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Abstract
The Alemannic dialects spoken in Switzerland and around lake Bodensee are structurally very similar. This seems to extend to a motion verb construction where the motion verb is obligatorily followed by a particle go (Swiss German)/gi (Bodensee Alemannic) plus infinitive. Upon closer inspection, however, intriguing asymmetries emerge. We account for these differences by treating the particles as categorically distinct from each other. The difference in category can be related to different historical developments of originally the same element, as proposed by Lötscher (1993). While gi retains some of its prepositional properties, go has been reanalyzed as a verbal element and is now partially integrated into the Verb Raising and Verb Projection Raising system.

1 Introduction

Simple motion verbs like come and go often occur in combination with an infinitive. In such constructions they often show special properties:

1. Even though they are not necessarily aspectual in a grammaticalized sense as e.g. English going-to, they often display a certain “semi-lexical” behavior (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001) in that they “oscillate” between auxiliary and lexical usage.

2. In languages that allow Serial Verb Constructions, come and go often occur to express direction/purpose.

3. In many languages the functional element preceding the infinitive is not the canonical infinitive marker. In English, there are the “go and V”- and the “go V”-constructions where either a coordinate conjunction or nothing occurs before the infinitive – as opposed to the regular particle to. Standard German has um...zu ‘in order to’ or ‘go’ + V as opposed to the canonical particle zu. In Danish we find ‘go’ + og ‘and’ + Vfin while in semantically similar nonfinite complementation we find the particle at. In Marsala Italian, finally, we find ‘go’ + a ‘and’ + Vfin, which is again different from the homophonous particle a derived from Latin ad ‘towards’ that is found in regular non-finite complementation.

Even though one finds elements untypical of subordination, i.e. coordinating conjuctions, these constructions normally display properties of subordination. They allow extraction from a complement and thus do not display violations of the Coordinate Structure Constraint, cf. e.g. English:

(1) What, did John go buy __?

Additionally, these motion verb constructions often behave like monoclausal units, i.e. they display restructuring properties (cf. Cinque 2006).

In Alemannic, this special particle introducing complements of motion verbs is gi in the dialects spoken on the German coast of lake Bodensee, i.e. Bodensee-Alemannic. In Swiss German, the particle is go:2-3

---

1 Earlier versions of this research were presented at the Edisyn workshop in Venice and at the Syntax Colloquium in Konstanz. We thank Sjef Barbiers, Josef Bayer, Hans Bennis, Chiara Gianollo, Anne Kjeldahl, Marika Lekakou, Doris Penka, Cecilia Poletto, and Eva-Maria Remberger for helpful discussion.
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This particle can be considered a Shibboleth. A speaker is immediately recognized as a foreigner/L2-speaker if he does not employ the particle. The particles are obligatory after verbs of motion, especially after ‘go’. Importantly, Alemannic varieties are the only German varieties where the particle is found. In other varieties, including the standard language, a bare infinitive is used:  

(3) Ich gehe den Onkel besuchen.  
I go the.ACC uncle visit.INF  
SG

As for the areal distribution: *gi* is found in Low Alemannic and more specifically in the Alemannic dialects on the German coast of lake Bodensee (Bodensee-Alemannic), in the Austrian state of Vorarlberg and in Liechtenstein. *Gi* is also found in certain locations in Switzerland such as the canton of Appenzell and the Rhine Valley [the construction is also found in Alsatian German, cf. Burgmeier 2006: 102ff.). Apart from a few exceptions in Southwestern Germany, *go* is only found in Swiss German varieties, both in Low, High and Highest Alemannic dialects.

The distribution of the particle in Southern Germany is illustrated by map I from the South-West-German language atlas (Südwestdeutscher Sprachatlas), which also includes other subordinating elements.

---

2 We will consistently write *gi* even though the particle sometimes appears in different forms, e.g. *ge*, cf. Burgmeier (2006: 95ff., 106, 110f.) for an overview. The same holds for Swiss German *go*. In some dialects the vowel is closer to [a], [u] or Schwa. Cf. Burgmeier (2006: 12f.) for an overview.

3 Notation: DE = Bodensee-Alemannic; CH = Swiss German; SG = Standard G. CH(DE) means that both varieties behave the same with respect to the feature in question; such examples are then only given in Swiss German (on the basis of Zurich German). DE(CH) stands for the reverse situation. For ease of reference we will often refer to Bodensee-Alemannic as DE-Alemannic and Swiss German as CH-Alemannic.

4 Interestingly, the Swabian dictionary (Schwäbisches Wörterbuch, 3, 174) claims that the *gi/ge*-construction is generally available in Swabian. Apparently, this is a case of language change. The relevant volume of the Swabian dictionary dates from 1911. In newer sources such as the South-West-German language atlas the forms are no longer mentioned for Swabian. Cf. Burgmeier (2006: 97) for discussion, compare also the map given here where the form *zum* is predominant in the Swabian area.

West-Flemish *goan*, Haegeman (1990), looks superficially similar but has a rather different syntactic status.

5 The form *ga* is also attested for certain parts of Vorarlberg and Liechtenstein, cf. Burgmeier (2006: 106, 110). It is unclear whether it constitutes a variant of *gi* or of *go*. Generally, we do not know whether identity of form implies identical properties, i.e. whether variants of *gi/go* always behave (more or less) the same even if they are spoken in areas where other forms are predominant: e.g. whether *gi* in Appenzell German behaves like *gi* in Southern Germany, and whether *go* in Southwestern Germany behaves like *go* in Swiss German. There is some evidence that this is not always the case (cf. fn. 15/16 below), but we do not have enough data to fully answer this question.
As map II from the language atlas of German-speaking Switzerland (Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz, SDS) shows, go is found in all regions.6

Although superficially the two constructions look the same and are probably of the same origin, we will show that there are subtle, but systematic differences between CH- and DE-Alemannic. Importantly, the differences are partially orthogonal to the traditional classification into Low – High – Highest (which is generally just phonetics/phonology-based). For instance, Bodensee-Alemannic behaves differently from practically all Swiss varieties, also the Low Alemannic varieties spoken in Basle with respect to the motion verb construction.

This paper is organized as follows. Section two discusses general properties of the construction. Section three describes the differences between the two varieties. In section four we present our explanation for the asymmetries. Section five addresses the question why the construction is only found in Alemannic varieties. Section six discusses similarities and differences between Alemannic and Italian motion verb constructions. Section seven concludes the paper.

6 The map shows more than that. It actually also includes the particle cho, derived from ‘come’ that can appear in some dialects after the main verb choo ‘come’, cf. 3.1.3 below.
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2. **General issues**

2.1 **Interpretive properties**

2.1.1 *Interpretation of the motion verb*

The interpretation of the motion verb (henceforth referred to as V1) is not aspectual as e.g. in English *going to*; rather, a motion event is always implied. Consider the following example:

(4) Ich gang **go** bügle.

*I go iron.*

This sentence is only felicitous if the speaker actually goes to a different room to do the ironing. He couldn’t utter the sentence with the ironing board in the same room. The action expressed by the infinitival complement immediately follows the motion event.

The locational goal is not necessarily specific, i.e. *I gang gi d Säu fuettere* ‘I go *gi* the pigs feed’ is adequate even if the speaker does not know where the pigs actually are (e.g. either in the barn or somewhere outside). In this sense, the *gi/go*-phrase does not specify a (locational) goal, rather it “delimits” the going-event. Since the motion verb has clear semantic content it cannot be an auxiliary.

2.1.2 *V1 must be a motion verb*

Importantly, V1 must be a motion verb, as the following example shows:

(5) Ich bi *uuflibe/ häiggange go de Boxkampf luege.

*I stayed up/went home to watch the box fight.*

The verbs that occur most frequently in the construction are *gaa* ‘go’, *choo/khoo* ‘come’. Less frequently one finds verbs of manner of motion such as *räne/springe/lauffe* ‘run’ and the object control verb *schicke* ‘send’ (cf. Burgmeier 2006: 33ff. for an overview). *Gi/go* are thus lexically selected by verbs that express a motion event.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) In some DE-Alemannic varieties, the *gi/go* construction is possible with stative matrix verbs such as *blibie* ‘stay’, cf. Noth (1993: 338):

i) Mir sin am Haag schdoo bliibä **go** luägä, wiä si ghiggä.

*We are at the fence stand remain PRT watch how they play*.

More examples of this can be found in Noth (2002: 6) and in the Badisches Wörterbuch (dictionary of Baden, 2, 322).

There is one exception that seems to be found in both varieties. It involves ‘be’ as a full verb:

ii) Ich bin im Stall **gsii** [go d Söi füettere].

*I am in the stable been PRT the pigs feed*.

No motion event is implied here. Rather, the matrix event refers to being in a location. We have no explanation for this exception so far. One might argue that having been somewhere to do something implies having gone there to do something, but since normally an explicit motion event is necessary to license *go* this seems insufficient. We leave this for further research (cf. Burgmeier 2006: 39 for additional examples).

Finally, *go* also appears where an infinitive or participle of a motion verb has been elided:

iii) Ich bi go poschte (ggange).

*I went shopping.*

iv) Ich sött go poschte (gaa).

*I should go shopping.*

2.1.3 Agentivity/Animacy restriction

The subject must be interpretable as being capable of volitional/intentional action:

   the smell of the restaurant comes me always PRT annoy
   ‘The smell of the restaurant always comes and annoys me.’

   b. D Nachberschind chömed mich immer go ärgere.
     the children of our neighbor come me always PRT annoy
     ‘The children of our neighbor always come and annoy me.’

Importantly, this is not due to selectional properties of motion verbs. Outside the construction with gi/go, non-agentive/inanimate subjects are easily possible:

(7) Dëë Brief gaat uf/chunnt us Amerika.
     this letter goes on comes from America
     ‘This letter goes to/comes from the United States.’

Related to the agentivity restriction on subjects is the observation that the infinitive must allow for an agentive interpretation, which excludes states, achievements and passives:

(8) a. *Ich bi extra häigrännt [go de Boxkampf nöd verpasse].
     I am specially run home PRT the boxing fight not miss INF
     ‘I ran home in order not to miss the box fight.’

   b.* Ich gang (is Spitaal) go untersuecht werde.
     I go (into hospital) PRT examined become
     ‘I’ll go (to hospital) get examined.’

   c.#Ich gang go schlaafe.
     I go PRT sleep
     ‘I go to sleep.’ (possible with the interpretation that I plan to go to the bedroom)

2.1.4 Single-event interpretation

The entire construction is interpreted as a single event. It is therefore impossible to negate the event expressed by the infinitival phrase, i.e. the going event entails the event expressed by the go-phrase (cf. Schönenberger & Penner 1995a: 297 for similar observations, Jaeggli & Hyams 1993 on the English ‘go’ V-construction and Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001 for Marsalese)

(9) Ich gang jede Taag go Gmües poschte, *aber es hät nie.
     I go every day PRT vegetables buy but there has none
     ‘I go buy vegetables every day (but there never are any).’

---

8 There is one systematic exception that is found in most dialects except in some DE-Alemannic varieties: It is possible to use the go/gi-construction with weather-verbs:
   (i) Es kunnt gi ränge.
       it comes PRT rain
   Since this example is lexicalized this does not challenge the generalization in the text (cf. Burgmeier 2006: 71ff. for discussion).

9 Schönenberger & Penner (1995: 297) argue that no single-event reading obtains with the particle cho in Bernese, cf. 3.1.3 below.
2.2 The category of the infinitival complement

The phrase including gi/go + the infinitive can be shown to be a bare VP. This implies that elements that are licensed in higher (functional) positions are impossible in the motion verb construction. First, sentential negation or negative quantifiers are impossible inside the go-phrase:¹⁰

(10) a.* Ich gang [go nöd hälffe]. b. Ich gang nöd [go hälffe].
I go not help I go not help CH (DE)

(11) a.* Ich gang [go niemertem hälffe]. b. Ich gang niemertem [go __ hälffe].
I go no.one.DAT help I go no.one.DAT help CH (DE)

Subject-related elements like depictives or floating quantifiers, which would require a vP, are equally impossible:

(12) a. Si sind geschter de Mueter all [go *all hälffe ggange].
They are yesterday the.DAT mother all PRT all help gone
‘They all went to help the mother yesterday.’ CH (DE)

b. Er isch bsoffe [go *bsoffe poschte (ggange)].
he is drunk PRT drunk do.shopping gone
‘He went shopping drunk.’ CH (DE)

High modifiers such as sentential or temporal adverbs are ruled out (cf. also Lötscher 1993: 198); Low adverbs, which are arguably adjoined somewhere within the VP, are possible:

(13) a. Ich gang wahrschiinlich [go *wahrschiinlich en Film luege].
I go probably PRT probably a film watch
‘I’ll probably go see a movie.’ CH (DE)

b. Er gaat morn [go *morn d Mueter bsueche].
he goes tomorrow PRT the mother visit
‘He will go to visit his mother tomorrow.’ CH (DE)

c. Mer gönd (gmüetlich) [go (gmüetlich) es Bier trinke].
we go relaxed PRT relaxed a beer drink
‘We will go to leasurely have a beer.’ CH (DE)

The fact that the go/gi-phrase is only a big VP also explains why passivized verbs as in (8b) are impossible (under the assumption that passive is crucially related to the v-head). Furthermore, the entire construction only involves one small vP (the one of the matrix clause/the motion verb), which accounts for the single-event interpretation in 2.1.4.¹¹

2.3 Constituency of the gi/go-phrase

Go/gi + the Infinitival phrase form a constituent. They can be topicalized together:

---

¹⁰ For us only constituent negation is possible in these cases. Cf. Lötscher (1993: 197f.) and Schönenberger & Penner (1995: 290) for a different view.

¹¹ Rather rarely and under conditions not yet understood, go can also embed a zu-‘to’-infinitive, cf. Burgmeier (2006: 34f.). This suggests that more than a VP is involved in those cases.
This shows that go/gi forms a constituent together with the infinitival phrase.

### 2.4 Structural position of the gi/go-phrase

The motion verb construction can be shown to involve subordination. Individual extraction from both the matrix vP and the go-phrase is possible, we are thus not dealing with coordination:

(15) a. Woane₁, __, gaasch [go poschte]?
    ‘Where do you go to do your shopping?’

b. Was, gaasch [go __, poschte]?
    ‘What do you go buy?’

The fact that extraction from the go-phrase is possible further shows that is merged as a complement, not as an adjunct.

Obviously, the go/gi-phrase is transparent. In fact there is evidence that it is also transparent for A-relations such as pronoun fronting, i.e. we find restructuring effects:

(16) I gang si go/gi __, hole
    I go it PRT fetch

This suggests that in addition to being a direct structural complement to the matrix V, the go/gi-phrase also contains less structure, which is in accordance with the observation that only VP-related elements can occur in the go/gi-phrase.

One might suspect that the gi/go-phrase actually expresses the goal of the motion event, but this is not correct as the gi/go-phrase can co-occur with a goal of the matrix motion verb:

(17) Ich gang id Stadt go de Unggle bsueche.
    ‘I’ll go to town to visit the uncle.’

### 2.5 Infinitival complements with zum: a clausal complement

It is instructive to compare the motion verb construction with go/gi with a semantically very similar construction that involves zum ‘to’, literally ‘to it’ to introduce the non-finite complement. First, in the zum-construction, there is no agentivity restriction. As a consequence, (8a/b) become perfect:

(18) a. Ichhi extra häigrännt [zum de Boxkampf nöd verpasse].
    ‘I ran home in order not to miss the box fight.’

b. Ich gang (is Spitaal) [zum untersuecht werde].
    ‘I’ll go (to hospital) to get examined.’
(19) Ich bi immer grännt, [zum no früsches Gmües überchoo],
I am always run to still fresh vegetables get
aber es hät nie ghaa].
but there has no had
‘I always ran to get fresh vegetables, but there never were any.’ CH (DE)

Third, depictives, (certain) high adverbs, and floating quantifiers are possible

(20) a. Ich ha pressiert, [zum morn chöne pünktlich abfaare].
I have hurried up to the tomorrow can on time leave
‘I hurried up to be able to leave on time tomorrow.’ CH (DE)

b. Ich han extra nüüt trunke [zum de Film chöne nüechtern]
I have on purpose nothing drunk to the film can sober
luege].
watch
‘I didn’t drink anything on purpose to be able to watch the movie sober.’ CH (DE)

c. Si sind häiggange [zum all(i) chönne de Film luege].
They are went home to all can the film watch
‘They went home so they could all watch the movie.’ CH (DE)

The zum-construction thus obviously involves more structure; it introduces a full clausal infinitival complement, see Brandner (2006).

2.6 Intermediate summary

The following structure can serve as an initial hypothesis to account for the properties of the construction that both varieties share:

(21) ...VP
      PP
      V'
    'that I go to town to visit the uncle’

The structure accounts immediately for the constituency facts (14) and the co-occurrence of goal-PP and gi/go-Phrase, cf. (17). It also accounts for some of the semantic properties such

---

12 Sometimes, go occurs together with zum, cf. Burgmeier (2006: 44ff.) for the data. Here is an example from Schmidt (2000: 33):
i) Emaal isch si wider choo, zum go d Brief abhole.
once she again come to PRT the letters get
‘Once she came again to get the letters.’
Probably such constructions can be analyzed as involving ellipsis of an infinitival motion verb.
as the ban against passivized verbs in the go/\textit{gi}-phrase (8b) and the single-event interpretation in 2.1.4. since it lacks a small vP-layer. Furthermore, the fact that certain elements that are related to structurally higher positions (high adverbials, negative elements, subject related FQs and depictives) cannot occur within the \textit{go}/\textit{gi}-phrase also follows directly if it only contains a big-VP. Finally, the structure explains the extraction (15) and restructuring facts (16).

As I side-remark we would like to point out that motion verb constructions are generally somewhat special when it comes to extraction: Even if the subordinate clause is introduced by elements that are normally associated with adjunct status such as Standard German \textit{um...zu}, extraction is relatively acceptable. If, however, an \textit{um...zu} clause occurs in a different context, i.e. not as a complement of a motion verb, extraction is strongly degraded:

\begin{align*}
(22) & \text{a.} \ \text{Was, bist du in die Stadt gegangen [um __, zu kaufen]?} \\
& \text{What are you in the town gone in order to buy} \\
& \text{‘What did you go to town in order to buy?’} \quad \text{SG} \\
& \text{b.} \ \text{Wen hast du ‘Krieg und Frieden’ gelesen [um __, zu beeindrucken]?} \\
& \text{Who have you ‘War and Peace’ read in order to impress} \\
& \text{lit.: ‘Who did you read War and Peace in order to impress?’} \quad \text{SG}
\end{align*}

This suggests that the \textit{um-zu}-clause is merged as a complement of the motion verb and is thus transparent for extraction. With other matrix clauses, however, it is merged as an adjunct, extraction therefore being ruled out. We will briefly come back to extraction in 6.2 below.

3 Differences between CH-Alemannic and DE-Alemannic

While the previous sections suggests indeed that we are basically dealing with the same construction in both varieties, there are a number of striking asymmetries between the two varieties that remain unaccounted for under the structure postulated in (21). Some of these properties, especially those of the CH-Alemannic dialects, are well-known from the literature; other properties, especially those of the \textit{gi}-dialects, have been the object of a detailed questionnaire study that we base ourselves on.

3.1 Form and position of the particle

3.1.1 Spreading of the particle

CH allows several instances of \textit{go}, DE-Alemannic does not (cf. also Weber 1964: 245f., Suter 1992: 89):

\begin{align*}
(23) & \text{a.} \ \text{Ich gang [go de Mueter go en Struuss go chauffe].} \\
& \text{I go PRT the.DAT mother PRT a bunch PRT buy} \quad \text{CH} \\
& \text{‘I’ll go buy a bunch of flowers for my mother.’} \\
& \text{b.} \ \text{I gang [gi de Mueter (*gi) en Struuss (*gi) kaufe].} \\
& \text{I go PRT the.DAT mother PRT a bunch PRT buy.INF} \quad \text{DE}
\end{align*}

3.1.2 Doubling of the particle


\begin{itemize}
\item[13] It is not clear under which conditions several \textit{gos} can appear. Native speakers intuitively mention prosodic/rhythmic reasons. Whether spreading of \textit{go} is possible in all dialects has not been investigated yet.
\end{itemize}
3.1.3 Doubling of choo ‘come’
Some CH-Alemannic dialects also feature a doubling verb cho ‘come’ after the motion verb choo ‘come’, e.g. Zurich German (Weber 1964); the gi-varieties do not, only gi is possible:14

(25) a. Chunnisch zu öis cho ässe? b. Kunsch zu üüs *cho/gi essa?
‘Are you coming to us for dinner?’ CH                                   DE

3.1.4 Position of the particle
In CH-Alemannic the particle can be placed at the beginning of the infinitival phrase, before the verb or between arguments (there is a certain preference to place it in front of the infinitive, though). In DE-Alemannic the particle has to be placed at the beginning of the infinitival phrase, with the only exception that datives can occur immediately before the particle:15

(26) a. Ich gang [ de Muetter en Struuss go chauffe].
   b. [ de Muetter go en Struuss chauffe].
   c. [ go de Muetter en Struuss chauffe].
   ‘I’ll go buy a bunch of flowers for my mother.’

3.2 Restructuring
Restructuring is pervasive in CH-Alemannic. Pronoun fronting is obligatory:

(28) a.??Ich gang [go s abhole]. vs. b. Ich gang s [go __ abhole].
   I      go      PRT      it      get               I    go   it      PRT      get
   ‘I’ll go get it.’                                                           CH

Reordering of arguments is easily possible, elements of the go/gi-phrase can also occur within the matrix clause:

(29) Es gaat [em Vatter]. niemert [go __, en Chueche bringe].
   it      goes   the.DAT      father   no.one      PRT      a   cake      bring
   ‘No one brings the father a cake.’                                         CH

In DE-Alemannic, however, restructuring is more limited. First, pronoun fronting is optional:16

---

14 Some of the go-dialects do not allow doubling with cho either. Instead, go is used, cf. e.g. Suter (1992) on Basle German and the SDS map 3, 265. This phenomenon is sometimes referred to as „cross-doubling“. Cf. Burgmeier (2006: 67ff.) for an overview over the data.

15 Seidelmann (2000: 2) mentions for the German varieties that arguments generally occur between the particle and the infinitive, interestingly even if the form is go.

16 Interestingly, in the DE-Alemannic dialect described by Noth (2002: 6), which uses go instead of gi, pronoun fronting also seems to be optional:
In fact it becomes strongly degraded if there is additional material in the matrix clause:

(31) a. Ich gang denn morge [gi s abhole].
   I go PRT tomorrow PRT it get
   ‘I’ll go get it tomorrow.’

b.?? Ich gang s1 denn morge [gi __, abhole].
   I go it PRT tomorrow PRT fetch
   ‘I’ll go get it tomorrow.’

This suggests that we are not dealing with restructuring proper. Reordering of arguments
seems to be limited to dative arguments (see also Dobler 2002 for a similar observation for
the Alemannic dialect spoken in the Austrian state of Vorarlberg):

(32) a. I gang [em Vatter], [gi __, en Kuecha bringa].
   I go the.DAT father PRT a cake bring
   ‘I’ll go bring the father a cake.’

b.?? I gang [s Fahrrad], [gi __, hole].
   I go the bicycle PRT get
   ‘I’ll go and get the bicycle.’

Reordering with elements of the matrix clause, however, is strongly degraded:

i) Si fahrt uf Gottene go ne abhole.
   She drives to Gottenheim PRT him pick.up
   ‘She drives to Gottenheim to pick him up.’

Another example of this type is found in Seidelmann (2000: 2); we slightly simplify the
transcription:

ii) Ich gang go si hoole.
   I go PRT her get
   ‘I’ll go get her.’

This suggests that the particle behaves like gi, not like Swiss German go.

On the other hand, we have data from speakers from Hotzenwald – a DE-Alemannic dialect that
uses the form go – and these speaker indeed tolerate a lower occurrence of the particle much more
readily than the Bodensee-Alemannic speakers. It should be noted that Hotzenwald is very close to
Switzerland, see also next footnote. 17

There is conflicting evidence from Liechtenstein German as described in Burgmeier (2006). He
gives quite a number of examples where a weak pronoun or a (non-dative) full DP that is an
argument of the lexical verb occurs outside the go-phrase (Burgmeier 2006: 111, ex. 127b; 112, ex.
131a; 113, ex. 133, 134b; 114, ex. 137, 138; 146, ex. 30; 152, ex. 72, 74). In two cases, the element
clearly occurs within the projection of the matrix verb as it proceeds elements that unambiguously
belong to the matrix clause (we use movement notation for ease of exposition):

i) I schlach vor, i komm eu am 19.10. [ge __, hola].
   I propose I come you.pl on.the 19.10. PRT pick.up
   ‘I propose I come and pick you up on the 19th of October.’
   (Burgmeier 2006: 111, ex. 127b)

ii) I gang [üsere zwai Karta], morn am Nometag zu diar ham [gi __, hola].
   I go.is our two tickets tomorrow on.the afternoon to you home PRT pick.up
   ‘I’ll come to you tomorrow afternoon to pick up our two tickets.’
   (Burgmeier 2006: 146, ex. 30)

These facts suggest that the construction behaves like the Swiss German variants. This would thus
be another case where form and function do not coincide (recall fn. 15). We have no explanation for
(33)??/* Es goot [de Mueter]/[ere], neamed [gi __, hälffe].

It goes the.DAT mother her.DAT nobody PRT help

‘Nobody goes to help mother.’

DE

While there are striking differences with respect to A-related processes, both groups of languages allow movement of material of the go-phrase to the matrix Spec-CP:

(34) [De Mueter], goot neamed [gi __, hälfe].

the.DAT mother goes nobody PRT help

‘Nobody goes to help mother.’

DE (CH)

We can thus conclude that the go/gi-construction in CH-Alemannic shows all the hallmarks of restructuring while in DE-Alemannic what looks like a restructuring configuration at first sight must actually be something quite different. In the next section we will relate these asymmetries to different properties of the particles.

4 Accounting for the differences

The asymmetries reviewed in the previous section are actually quite puzzling given the strong parallelism with respect to the structural and semantic properties described in section 2. In this section we would like to propose that the asymmetries can be straightforwardly accounted for by assuming that go and gi differ from each other in syntactic category, thereby adopting and extending insights from Lötscher (1993).

4.1 The prepositional origin of go/gi

According to Lötscher (1993) both particles originate from the preposition gen which is a shortened version of gegen ‘towards’; it occurred as ge, ga and go and existed already in Middle High German. Gen was used preferably with place names (gen Venedig = ‘towards Venice’) and with directions (gen Westen = ‘towards the west’). This is still true for (parts of) contemporary DE-Alemannic as well as those varieties of CH-Alemannic that use gi, see Burgmeier (2006):

(35) I gang gi Venedig.

I go to Venice

‘I go to Venice.’

DE

As a consequence of semantic bleaching the use of gen was extended: The particle could be used to introduce infinitival complements of motion verbs:

(36) go/come [PP go/gi [Infinitive ....]]

Here is an example from Liechtenstein German where gi occurs twice, once as a directional preposition and once as a prepositional complementizer (Burgmeier 2006: 111, ex. 126):

(37) I sött amool zo diar gi Zöre ko gi Büacher koofa.

I should once to you to Zurich come PRT books buy

‘I should come to you to Zurich to buy books.’

this so far. Perhaps language contact plays a role here (the data are from younger people some of whom study in Switzerland).
This fits with the observation that Alemannic generally has left-peripheral infinitival complementizers, see Brandner (2006):

\[(38) \quad \text{a. I ha vergesse zum de Block zuemache.} \quad \text{DE (CH)} \]
\[\quad \text{I have forgotten to.the the greenhouse close} \]
\[\quad \text{‘I forgot to close the greenhouse.’} \]

\[\quad \text{b. I ha koa Ziit zum mit dir schpile.} \quad \text{DE (CH)} \]
\[\quad \text{I have no time to.the with you play} \]
\[\quad \text{‘I have no time to play with you.’} \]

\[(38a) \quad \text{shows clearly that the particle zum has lost its original purpose meaning. The same element exists in Standard German but in this variety it can only combine with a nominalized infinitive that does not tolerate its arguments to be realized. It occurs also as a directional, provided that a masculine or neuter noun is chosen, cf. (39b):} \]

\[(39) \quad \text{a. Ich lud sie ein zum Fischessen/ *zum die frisch gekauften Fische essen} \quad \text{CH} \]
\[\quad \text{PRT to.the fish.eating/ to the freshly bought fish eat} \]
\[\quad \text{‘I invited them to a fish dinner.’/‘I invited them to eat the freshly bought fish.’} \]

\[\quad \text{b. Ich gehe zum Marktplatz} \quad \text{CH} \]
\[\quad \text{I go to.the market.place} \]
\[\quad \text{‘I go to the market place.’} \]

The development from preposition to infinitival complementizer is crosslinguistically well-established, cf. e.g. French de/à English to etc. The crucial point is that the particle developed differently in the two varieties. While it retains most of its prepositional properties in DE-Alemannic, it has been reanalyzed as a verbal element in CH-Alemannic.

The development in CH-Alemannic was as follows: The preposition \textit{gen} was used until the early 20th century, but nowadays it is only used in those varieties that still have \textit{gi}, e.g. in those spoken in the Rhine Valley (cf. also Burgmeier 2006: 27). In the other varieties, \textit{gi}, often appearing in the form of \textit{go}, was reinterpreted as a doubled verb (but see 4.3 below why the notion “doubling” may be misleading). According to Lötscher (1993), this reinterpretation was crucially facilitated by phonetic similarity with the infinitive of ‘go’, which was either \textit{geen, gaan or goon}. Once \textit{go} was interpreted as a double, the doubling rule was extended to other verbs: \textit{choo ‘come’ laa ‘let’} and \textit{aafaa ‘begin’}. Here are examples with the latter two:

\[(40) \quad \text{Er laat (la) grüesse.} \quad \text{CH} \]
\[\quad \text{He lets (let) greet} \]
\[\quad \text{‘He lets greet.’} \]

\[(41) \quad \text{Er faat a(fa) schaffe.} \quad \text{CH} \]
\[\quad \text{He begins (begin) work} \]
\[\quad \text{‘He’s starting to work.’} \]

According to Lötscher, the geographical distribution neatly converges with this scenario: \textit{Go} is the most widely used particle, occurring practically everywhere in Swiss German, while \textit{cho, la and afa} occur in much more restricted areas. The doubled particle \textit{goge} can be analyzed as the grammaticalization of finite motion verb + the grammaticized preposition (Lötscher 1993).
Importantly, we are dealing with a case of grammaticalization. This implies that an element may not yet have acquired all the properties of a particular category. As we will see, this is indeed the case: While the particles have clearly developed towards different categories, some of the properties are not as categorical, which is, of course expected under grammaticalization.

### 4.2 Gi in DE-Alemannic

The properties of the gi-construction in DE-Alemannic can be largely accounted for if we assume that gi is developing towards a complementizer, but retains traces of its prepositional origin.

#### 4.2.1 Accounting for the form and position of gi

First, the fact that we find only one occurrence of gi (23) is expected since prepositions and complementizers are normally not doubled.

Second, the impossibility of *gige* is also expected: According to Lötscher (1993), the Swiss German doubling forms goge/choge are derived from finite motion verb go/cho + gi. However, since gi, being a directional preposition, would never govern another directional preposition, gige cannot be derived.

Third, the fact that we find no doubling after the motion verb choo ‘come’ is simply due to the fact that gi has never been interpreted as a double and therefore has not been extended to other verbs.

Finally, the position of gi at the beginning of the infinitival phrase is expected given its prepositional/complementizer status.

#### 4.2.2 Accounting for the (absent) restructuring properties of gi

The optionality of pronoun fronting (30) is expected if we assume that gi is a complementizer with prepositional properties since both prepositions and complementizers are possible clitic hosts in Alemannic. The question then is how we can account for the cases where the pronoun is cliticized onto the matrix verb as in (30b), repeated here for convenience:

\[(42) \text{ Ich gang s, } [\text{gi } \text{ ___}, \text{ abhole].} \]

*I go it PRT get ’I’ll go get it.’*  

DE

Since intervening material blocks pronoun fronting (31b), we are not dealing with a proper restructuring configuration. Pronoun fronting as in (42) then takes place only for prosodic reasons, at a very late stage in the PF-branch (cf. Embick & Noyer 2001 for similar PF-operations that cannot skip intervening material). The lack of restructuring we attribute to the prepositional properties of gi.

Depending on one’s analysis of restructuring (cf. below for our solution), there either is too much structure (an additional PP layer) or the prepositional properties of gi block (abstract) incorporation into the matrix verb. The fact that datives can precede gi (27), however, remains unclear so far. We will provisionally assume that they move to Spec, PP, but crucially do not leave the PP. This is in accordance with the fact that datives cannot reorder with elements of the matrix clause (33).

Additionally, topicalization of the gi-phrase while leaving the dative behind leads to strong ungrammaticality. In contrast, the gi-phrase can be topicalized together with the dative, even if it precedes gi:

\[(43) \text{ a.} [\text{Gi helfe] isch er em Vater gange.} \]

PRT help is he the.DAT father gone
b. [Em Vater gi helfe] isch er gange.
   the.DAT father PRT help is he gone
   ‘He’s gone to help his father’ DE

In a restructuring configuration, e.g. with a modal, a complement can occur outside of the projection of the lexical verb, i.e. it can be stranded:

(44) [Lese solle] hätt er die Brief halt scho.
    read should has he the letters PRT
    ‘He should have read these letters.’ DE (CH)

Importantly, the fact that extraction from the gi-phrase is possible, cf. (15b) implies that gi must not be analyzed as a genuine preposition since extraction from PPs is ungrammatical in Alemannic; not even R-pronouns can be extracted. Rather, there is base-generation and a double appears inside the PP:

(45) Da wäiss i nüüt devoo.
    there know I nothing there.of
    ‘I don’t know anything about it.’

Gi thus shows certain non-categorical properties, as is expected if it is an element on the grammaticalization path from P to C.

4.3 Go in CH-Alemannic

4.3.1 Go as a verbal element

The assumption that go in CH-Alemannic is a verbal element is by no means new. Lötscher (1993), Schönenberger & Penner (1995a/b), Nübling (1995), Schmidt (2000) and van Riemsdijk (2002) among others have treated go as a verb even though it does not show any inflection and cannot appear on its own. The construction is often referred to as a verb doubling construction. Given the fact that go also appears after motion verbs other than ‘go’, namely ‘come’, ‘run’ or ‘send, cf. 2.1.2, “doubling” must be understood loosely. The term “doubling” is often employed in the literature for phenomena where the two doubles are somehow syntactically related, e.g. they are analyzed as spell-outs of several copies of a movement chain (cf. e.g. the contributions in Barbiers et al. 2008). In this sense, we are certainly not dealing with doubling (anymore) as the lexical items do not have to be identical. The facts also argue against an account in terms of copying of syntactic and semantic features as in Schönenberger & Penner (1995b) and van Riemsdijk (2002). What most generative accounts share is the assumption that go is a non-finite form that behaves similarly like non-finite modals and participates in Verb Raising and Verb Projection Raising processes. We follow this line of research and adopt the following structure:

(46) go/come [go [VP Inf]]

This explains the variable position of go, if we assume that this is an effect of the re-ordering possibilities due to the restructuring configuration in the verbal complex in Alemannic. The go-construction is thus parallel to Verb Projection Raising (as proposed e.g. in Schönenberger & Penner 1995a: 289):\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{18} Note that we adopt a right-branching structure for the verbal complex as e.g. in den Dikken (1995/1996). We will adhere to the classical OV-structure for DP- and PP arguments for ease of exposition even though we believe that a reformulation in a strongly antisymmetric model would also be possible.
(47) a. Er hät **wele [VP es Buech läse].** → Er hät [es Buech], **wele [VP __].**
    he has wanted a book read  he has a book wanted  
    **läse].**
    read

b. Er gaat **[go [VP es Buech läse]].** → Er gaat [VP[es Buech],[**go [VP __].**
    he goes PRT a book read  he goes a book PRT  
    **läse]].**
    read

The parallelism extends to pronoun fronting, which is also obligatory in Verb (Projection) Raising:

(48) a.??Ich ha  **wele s hole]**       b.  Ich ha **s [wele __ hole]**
    I have wanted it get       I have it wanted get  
    **CH**

Whenever word order variation in varieties of German is at stake the question arises how the different orders come about, i.e. whether they are the result of a syntactic movement operation like scrambling or whether they are base-generated. The question is actually two-fold. First we need to determine whether the ordering possibilities in the **go**-construction are associated with the semantic effects of scrambling such as change of focus, definiteness-requirement etc. Second we need to test whether there are syntactic effects that point towards a movement derivation, e.g. freezing effects.

4.3.2 Semantic effects?

As for the semantic effects, there is no indication that elements that appear in front of one of the verbal elements have to satisfy certain semantic criteria such as specificity/definiteness. All examples in (47) are fine under both a specific and under a non-specific interpretation. This extends to bare plurals which receive an existential interpretation in their base-position and a generic one when scrambled (Diesing 1992). The first pair illustrates the situation in simple clauses:

(49) a. dass er häimlich **Gedicht schriibt**
    that he secretly poems writes
    ‘that he secretly writes poems’

b. dass er **Gedicht häimlich schriibt**
    that he poems secretly writes
    ‘that he writes poems secretly’

In the **go**- and VPR-construction no such interpretive difference obtains if the bare plural occurs in different parts of the cluster. The bare plural receives an existential interpretation in both cases:

(50) a. Er gaat **[go Gedicht schriibe].**
    he goes PRT poems write
    ‘He goes to write poems.’

b. Er gaat **Gedicht [go schriibe].**
    he goes poems PRT write
    ‘He goes to write poems.’

(51) a. Er hät **[wele Gedichtschriibe].**
    he has wanted poems write
    ‘He wanted to write poems.’

b. Er hät **Gedicht[wele schriibe].**
    he has poems wanted write
    ‘He wanted to write poems.’

The third type of semantic effect concerns focus projection: Focus projection in a German sentence is possible only under normal constituent order with the accent falling on the
constituent closest to the verb (Höhle 1982). The following triple illustrates a) normal order with accent on the lowest constituent, b) normal order with accent on a non-lowest constituent, and c) non-canonical order with accent on the lowest constituent:

(52) a. dass er em Mätli s BUECH geschänkt hät ‘that he gave the girl the book’
    b. dass er em MÄITLI s Buech geschänkt hät
    c. dass er s Buech em MÄITLI gschänkt hät

Focus projection is only possible in a). Scrambling as in c) thus leads to narrow focus. In the go-construction and VPR no such effect obtains if an argument of the lexical verb occurs outside its projection. Focus projection is possible irrespective of the position of that argument as long as the normal order of the arguments is retained. Thus all the following variants allow focus projection:

(53) a. Er gaat de Muetter es BUECH [go chauffe].
    ‘He goes to buy the mother a book.’
    b. Er gaat de Muetter [go es BUECH chauffe].
    c. Er gaat [go de Muetter es BUECH chauffe].

(54) a. Er hät de Muetter s Buech vom CHOMSKY [wele schänke].
    ‘He wanted to give mother the book by Chomsky.’
    b. Er hät de Muetter [wele s Buech vom CHOMSKY schänke].
    c. Er hät [wele de Muetter s Buech vom CHOMSKY schänke].

There is one case where reordering is impossible, namely when non-referential complements such as Velo faare lit. ‘bike drive’ = ‘bike’ or Ziiitig läse ‘read the newspaper’ are used. Here the argument has to occur adjacent to the lowest verbal element, both in the go-construction and in VPR (cf. also Lötscher 1993: 197):

(55) a.* Ich gang Ziiitig [go ___ läse]  b. Ich gang [go Ziiitig läse]
    I go newspaper PRT read I go PRT newspaper read
    ‘I’ll go to read the newspaper.’

(56) a.* Er hät Ziiitig [wele ___ läse]  b. Er hät [wele Ziiitig läse]
    He has newspaper wanted read he has wanted newspaper read
    ‘He wanted to read the newspaper.’
However, we do not take this to be evidence for a scrambling operation because such non-referential elements have to occur adjacent to the verb to be properly interpreted.  

Interestingly, scrambling effects emerge if the order of elements is reversed, especially if the matrix vP is crossed; for instance, only definite objects can (easily) scramble across matrix subjects (the b-example improves somewhat under a specific interpretation of the indefinite):

(57) a. Es geht de **Muetter** [vp niemert [vp go [vp hälffe]]].  
   it goes the.DAT mother no.one.NOM go help  
   ‘No one goes to help mother.’  
   CH

b.* Es geht öppertem [vp niemert [vp go [vp hälffe]]]  
   it goes someone.DAT no.one.NOM go help  
   ‘No one goes to help someone.’  
   CH

The same can be observed for bare plurals once they occur above vP-adverbs: In that case, only the generic interpretation is possible

(58) a. Er geht **Gedicht** häimlich [go schriibe].  
   he goes poems secretly PRT write  
   ‘He goes to write poems secretly.’

b. Er hätt **Gedicht** häimlich [wele schriibe].  
   he has poems secretly wanted write  
   ‘He wanted to write poems secretly.’

Scrambling effects also emerge with respect to focus projection once the arguments occur in non-canonical order. But again, it is irrelevant whether the arguments occur within the raised cluster or not. All the following variants only allow narrow focus:

(59) a. Er geht s Buech de **MUETTER** [go chauffe].  
   He goes the book the.DAT mother PRT buy

b. Er gaat s Buech [go de **MUETTER** chauffe].  
   He goes the book PRT the.DAT mother buy

c. Er geht [go s Buech de **MUETTER** chauffe].  
   He goes PRT the book the.DAT mother buy

(60) a. Er hätt s Buech vom Chomsky de **MUETTER** [wele schänke].  
   he has the book of.the Chomsky the.DAT mother wanted give  
   ‘He wanted to give the book by Chomsky to the mother.’

b. Er hätt s Buech vom Chomsky [wele de **MUETTER** schänke].  
   he has the book of.the Chomsky wanted the.DAT mother give

---

19 Non-referential DPs can, however, be A'-moved (at least marginally):
   i) Velo faar i sälte  
      bike drive I seldom  
      ‘I seldom ride the bike.’

Since A'-movement is generally reconstructed, adjacency between the non-referential argument and the verb obtains at LF. The reordering possibilities in the middle-field generally involve A-relations (Haider & Rosengren 1998), which are not reconstructed. There are, of course, approaches, that have analyzed scrambling as an instance of A'-movement, but since a detailed discussion of the nature of scrambling is beyond the scope of this paper, we will simply adhere to what we consider the majority view.
c. Er hat [wele s Buech vom Chomsky de MUETTER schänke].
   he has wanted the book of the Chomsky the.DAT mother give

The distribution of semantic the effects is reminiscent of (and arguably parallel to) what Wöllstein-Leisten (2001) has observed for the so-called Third Construction which involves apparent scrambling of arguments of extraposed non-finite complement clauses. Semantic effects only occur if the order of elements is reversed, but not if an element of the embedded verb occurs in the matrix clause. The following pair shows that indefinites can be interpreted as specific or non-specific inside or outside the non-finite clause:

(61) a. dass er mir es Buech versproche hät [z chauffe]
   that he me.DAT a book promised has to buy
   ‘that he promised me to buy a book’

   b. dass er mir versproche hät [es Buech z chauffe]
   that he me.DAT promised has a book to buy
   ‘that he promised me to buy a book’

Similar observations have been made for bare plurals. According to Wöllstein-Leisten (2001: 126) bare plurals can receive an existential interpretation both inside and outside the non-finite clause (we use Swiss German examples instead):

(62) a. dass er Gedicht versuecht hät [z schriibe]
   that he poems tried has to write
   ‘that he tried to write poems’

   b. dass er versuecht hät [Gedicht z schriibe]
   that he tried has poems to write
   ‘that he tried to write poems’

As for focus projection, Wöllstein-Leisten (2001: 96ff.), discussing work by Geilfuss (1991), points out that focus projection is possible even if an argument of the non-finite verb appears in the matrix clause (again, we use Swiss German examples):

(63) a. Er hät emene Chind versuecht, [s MËËRLI voorzläse].
   he has a.DAT child trief the fairy_tale read_to
   ‘He tried to read the fairy tale to a child.’

   b. Er hät en chliine HUND versuecht [z schlaa].
   he has a small dog tried to hit
   ‘He tried to hit a small dog.’

Scrambling effects re-emerge once the arguments occur in non-canonical order or (in the case of bare plurals) above the relevant vP-delimiting elements (Wöllstein-Leisten 2001: 126, 97; again, we use Swiss German examples):

(64) a. dass emene Chranke niemert versuecht hät [z hälffe] specific only
    that a.DAT sick no_one tried has to help
    ‘that no one tried to help a sick person’

   b. dass er Gedicht häimlich versuecht hät [z schriibe] generic only
    that he poems secretly tried has to write
    ‘that he secretly tried to write poems’
c. Er hät s Mëërli versuecht, [emene CHIND voorzläse].
   he has the fairy_tale tried a.DAT child read_to
   ‘He tried to read the fairy tale to a child.’ no focus projection

4.3.3 Freezing effects?
It is not immediately clear how to interpret this result. Before we present our solution, we will first look at freezing effects. The following examples show that there are no freezing effects if an argument of the embedded verb occurs above the go-phrase/the modal. Freezing effects are tested by means of the was-für-Split:20

(65) a. Wasi gaat de Hans [__, für Lüüt] [go [vp öppis Persöönlichs frööge]]
   what goes the John for people PRT something personal
   ask
   ‘What kind of people is John going to ask something personal?’ CH

   b. Wasi hät de Hans [__, für Lüüt] [wele öppis Persöönlichs frööge]?
   what has the John for people wanted something personal ask
   ‘What kind of people did John want to ask something personal?’ CH

Interestingly, freezing effects re-emerge if the constituent from which extraction takes place occurs in a non-canonical position, e.g. above a modal particle marking the vP-boundary (cf. Diesing 1992; extraction is fine if the was-für remnant is below the particle):

(66) a.?? Wasi gaat de Hans [__, für Lüüt] dänn [go [vp öppis Persöönlichs]
   what goes the John for people PRT PRT smth. personal
   frööge]?
   ask
   ‘What kind of people is John going to ask something personal?’ CH

It is not so trivial to illustrate the absence of freezing effects with the go-construction and VPR. The base-order has to be held constant to avoid interfering factors. Furthermore, we need a verb that takes two internal arguments with the lower one remaining within the lowest verbal projection to make sure that we are dealing with VPR (and not VR, which may only involve verb incorporation but no argument scrambling). And extraction has to take place from the higher argument. Since datives are intransparent for many types of extraction (e.g. Müller 1995; as a matter of fact, was-für split from dative objects is often well-formed), dative-accusative verbs have to be avoided. We have used a double-accusative verb because the first object is a structural one and thus transparent. It would in principle have been possible to use a Acc-PP verb such as überzüüge ‘convince’:

i) Wasi hät de Hans [__, für Lüüt] [wele vo siine Idee überzüüge]?
   what has the John for people wanted of his ideas convince?
   ‘What kind of people did John want to convince of his ideas?’

We could not use such verbs for the go-construction, though, because it does not easily tolerate PPs inside the go-phrase, which is arguably due to prosodic reasons (but see Löscher 1993: 199). The only option left were therefore double accusative verbs.

20 It is not so trivial to illustrate the absence of freezing effects with the go-construction and VPR. The base-order has to be held constant to avoid interfering factors. Furthermore, we need a verb that takes two internal arguments with the lower one remaining within the lowest verbal projection to make sure that we are dealing with VPR (and not VR, which may only involve verb incorporation but no argument scrambling). And extraction has to take place from the higher argument. Since datives are intransparent for many types of extraction (e.g. Müller 1995; as a matter of fact, was-für split from dative objects is often well-formed), dative-accusative verbs have to be avoided. We have used a double-accusative verb because the first object is a structural one and thus transparent. It would in principle have been possible to use a Acc-PP verb such as überzüüge ‘convince’:
b. ??Was, hät de Hans [__, für Lüüt] dänn [ wele öppis Persöönlichs 
what has the John for people PRT wanted smth. personal
frööge]? 
ask
‘What kind of people did John want to ask something personal?’ CH

The effect is perhaps even stronger if the was-für-phrase occurs above the subject:

(67) a.* Was, gaat [__, für Lüüt] de Hans [ go [vp öppis Persöönlichs 
what goes for people the John PRT something personal
frööge]? 
ask
‘What kind of people is John going to ask something personal?’ CH
b.* Was, hät [__, für Lüüt] de Hans [wele öppis Persöönlichs 
what has for people the John wanted something personal
frööge]? 
ask
‘What kind of people did John want to ask something personal?’ CH

The effect is thus the same as in a simple clause where extraction takes place from above the particle or from above the subject:

(68) a.??Was, hät de Hans (dänn) [__, für Lüüt](?? dänn) versuecht, 
what has the John PRT for people PRT tried
[öppis z frööge]
asked
‘What kind of people did John ask something personal?’ CH
b.* Was, hät [__, für Lüüt] de Hans öppis Persöönlichs gfröögt ?
what has for people the John something personal asked
‘What kind of people did John ask something personal?’ CH

These observations can be extended to the Third Construction: There are no freezing effects unless the element occurs in a non-canonical position:

(69) a. Was, hät de Hans (dänn) [__, für Lüüt](?? dänn) versuecht, 
what has the John PRT for people PRT tried
[öppis z frööge]
asked
‘What kind of people did John try to ask something?’

b.* Was, hät [__, für Lüüt] de Hans versuecht, [öppis z frööge]
what has for people the John tried something to ask
‘What kind of people did John try to ask something?’
4.3.4 In favor of base-generation

Obviously, what is crucial is not the position relative to the modal/go (or, in the Third Construction the restructuring verb), but rather whether the constituent from which extraction takes place is in a canonical position or not, where canonical means neutral word order/placement below certain vP-delimiting particles. This generalization holds for both the semantic effects as well as the freezing effects. This argues against a derivational relationship between the variants in (47), (50–54) and (61–63); similarly, the anti-freezing facts in (65) and (69a) imply that the constituent from which extraction takes place must not have reached its surface position by means of movement. Rather, both variants are base-generated. This is strong evidence against the scrambling and adjunction approach for VPR proposed in Haegeman (1992), Schönenberger (1995) and Schönenberger & Penner (1995a/b).

Instead, we will adopt the following assumptions (here we adapt ideas from Neeleman 1994, Neeleman & van de Koot 2002, Sternefeld 2006): The argument structure of a verb is encoded as features on V that percolate along the projection line until they are satisfied/checked by the respective argument. In Alemannic varieties percolation may exceptionally cross the maximal projection of the predicate: I.e. it can cross VPs (go) and restructuring TPs (in the case of modals, cf. below, in the 3rd construction and possibly in regular restructuring with to-infinitives), but crucially not CPs as there is no scrambling from finite clauses. As a consequence go and modals (and restructuring verbs) may merge in any position within the projection of the lexical verb, which means that they may also be interspersed with the arguments of the lexical verb. A partial structure for a go-construction with the arguments distributed over two verbal projections then looks as follows:\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{21}Another argument against the scrambling and adjunction approach are examples where elements which are semantically related to the lowest verb and which cannot scramble occur outside the projection of the respective verb:

i) Geschter hät er s no \textbf{am Mittwuch} wele mache.

\indent Yesterday has he it still on Wednesday wanted make

\indent ‘Yesterday he still wanted to do it on Wednesday.’

Under the scrambling and adjunction approach the adverbial \textit{am Mittwuch} ‘on Wednesday’ would have to be scrambled out of the projection headed by \textit{mache}. But since adverbials cannot scramble (cf. Bayer & Kornfilt 1994, Haider & Rosengren 1998, Fanselow 2001) this is impossible. Schönenberger & Penner (1995b: 306) argue in favor of their approach by claiming that idioms loose their idiomatic interpretation if they are contained within the raised cluster. For instance, they present the following contrast (their judgments, \textit{de Schlaag träffe} means ‘to be thunderstruck’):

ii) dass n \textit{de Schlaag} chönt träffe

\indent that him the stroke could hit

\indent ‘that he might be thunderstruck’

\indent iii)?? dass n chönnt \textit{de Schlaag} träffe

\indent that him could the stroke hit

In our view, the idiomatic interpretation is equally available in both cases. Somewhat more convincing are the acquisition data discussed in Schönenberger & Penner (1995b: 312f.).

A further argument against the scrambling and adjunction approach comes from variable binding: Material within the lowest verbal projection can be shown to be c-commanded by non-subjects outside that projection:

iv) dass er jede\textsubscript{e} Tänzerin wett ire \textit{Partner} voorstelle

\indent that he every dancer wants her partner introduce

\indent ‘that he would like to acquaint every female dancer with her partner’

Cf. (88) below for a similar example.

\textsuperscript{22}On this analysis, Verb Raising and Verb Projection Raising are the same thing, the only difference being the projection of the arguments of the lowest verb (cf. den Broekhuis & den Besten 1989 for an early precursor based on the scrambling and adjunction approach). This is certainly the most attractive position. There have been arguments against this, some more theory-internal (den Dikken 1995/1996), some more empirical (Haegeman 1994). As far as we can assess they do not (the empirical facts) or do no longer apply (the theoretical issues), at least not in the case of Alemannic. Our approach is perhaps even more radical as it also treats the Third Construction the same.
The question then is whether the noncanonical orders with semantic effects in the examples (57–60) and (64) on the one hand and those with freezing effects in (66–67) and (69) should be derived by means of base-generation or by means of movement. In principle this issue is independent of the solution for the variants in e.g. (47) where base-generation is the only option. It basically reduces to the question whether scrambling involves base-generation or movement. A full discussion of this issue, is, of course far beyond the scope of this paper. From the perspective of theoretical economy, it seems desirable to handle all word order variations the same, i.e. to derive them all by means of base-generation. Within our assumptions this could look as follows: Scrambled orders can be obtained if we assume that the argument features can be checked off in any order (cf. also Bayer & Kornfilt 1994, Neeleman 1994, Fanselow 2001 for various base-generation accounts of scrambling). The scrambling effects can be accounted for under base-generation as follows: As for the freezing effects, there are different generalizations and explanations for how and why they come about with was-für-Splits. As pointed out in Fanselow (2001: 413f.) simply occurring in a non-canonical or putatively derived position is not sufficient to trigger freezing effects. Rather, what seems crucial is that the derived position corresponds to the last-merged specifier within a phase (Müller 2008). This view is neutral with respect to movement or base-generation. An element can be the last merged phrase of a phase without having reached this position by means of movement. This is sufficient to explain the freezing effects in (66–67) and (69).23 As for the semantic effects, they can be captured by surface generalizations (as

---

23 A partially comparable approach is the one by Bayer (2005) which is mainly concerned with that-trace effects but also covers certain freezing effects: Extraction is degraded/ungrammatical if it takes place from a topic position. This would certainly cover the effects in (67), and perhaps also those in (66) if it is assumed that any element that occurs above denn occupies a topic position.

24 Actually, things are more complex: The direct object in (65) – like in principle any direct object of a transitive verb – is the highest specifier of VP and is therefore expected to be intransparent for extraction, contrary to fact. Obviously, direct objects, even if merged as a specifier, remain transparent as long as they are within VP. This argues against the proposal in Müller (2008: section 3.2) where the transparency is related to an Agree operation between V and N (of a DP from which extraction is to take place) that is exempt from the PIC. However, since Agree requires c-command it cannot target specifiers. As a consequence, the transparency in (65) and quite generally with double accusative verbs where the higher one is transparent does not follow. As an alternative we would like to suggest exempting VP from phasehood. Since Müller (2008) assumes every phrase to be a phase one could also simply dispense with the distinction between vP and VP and adopt only
e.g. in Müller 1999). What is relevant is not necessarily being inside/outside vP but rather the position relative to a particular adverb such as *häimlich ‘secretly’.*

Even though theoretical parsimony seems to dictate a unification of all types of word order variation, cross-linguistic facts cast some doubts on this: While all three types (Verb Projection Raising, Third Construction, scrambling) are possible in Alemannic varieties, there are languages which only allow one or two types of variation: Colloquial German has the Third Construction and scrambling but no VPR. West Flemish is the reverse, it has the Third Construction, VPR but no scrambling (cf. e.g. den Dikken 1996). Before this background a unification no longer seems compulsory. While base-generation is necessary for the positioning of arguments with respect to modals and *go*, reordering of VP-constituents might also be a consequence of a scrambling operation (cf. e.g. Wöllstein-Leisten 2001 for such an approach to the Third Construction). Since a full discussion of this issue is essentially orthogonal to our interests we will leave it at this here.\(^{25}\)

---

\(^{25}\) An important issue in the discussion about VPR has been scope, cf. e.g. den Dikken (1995/1996: 78ff.). It seems to be the case that quantified DPs allow inverse scope only if they occur within the same verbal projection as the other scopal element, but not if one occurs above the modal and one below. The same is true for the *go*-construction (for reasons we do not understand, Haegeman 1988: 676 claims for an example similar to (iii) that inverse scope is impossible; inversely, Schönenberger 1995: 371 and Schönenberger & Penner 1995b: 302, fn. 13 claim that (ii) is ambiguous):

\[\begin{align*}
&i) \text{ dass } si \quad \text{zweï Studänte vier Buecher go } \text{bringe} \quad 2>4; 4>2 \\
&\quad \text{that they two students four books go PRT bring} \\
&ii) \text{ dass } si \quad \text{zweï Studänte go } \text{vier Buecher bringe} \quad 2>4; *4>2 \\
&\quad \text{that they two students go PRT four books bring} \\
&iii) \text{ dass } si \quad \text{go } \text{zweï Studänte vier Buecher bringe} \quad 2>4; 4>2 \\
&\quad \text{that they go PRT two students four books bring}
\end{align*}\]

Den Dikken presents an analysis based on a scope theory that predicts scopal interactions if an element c-commands a member of the chain of the other element. According to den Dikken (1996: 85) the lack of ambiguity in ii) can be explained as follows: The indirect object first moves to Spec, AgrIOP within the projection of V2, then it crucially undergoes scrambling to the projection of V1. Since no link of this scrambling operation is ever c-commanded by a member of the DO-chain, no ambiguity is possible. Since we have argued against scrambling, this solution is not available. To what extent these facts can be replicated in a non-movement account is an issue we leave for further research.


\[\begin{align*}
&iv) \text{ dass de Aff kà Banane wött ässe } \text{no banana > want; want > no banana} \\
&\quad \text{that the monkey no banana wants eat} \\
&v) \text{ dass de Aff wött kà banane ässe } *\text{no banana > want; want > no banana} \\
&\quad \text{that the monkey wants no banana eat}
\end{align*}\]

The negative existential can have wide scope with respect to the modal only if it occurs outside the lowest verbal projection. This seems to argue in favor of a scrambling derivation for (iv), cf. den Dikken 1995, the ambiguity can then be related to the two positions of the scrambled direct object. However, under the present approach a simpler solution suggests itself: In (v) the negative existential is fully contained within the projection of V2; consequently, it cannot interact with the modal which heads its own projection; i.e. as in (ii) only surface scope is possible. In (iv), on the other hand, the negative existential is part of the projection of the modal, and in this case inverse
The integration of the *go*-construction into the VPR-system thus explains the restructuring facts and the variable position of *go*. What remains unexplained so far is the spreading of the particle (3.1.1). We do not have a proper explanation yet and will only offer the following speculation: Since *go* is verbal in CH it is conceivable that it occupies the various V-heads of the VP-shells. This is not possible in DE-Alemannic where *gi* is not verbal.\(^26\)

### 4.3.5 *The go*-construction and VPR

Before finishing this section we need to point out one important difference between the *go*-construction and modals in VPR that show that a full unification is not (yet) possible: While the complement of *go* is just a big VP (recall the facts from 2.2),\(^27\) VPR involves more structure. Den Dikken (1995: 101ff./1996: 77ff., 89) argues (for West Flemish) that VPR involves a TP (cf. also Schönenberger & Penner 1995a: 303, fn. 3). His reasoning is partly based on theoretical assumptions of early Minimalism some of which (such as overt movement for case checking to AgrOP) are no longer cogent (cf. also the discussion in den Dikken 1996: 94f.), but some of the empirical arguments carry over to Alemannic. First, transitive subjects can occur within the lowest verbal projection (Hagemeier & van Riemsdijk 1986: 445 and den Dikken 1995: 101 make the same point with subject related floating quantifiers):

\[(72) \quad \text{Es het sölle öpper de Wage wäsche.} \]

\[\text{it had.\text{SUBJ} should someone the car wash} \]

\[\text{‘Someone should have washed the car.’} \]

Consequently, we must be dealing with at least a vP. As a consequence, elements related to/attached to vP will be possible in VPR, contrary to the *go*-construction (recall 2.2). As for the evidence for a TP-projection, den Dikken adduces the licensing of negative elements within the lowest verbal projection:

\[(73) \quad \text{dass er [wett kää Fläisch ässe]} \]

\[\text{that he wants no meet eat} \]

\[\text{‘that he does not want to eat any meat’} \]

Since the postulation of a NegP is somewhat controversial for German and its varieties, this may not be a very strong argument. Den Dikken’s second argument, however, is more

---

\(^{26}\) Josef Bayer has pointed out to us that in colloquial German one finds doubling of the complementizer *dass* ‘that’, resulting in left-dislocation:

i) \(\text{Ich glaube, dass der Hans, dass der niemanden mag.} \)

\[\text{‘I believe that the John that he no.one likes} \]

\[\text{‘I believe that John doesn’t like anyone.’} \]

Since *dass* is also contentless (apart from certain formal features, of course), spreading of *go* is then perhaps not as marked as it initially may seem.

\(^{27}\) There is a theory-internal problem concerning the licensing of objects: If an object that needs case is licensed within the VPR cluster one would normally assume that this implies the presence of a vP. But since overt subjects are impossible, this is arguably incorrect. Postulating and AgrOP projection instead does not work either because AgrOP is or rather was normally taken to be above the base-position of the subject so that again we would lose the explanation for the impossibility of subjects. One could locate AgrOP below the base-position of the subject and claim that the complement of the *go*-phrase corresponds to AgrOP, but this would not be much different from saying that an object can be case-licensed inside VP.
convincing: VPR constructions allow independent tense specification in the lower verbal projection. Since tense is related to TP, this suggests that a full TP is involved:

(74) dass si **ge**schter hät [wele ihres Chläid **am** Mittwuch chauffe] that she**yesterday** has wanted her dress **on** **Wednesday** buy

‘that yesterday she wanted to buy her dress on Wednesday’

This evidence conflicts with facts from pronoun fronting in Alemannic: Weak pronouns are impossible within the lowest verbal projection showing that it does not contain a Wackernagel position:

(75) a. *Er het sölle s löse. he had.SUBJ should it solve

b. Er het **s** sölle löse. he had.SUBJ **it** should solve

‘He should have solved it.’

This does not change even if an overt subject occurs in the lowest vP: The clitic cannot follow the subject, which it otherwise can (c):

(76) a.* dass geschter het sölle de Peter **s** läse

that **yesterday** had.SUBJ the Peter it **read**

‘that Peter should have read it yesterday’

b. dass **es** geschter het sölle de Peter läse

that **it** **yesterday** had.SUBJ the Peter read

‘that Peter should have read it yesterday’

c. dass de Peter **s** het sölle läse

that the Peter it had.Subj should read

‘that Peter should have read it’

Obviously, there is no Wackernagel position inside the lowest verbal projection. This may be problematic for accounts that locate it below TP as e.g. Müller (1999). Alternatively, these facts could show that VPR does not involve a full TP and that overt subjects in VPR occupy Spec, vP. We will leave a full discussion of these facts for further research.28

5 The function of **go** – why only in Alemannic varieties?

It is somewhat surprising that the **go**-construction is only found in Alemannic varieties of German. The grammaticalization path as such is typologically unmarked, cf. the Romance languages where Latin *ad* has evolved into an infinitival particle. Furthermore, in Serial Verb languages ‘go’ is often used as a directional; in some Caribbean creoles we even find some kind of doubling with ‘come’ (Winford 1990: 127):

(77) a. Yu beta **go** hoom **go** sii bau cha chilan.

you better **go** home **go** see about your children

b. Di hosban **kom** in **ko(m)** luk biebi.

the husband came in **come** look **baby**

28 There are further asymmetries between VPR and the **go**-construction. For instance the **go**-construction does not tolerate wh in-situ, NPIs or the remnant of *was-für* splits within the **go**-phrase while VPR-constructions do. For reasons of space we have to leave a discussion of these issues for further research.
Interestingly, Winford (1990: 130) mentions that the second occurrence of the motion verb is phonologically reduced and does not bear any TMA-marking. Similar facts are reported by Kouwenberg (1994: 307ff.) on Berbice Dutch. These similarities in such distant languages are quite remarkable and show that what happens in Alemannic is by no means exotic. The question then is why we do not find the go-construction in other German dialects. We can only offer a few tentative suggestions:

First, the phonetic similarity between the infinitive and the preposition *gen* was only found in Southern varieties. This clearly facilitates re-analyzing the preposition as a verbal element, as it is the case in Swiss German. Second (cf. Lötscher 1993), Alemannic varieties are arguably the only ones that have a strictly right-branching verb cluster so that the motion verb precedes the infinitive introduced by the preposition/prepositional complementizer: V1 > V2. Together with the general availability of left-peripheral complementizers in Alemannic – in contrast to Standard German – it is quite plausible that the same process as in e.g. Romance infinitives has taken place.

Third, the overt marking of the special syntactic configuration between motion verb and infinitive is in accordance with the general tendency of dialects for explicit marking while such markings are usually leveled out in standardized languages.

### 6 Functional or lexical? A comparison with Italian

There has been a lot of discussion of motion verb construction in the literature on Romance. It is therefore instructive to look at similarities and differences between Alemannic and Romance.

#### 6.1 Restructuring verbs are functional – the role of directional PPs

Cinque (2006) argues that restructuring verbs are always functional and that they always form monoclusal units. Motion verbs taking an infinitival complement are also analyzed as restructuring verbs. As a consequence Cinque proposes that they are merged as functional heads.

Next to their functional use motion verbs are also claimed to have a lexical use, namely when they take an argument such as a directional complement. In that case we are dealing with a biclausal structure, and since the directional complement occupies the complement position, the infinitival clause must be merged as an adjunct. Cinque presents the following evidence in favor of this analysis: First, the directional PP blocks restructuring (Cinque 2006: 53, fn. 30, citing Fresina 1981: 164ff.)

(78) \[ \text{Li, andiamo (*alla stazione) a ricevere } \_\_\_. \]
\[ \text{them go.PL to.the station go receive} \]
\[ \text{‘We are going to the station to pick them up.’} \]

Second, wh-extraction is blocked if a directional PP is present (Cinque 2006: 48, fn. 10). The following example illustrates argument extraction:

29 Note that the examples given are completely parallel to the Alemannic construction since the goal argument of the motion verb is overtly given (home, in) and thus the particle cannot be analyzed as directional in these cases.

30 In Standard German, the infinitive has to precede the motion verb in an embedded clause:

(i)*dass er geht die Zeitung holen
\[ \text{that he goes the newspaper fetch} \]
(ii)dass er die Zeitung holen geht
\[ \text{that he the newspaper fetch goes} \]
\[ \text{‘...that he goes to fetch the newspaper’} \]
(79) [A chi], è venuto (*a Firenze) [ad esporre la sua idea ___]? to whom is come to Florence to explain the his idea _Who did he come to Florence to explain his ideas to?_

The following pair shows that adjunct extraction is blocked in the presence of a directional PP:

(80) a. Come, ti è venuto [ad esporre la sua idea ___]? how to you is come to explain the his idea ‘How has he come to explain his idea to you?’ (intended: very clearly)

b. *Come, è venuto a Firenze [ad espor-ti la sua idea ___]? how is come to Florence to explain-to you the his idea ‘How has he come to Florence to explain his idea to you?’ (intended: very clearly)

Third, V1 can only be modified if a directional PP is present. This provides evidence for the dual status of the motion verb: If it occurs without a directional complement it is a functional element and consequently cannot be modified. Once a directional complement is projected, however, it is lexical and allows modification:31

(81) a. Come verrà da te a dipingere la porta? (lexical) how will come by you to paint the door ‘How will he come by you to paint the door?’ B: In bicicletta ‘With his bicycle’

b. Come ti verrà a dipingere la porta? (functional) How you will come to paint the door ‘How will he come to paint your door?’ B: *In bicicletta ‘With his bicycle’

Importantly, the effects only obtain with a directional complement, but not e.g. with locative adjuncts where restructuring and extraction are possible (Cinque 2006). This shows that the effects are not related to processing complexity but really to the adjunct status of the infinitival complement under the lexical use of motion verbs.

6.2 The facts in CH-Alemannic

At first sight things look very similar in Alemannic. The addition of a directional PP blocks restructuring. This is, of course, only relevant for the Swiss German varieties (we use movement notation for ease of exposition):32

(82) Er gaat [em Vatter], [em], (*ufs Fäld) [go ___ hälffe]. he goes em Vatter / he DAT on the field PRT help ‘He goes on the field to help the father/him.’ CH

31 Chiara Gianollo informs us that for her modification with in bicicletta is fine in both cases. We have no explanation for this difference in judgments.

32 There does not seem to be a grammatical variant with pronoun fronting; leaving the pronoun inside the go-phrase leads to strong degradation. Interestingly, DP-arguments of the lexical verb can occur above gi as long as they occur below the directional (we thank Josef Bayer for suggesting to test this):

i) Er gaat ufs Fäld [em Vatter], [go ___ hälffe]. he goes on the field the DAT father PRT help ‘He goes on the field to help the father.’

However, this does not necessarily show that it has left the projection of go, the surface string is ambiguous.
As in Italian, no blocking effect obtains with locative adjuncts:

(83) Er geht [em Vatter]/[em], um Fäld [go __, hälffe]
    He goes the.DAT father he.DAT on.the field PRT help
    ‘He goes to help the father/him on the field’

However, there are also systematic differences between Italian and Swiss German: A directional PP does not turn the infinitival complement into an island. At least extraction of direct objects is still well-formed (even though somewhat degraded compared to extraction without a directional PP):

(84) Was gaasch (is Kino) [go __, luege]?
    what go.2s in.the movie.theater PRT watch
    ‘What do you go to the movies to watch?’ CH

There are also semantic differences: The single event-interpretation is retained in the presence of a directional P, the motion verb thus does not become more lexical or less functional:

(85) Ich gang jede Taag uf de Määrt [go Gmües poschte],
    I go every day on the market PRT vegetables buy.INF
    *aber es hät nie.
    but it has never
    ‘I go to the market to buy vegetables every day.’ CH

As for modification it seems that V1 can never be modified alone. This is shown by the following example where the modifier is only compatible with V1:

(86) ?? Ich gang amigs mit em Auto an See go schwüme.
    I go always with the car to.the lake PRT swim.INF
    ‘I go by care to the lake to go swimming.’ CH

Modifiers are felicitous if they are compatible with the entire event:

(87) Ich gang amigs mit em Auto id Stadt [go poschte].
    I go always with the care in.the city PRT do.shopping.INF
    ‘I usually go to town by car to do the shopping.’ CH

In this example, ‘with the car’ means that the car is not only used to go to the city but also plays an important role in the shopping process (it is used to carry the goods etc.). In the previous example such an interpretation is, of course, impossible.34

It seems therefore that semantically the dichotomy lexical/functional is inadequate for motion verbs in Alemannic. They seem equally lexical/functional, regardless of whether a directional PP is present. Unfortunately, this does not really fit with the syntactic asymmetries depending on the presence of the directional PP.

33 The following spontaneous example by Marlys Moser was recorded during a birthday party:
   i) (Er fröögt sich), was, ihr use seged [go __, mache].
      he asks self what you.PL out be.SUBJ PRT do
      ‘He is wondering what you guys went out to do.’

34 Since modification of V2 is only possible with (low) manner adverbs (2.2), and since modifiers of this type generally only seem possible if they are compatible with the entire event, adjunct extraction from the infinitival complement cannot really be tested as it would be unclear if extraction really takes place from the infinitival complement.
6.3 But why is restructuring blocked and extraction degraded?

The fact that extraction is possible (even though degraded) and that restructuring is blocked with a directional PP is very difficult to explain. There are arguably no structural reasons, i.e. Cinque’s explanation that relates the opacity to the adjunct status of the infinitival complement is not correct for Swiss German: The *go*-phrase cannot be an adjunct as it is structurally lower than the directional PP, as shown by the following variable binding facts:\footnote{35}

\[(88)\] D Susi geht zu jedem, Unggle [go siin Charre aaluege].

the Susi goes to every.DAT uncle PRT his car look.at

‘Susi goes to every, uncle to have a look at his, car.’  CH (DE)

Furthermore, the *go*-phrase is a direct complement of the verb: In unmarked order it occurs adjacent to the verb and is thus closer than the directional complement. Obviously, it is not the case that the directional complement takes the position of the infinitival clause. Rather, the directional complement does not affect the position of the *go*-phrase:

\[(89)\]

\(a\). dass de Hans uf Züri [go poschta] gaat

dass de Hans [go poschta] uf Züri gaat

that the John to Zurich PRT do.shopping goes

‘that John goes to Zurich to do some shopping’  CH (DE)

\(b\).?? dass de Hans [go poschta] uf Züri gaat

that the John PRT do.shopping to Zurich goes

One can conclude therefore that the *go*-phrase is a direct complement of the motion verb. But given this result, extraction and clitic climbing should be unproblematic, contrary to what we have just observed. One cannot argue that matrix arguments generally block restructuring. As shown in Müller (2002: 65, ex. 137a/b), there are no such effects in German, even with matrix accusative objects that are sometimes claimed to lead to similar blocking effects as in Italian (cf. Sabel 1996 who claims that the matrix direct object then occupies the complement position so that the infinitival clause becomes an adjunct):

\[(90)\]

\(a\). weil er [es], sie tatsächlich [__, zu reparieren] bat

because he it her.ACC indeed to repair asked

‘because he indeed asked her to repair it’  SG

\(b\). weil der Fritz [es], ihn nicht [__, zu lesen] bat

because the Fritz it him not to read asked

‘because Fritz didn’t ask him to read it’  SG

Unfortunately, we have to leave this issue unresolved here, but would like to point out another complicating aspect: As pointed out in 2.1.2 above, the verb *schicke ‘send’* is also compatible with the *go*-construction. Since it is an object control verb it certainly cannot be argued to be functional. Nevertheless, both wh-extraction and restructuring are (easily) possible:\footnote{36}

\[(91)\]

Was, häsch en gschickt [go __, hole]?

what have.2s him sent PRT get

‘What did you send him to get?’

---

\(35\) Note that this also argues against the scrambling and adjunction approach of VPR. The pronoun would be expected to be outside the c-command domain of the directional, contrary to fact.

\(36\) If a directional complement is added to the motion verb, the same degradation obtains as with ‘go’.
(92) a. Ich ha sī en gsckikt [go __. hole].
    I have.1S it him sent PRT get
    ‘I sent him to get it.’

   b. Ich han en [s Buech]], gsckikt [go __. hole]
    Ich have.1S him the book sent PRT get
    ‘I sent him to get the book.’

This is certainly unexpected under Cinque’s approach. For some reason, *schicke* ‘send’ is more transparent than *gaa* ‘go’ with a directional complement. Cinque (2006: 24f.) observes the same transparency for Romance object control verbs; he then explains it away by treating them as causative verbs, which can be independently shown to behave differently from ordinary restructuring verbs. While semantically this is may be sound for Swiss German as well, we are not aware of any syntactic evidence that would require a causative analysis of ‘send’.

As a final case in point it is instructive to look at the manner of motion verb *räne* ‘run’, which given its descriptive content certainly cannot be argued to be functional. It seems to us that both extraction and restructuring are possible:

(93) a. Was ich er grännt [go __. hole]?
    what is he run PRT get
    ‘What did he run to get?’

   b. Er isch [es]/[s Buech]], grännt [go __. hole].
    he is it the book run PRT get
    ‘He ran to get the book.’

Summing up, the picture we get is thus rather mixed. While Cinque’s observation carry over to motion verbs taking directional complements with respect to restructuring they do not with respect to extraction and semantic interpretation. Furthermore, other motion verbs used in the *go*-construction that certainly are not functional allow both extraction and restructuring. We intend to tackle these issue in further research.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have compared motion verb constructions in two Alemannic varieties, namely in Bodensee-Alemannic and Swiss German. In both varieties a particle *gi* (Bodensee-Alemannic)/*go* (Swiss German) introduces infinitival complements of motion verbs. At first sight the two varieties only seem to differ with respect to the form of the particle. Upon closer inspection, however, a number of striking asymmetries emerge. We have shown that the asymmetries can be related to the categorial status of the particle in the two varieties. It was originally a preposition and has developed towards a complementizer that retains some of its prepositional properties in Bodensee-Alemannic. In Swiss German, however, it has been integrated into the verbal system with *go* participating in the Verb Projection Raising system. We have provided evidence in favor of a base-generation analysis of at least some of the word order variation that obtains in VPR. Furthermore, a number of asymmetries between VPR and the *go*-construction in Alemannic have been discussed in some detail. While the *go*-phrase contains just a VP, VPR involves more structure, arguably a TP. We have finally compared the Swiss German facts with motion verb constructions in Standard Italian. It turned out that while there are many similarities, one crucial point cannot be confirmed for Swiss German: In Italian the presence of a directional PP has a drastic influence of the syntax of motion verb constructions, pushing them towards a lexical non-single-event interpretation with an opaque complement. In Swiss German, however, no semantic difference obtains and the complement remains transparent for wh-extraction while blocking restructuring.
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