and the additional material, arguments and adjuncts in the VP can occur freely there, indicating that we have a full clausal structure here. SG must express these with a kind of purpose clause whereby the initial element *um* is optional in this construction. Note that in genuine purpose clauses this optionality is does not occur, cf. (51):
a. Ich habe keine Zeit (um) mit dir an den See zu gehen  
I have no time in-order with you to the lake go  
b. Ich habe keine Lust (um) mit dir auf das Fest zu gehen  
I have no desire in-order to the party go

(52) er hat das getan nur * (um) ins Fernsehen zu kommen  
he has that done only in-order in-the TV to come

So we see that zum has a wider distribution in Alemannic than in SG. In the next section, I will show that zum in Alemannic has indeed developed into an infinitival complementizer.

3.2. Purpose clauses
Let us first consider purpose clauses. (53) is from the Lake Constance region and (54) is an example from Noth (1983):

(53) ich zünd [um unter de schemmel stelle] jo oh koa liecht a  
I enlighten prt prt no light on to-the (in order) under the stool place

(54) Mr brücha a Oszillograaf [um des Schbannungsvrlau̯ ufzaichna]  
we need a oscillograph to-the (in order) the tension record

In Müller (2000) the construction in (52,53) is discussed w.r.t. Swabian which is also an Alemannic dialect. In Swabian, a purpose clause can be realized with two occurrences of the infinitival marker particle: one at the beginning of the clause – just like in the examples above – a second one can occur in the position before the verb:

(55) I han a Auto kauft [zum des Johr mit meine Fraind noch Spania / z' / zom fahra]  
I have a car bought to-the this year with my friends to Spain drive

Note that with the lower occurrence of the infinitival marker, there seems to be free variation w.r.t. the form of the marker; it can either copy the full form or it can be a cliticized version (or be zero of course). In the dialects we examined, we found the same type of construction – although speakers seem to be aware of the fact that this is a kind of ‘repair strategy’ or imitation of the standard variety. The optionality of the lower particle and the mere possibility of doubling show in my view clearly that the lower particle does not head any functional projection and is thus inserted on the surface.

Interestingly, the initial zum seems to be spreading to environments where otherwise bare infinitives occur. Recall from section 2. that if the infinitival complements of opc verbs require a full clausal structure (tense, negation, etc.), the usual strategy in
Alemannic is to use a finite clause as the usual strategy. However, some informants offered also a version like the following, compare with (40)

(56) ma het ihne grote zum sich in Radolfzell (?zum) treffe
    one has them advised to-the themselves in R. to-the meet
    "They advised them to meet in Radolfzell"

As the question mark indicates, the structure is not judged as completely grammatical; however it is considered as a way of saving the infinitival construction with the anaphor in it, cf. the discussion of binding as a diagnostic for non-coherence. I will return to this below but first let us consider the properties of this element in more detail.

(57), a tough-construction, shows that zum occupies the C-position since the PP cannot appear before it, although the PP itself is mobile, as shown in (57c):

(57) a. die sell Wies war amel schwer [zum vu Hand maie] ALM
    the that meadow was sometimes hard to-the by hand mow
    b. *die sell Wies war amel schwer [vu Hand zum maie]
    the that meadow was sometimes hard by hand to-the mow
    c. die sell Wies war amel schwer [zum maie vu hand]
    the that meadow was sometimes hard to-the mow by hand
    "That meadow eas always hard to mow by hand"

Further evidence that we are dealing here with a complementizer-like element comes from the fact that it can delete under coordination – an operation which is known not to be applicable to zu in SG infinitives.

    I have no desire C there to-go and then only around sit
    b. Ich habe keine Lust [dort hinzugehen] und [dann nur herum*(zu)sitzen] SG
    "I don’t want to go to that place and then merely sit around"

Another observation that I would like to mention in this context is that the complements of opc verbs are not rated as completely ungrammatical if they are introduced by the complementizer zum:

(59) a. i han em verbote (?zum) along uff d’Dilli go
    I have him forbidden to-the alone on the attic go
    b. I han en ghoasse (?zum) de sel Kruscht affrumme
    I have him ordered (to-the) the this rubbish clear
    c. ich ha vergesse (?zum) de Block zuemache
    I have forgotten Comp the greenhouse close

Speaker judgements vary to a great extent and so it is hard to determine at the present stage whether this phenomenon is an ongoing diachronic change or whether it is merely

---

10 This clitic-form exists also in Alemannic and in Reichenau German (a small island in the Lake Constance), this form occurs exclusively with an infinitive form which is called the gerund, distinguished from a bare infinitive via a dental stop at the ending, i.e. (’essit). This form is quite restricted in that it occurs e.g. only with weak quantifiers. It corresponds to an infinitival construction which in German, but also English does not differ from other infinitives, cf. I want something to eat. How Alemannic can give us a clue to a deeper understanding of this construction is discussed in detail in Bayer/Brandner (2004, ms). I refer the interested reader to this work.
a surface variation of the kind discussed in section 2. However, that the latter possibility is probably not at stake here can be seen by the following considerations.

First, that this is not "simply" an imitation of the standard variety can be seen by the fact that if the infinitival marker is placed before the verb (as it would be the case in SG) and if there is no introducing complementizer in addition, cf. the examples with doubling above, the sentences were judged as impossible:

(60) a. i han em verbote along uff d'Dilli (*zum) go
    I have him forbidden to-the alone on the attic go
b. I han en ghoasse de sel Kruscht(*zum) uffrumme
    I have him ordered (to-the) the this rubbish clear
c. ich ha vergesse de Block (*zum) zuemache
    I have forgotten the greenhouse close

Secondly, those speakers who accepted readily an initial zum after an opc or a lexical restructuring verb judge long scrambling in this case as much worse if not as completely impossible than in the examples without a complementizer; (but again, speaker judgements vary to a great extent):

(61) a. woasch no wo die aagfange hond [zum d'schtrooss uffriisse]
    know-you still where they started the road up-tear
b. ?*woasch no wo die d'schtrooss aagfange hond [zum uffriisse]
    know-you still where they started the road up-tear

This is reminiscent of the Dutch dialects which also do not allow long scrambling as soon as an om-te infinitive is chosen, see e.g. Broekhuis et al (1995)

(62) dat Jan die brief heft geprobeerd (*om) zijn broer te schrijven
    that Jan the letter has tried Compl his brother to write

In sum, we have good evidence that zum is a left-peripheral complementizer, occurring genuinely in contexts which are not selected by a verb but which seems to spread to the verbal domain, being an alternative realization of a finite CP.

So I will assume that zum occupies the C^0-position of an infinitival CP in agreement with Müller (2000) w.r.t. the Swabian data.

3.3. Complements of motion verbs

There is another sentential infinitival construction which gives evidence that Alemannic has elements that can occupy the C^0-position in an infinitive. This is the complementizer gi (in some variants realized as go). Some examples are given below.

11 This is remarkably different from Bavarian which also uses the form zum rather regularly with infinitives, but its position corresponds to the SG one, i.e. immediately before the verb, see. Bayer (1993), Donhauser (1986), and Weiß (1998).
(63) *die gond etz gi bade*
they go now Comp bath

(64) *kumm, gang gi ’n Fisch hole*
come, go Comp a fish get

(65) *es kummt gi regngle*
it comes Comp rain

Gi is compatible only with verbs of *coming*, *going*, and *standing*:

(66) Mr sin am Haag schdoo bliiba [go luaga wia si ghigga] Kaiserstuhl
We are at-the gate stand staying Comp look how the play(football)

(67) ich bin g’ku gi sell Sach abhole
I been come Comp this thing fetch

The construction is also known from Swiss German where it is treated under the heading of 'verb doubling', see Penner/Schönenberger (1995), Lötscher (1993). Some examples are given below:

Swiss German, data from Lötscher (1993):

(68) a. *er laat d Vaase la gheie*
he lets the vase let drop  
Swiss
b. *er losst d Vase gheie*
he drops the vase let drop  
Alm

(69) a. *er chunnt cho der Onkel bsueche*
he comes come the uncle visit  
Swiss
b. *er kunnt gi de Onkel bsueche*
he comes come the uncle visit  
Alm

(70) a. *si faat s Zmittag afa choche*
she begins the lunch begin cook  
Swiss
b. *si fangt a s Mittagesse koche*
begin cook  
Alm

The Alemannic construction is different though: (i) we only encounter the form *gi*, i.e. there is no doubling of other verbs as in (67-69), and (ii) *gi* never occurs immediately before the verb (if there is more material in the infinitival clause), which does not seem to hold for the Swiss German construction, cf. (70):

(71) *de Fritz chunt sys Auto em Hans cho verchauffe*
the Fritz comes (come) his car (come) the-dat Hans (come) sell  
Swiss German

Dobler (2002) reports from the Vorarlberg dialect (east of the Lake Constance) that dative marked arguments seem to occur preferably before *gi*, which leads her to an analysis in which *gi* is an aspect-element, situated rather low within the VP. Although we found the same effect to a certain extent with datives, it seems by no means to be such a straightforward pattern in the dialects we examined that it would justify such an analysis:
(72) a. dass se gange isch gi der Oma en Kueche bringe
   that she went is (gi) the Grandma a cake bring-inf
   b. ??dass se gange isch der Oma gi en Kueche bringe
   c. *dass se gange isch en Kueche gi der Oma bringe
   "That she went to bring grandma a cake"

(73) a. I ha se gschickt [gi em Vater bim ufflade helfe]
   I have her sent Comp the-dat father at-the up-loading help
   b. *I ha se gschickt [em Vater gi bim ufflade helfe]
   I have her sent the-dat father Comp at-the up-loading help
   c. *I ha se gschickt [bim ufflade gi em Vater helfe]
   I have her sent at-the up-loading Comp the-dat father help

As shown in (71c), other constituents are completely impossible in this position. It
seems also to be the case if there is additional, non-selected material (i.e. bim ufflade) in
(72), the occurrence of the dative before gi becomes ungrammatical. I cannot offer a
complete analysis of this construction but the Alemannic data point rather clearly into
the direction that gi is a $C^0$-element which is lexically selected by motion verbs.
However, I will follow Lötscher (1993) and Dobler (2002) in assuming that the source
of the particle in Alemannic is probably the preposition "gen" (the short form of gegen
meaning against) and not a doubled version of the matrix verb. As with zum, it is thus
originally a preposition and for that reason it is a good candidate for the reanalysis as a
complementizer. What is important in the context here is the fact that in SG, this type of
infinitive is marked with zu if the infinitival complement is complex, cf. (75), but can
also be realized as a bare infinitive, if the complement consists of a sole verb, cf (74).
(74b) shows that intraposition is obligatory in SG in this case which conforms to the
patterns we have seen above with other bare infinitives. Reis (2001:307) takes this as
an indication for a coherent structure, but as we have seen above, the position of an
infinitive does not exclusively correlate with any other syntactic property.

(74) a. ich gehe einkaufen
   I go shop
   b. dass ich einkaufen gehe*gehe einkaufen
       that I shopping go/go shopping

(75) a. *weil ich gekommen bin die Bücher abholen
   because I come am the books collect
   b. weil ich gekommen bin die Bücher ab$zu$holen
   because I come am the books to-collect
   c. weil ich gekommen bin um die Bücher ab$zu$holen
   because I come am in-order the books to-collect
   "Because I’ve come in order to collect the books"

Whether the optionality between (74b) and (74c) should be analyzed as a PF-drop of the
particle um (which is an option in SG in certain environments, see above) or whether
there are two different structures at stake must be left open here. The important thing is
that in SG we do not find this kind of left-peripheral element in an infinitival construction.

In sum although lexically restricted, gi nevertheless has basically the properties of a complementizer and I will analyze it thus as an element occupying the C^0-position in an infinitival CP. So we have two elements in Alemannic which can be classified as infinitival complementizers. To see whether this provides this language with other or further possibilities in their infinitival syntax, let us now consider the already mentioned possibility of wh-infinitives in Alemannic.

5. Wh-infinitives

SG is known for not allowing wh-infinitives, at least not in embedded contexts, see Reis (2002, 2003), Sabel (1996). There are some (quite often) cited cases like the following:

(76) *Ich weiss nicht [was tun]  
I know not what do

However, there is general agreement that these should be analyzed as idiomatic or 'frozen' expressions and that SG lacks productive wh-infinitives.

Now this is different in Alemannic where constructions like in (76) are readily accepted.

(77)a. *I woass it [wellem Enkele wa schenke]  
I know not [which grandchild what give

(78)b. I zoag dir schnell [welle Socke schtopfe]  
I shwo you quickly which socks fix

(79)c. I ha dir doch gseet [weller Pinsel nea]  
I have you prt told which brush take

As can be seen, we have the full range of possible wh-constructions: (i) we can have two wh-expressions, (ii) the wh-expressions can be either a simple wh-word or a which-phrase, and (iii) we have several kinds of matrix verbs, which indicates that these can not be 'frozen' expressions' as with the SG cases. An interesting fact is that wh-phrases in an infinitive can never occur together with any (kind of) infinitival marker, be it before or after the wh-expression:

(80)b. I zoag dir schnell [(zum/z) welle Socke (*zum/z’) schtopfe]  
I shwo you quickly [zum/z’] which socks fix

This goes very well with the findings discussed in Sabel (1996, chapter 8).
First, Sabel establishes the empirical generalization that exactly those languages which have an overt realization of the C-head in infinitivals also do allow wh-infinitives. Second, this element is in complementary distribution with the wh-element.

E.g. most of the Romance allow wh-infinitives and the infinitival marker in these languages is generally assumed to occupy the C-head, see Sabel (1996 for references). Let us take as one example French:

(81) a. Il a oublié [\textit{de [PRO nettoyer la chambre]}]
he has forgotten to clean the room
b. Je lui ai dit [\textit{où [PRO aller t]]]
I him have told where go

So we find the same pattern as in Alemannic, namely we have a left-peripheral complementizer which does crucially not occur in the wh-infinitive. I will not go into a detailed analysis, however, the empirical generalization established by Sabel (1996) is confirmed by the Alemannic data and we have thus further evidence that \textit{zum} is a left-peripheral infinitival complementizer, not existent in SG. Here we can see that the availability of a lexical item (and its featural content) correlates with another syntactic property and this correlation is clearly not an 'accident' because it operates on the same syntactic head and because it patterns with a correaltion that is found in many other languages too.

In sum, we have seen two types of variation between SG and Alemannic: in one case, it could be shown that despite certain surface differences, the underlying structure is basically identical, which leads to the same results w.r.t. movement operations, such that there is no reason to assume different structures. Instead it was argued that (i) the Infinitival marker \textit{zu} in SG does not occupy a functional head position in these constructions and (ii) that extraposition is even for SG not a decisive factor for monoclauasality. For this reason, the variation is considered as microvariation.

On the other hand, we have seen that Alemannic has a lexical item – not available in SG – which correlates undoubtedly with a rather 'dramatic' difference between the two languages, namely the licensing of wh-infinitives. The place of this variation can be located in the lexicon and so we have further evidence that the conception of micro- and macrovariation as sketched in the introduction has a solid basis. Another important result is that we did not find evidence for positing different kinds of parameters in order to account for the microvariation found with the opc-verbs but that instead the tools of Minimalism are sufficient if we take it seriously that a difference in structure should correspond to a difference in interpretation. What we have to do is to accept the idea that there are some areas which at first sight seem to belong genuinely to syntax (e.g.
the different orders of verbs in a verbal cluster) – but which obviously are better captured on a PF or morphological level.
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