

AutorInnen:

Eva Dobler

Wolfgang U. Dressler

Sabine Klampfer

Katharina Korecky-Kröll

Stela Manova

John R. Rennison

Elisabeth Rieder

Antonia Rothmayr

Ineta Savickiene

J. Magdalena Scheiner

Anita Schenner

Maria Voeikova

a9615491@unet.univie.ac.at

ulli@ling.univie.ac.at

sabine.klampfer@univie.ac.at

kkorecky@easyon.at

stela_manova@hotmail.com

john.rennison@univie.ac.at

a9202221@unet.univie.ac.at

a9627035@unet.univie.ac.at

ineta_savickiene@fc.vdu.lt

magdalena.scheiner@univie.ac.at

a9204775@unet.univie.ac.at

maria.voeikova@univie.ac.at

Eigentümer, Herausgeber und Verleger:

Wiener Linguistische Gazette

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien

Für den Inhalt verantwortlich:

Wolfgang U. Dressler

Institut für
Sprachwissenschaft

Redaktion:

Sabrina Bendjaballah

Florian Menz

Eingang am 19. JUNI 2001

von: W26

Preis: 8

Inv.-Nr. Z 193 - 11

Alle:

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien

Berggasse 11

A-1090 Wien

Austria



Eva Dobler and Antonia Rothmayr

THE GI+INF CONSTRUCTION IN VORARLBERG GERMAN¹

1. Introduction

Vorarlberg German² is a German dialect spoken in the west of Austria. Although both Vorarlberg German and Swiss German belong to the group of Alemannic dialects, they differ syntactically from each other. "Verb Raising"³ and "Verb Projection Raising", which, as Schönenberger and Penner (1995) point out, are characteristic for Swiss German, do not exist in Vorarlberg German (VBG). The latter behaves like Standard German in this respect. Nevertheless there are a few peculiarities about this dialect, such as the particle *gi* in (1), which shows some similarities to the Swiss particle *ga/go* in (2):

¹ For invaluable comments and discussions we like to thank Martin Prinzhorn, Christine Czinglar and Katharina Köhler. Special thanks go to Christian Huber who spent so many hours helping us to organize our thoughts. We also thank Kleanthes Grohmann for useful criticism. Last but not least we are indebted to Silvia und Heinrich Dobler – without their native speaker intuition this paper would never have been possible.

All errors are our own.

² We have to point out that Vorarlberg-German is not a uniform dialect but varies regionally. Furthermore it is undergoing a remarkable change in the last decades so that there exist differences from one generation to the next due to the influence of Austrian Standard German. Our data stem from two "strong" native speakers, both retired and living in the region around Feldkirch.

³ In German verb raising in the sense of Evers (1975) is usually vacuous movement. This does not hold of all Swiss German dialects, e. g. St. Galler German:

- (i) dass er en wisse Waal t wöt *fange*
that he a white whale t wants catch
"that he wants to catch a white whale"

(data by Schönenberger and Penner, 1995)

In (i) the non-finite *fange* raises to the right of the modal *wöt*.

- (1) a. dass er gi schaffa goht (VBG)
that he *gi* work-inf goes
"that he is going to work/that he works"

- b. dass er gi d'Maria abhola kunnt (VBG)
that he *gi* the Maria pick-up-inf comes
"that he is coming to pick Mary up/that he picks up Mary"

- (2) a. dass si goot go luege (SG)
that she goes *go* look
"that she goes looking/watching"

- a. dass es chunt go schneie (SG)
that it comes *go* snow
"that it is going to snow"

(St. Galler German: Schönenberger and Penner, 1995)

Although at first glance the Vorarlberg German data seem to resemble the Swiss doubling verbs, we will argue that this phenomenon is of a different nature. We will show that both phenomena have partly the same origin but developed differently and now even belong to two distinct classes.

We will start by presenting Swiss German data involving so-called doubling verb constructions and then give a brief sketch of their diachronic development according to an article by Lötscher (1993) and finally examine the Vorarlberg German data in detail.

2. Doubling-Verb Constructions in Swiss German

The Swiss Doubling-Verb Construction is not distributed uniformly among the different dialects of Swiss German but varies regionally. What they all have in common is that one verb occurs twice in one sentence: There is an inflected form in the position of the matrix verb and, additionally, a non-finite form with a subordinate infinitive group. This phenomenon is restricted to a subgroup of four raising verbs, which Penner and

Schönenberger (1995) call the *aspectual* verbs: *go*, *come*, *let* and *begin*. As you can see from the following examples, the non-finite form can as well occur in front of the infinitive or in front of the complement of the infinitive:

- (3) a. Ich *gang ga* der Onkel bsueche. (ZH)
I go go-inf the uncle visit.
"I am going to visit my uncle."

- b. Ich *gang* der Onkel *ga* bsueche. (ZH)
I go the uncle go-inf visit.
"I am going to visit my uncle."

- (4) a. Er *chunnt cho* der Onkel bsueche. (ZH)
He comes come-inf the uncle visit.
"He comes/is coming to visit his uncle."

- b. Er *chunnt* der Onkel *cho* bsueche. (ZH)
He comes the uncle come-inf visit.
"He comes/is coming to visit his uncle."

- (5) a. Er *laat d Vaase la* gheie. (ZH)
He lets the vase let-inf drop.
"He drops the vase."

- b. Er *laat la* d Vaase gheie. (ZH)
He lets let-inf the vase drop.
"He drops the vase."

- (6) a. Si *faat afa s* Zmittag choche. (ZH)
She begins begin-inf the lunch cook.
"She is beginning to cook lunch."

- b. Si *faat* s Zmittag *afa* choche. (ZH)

She begins the lunch begin-inf cook

"She is beginning to cook lunch."

(Zurich German: Lötcher, 1993; our translation)

This is also true for Bernese whereas in St. Galler German only *go* (go) behaves like a real doubling verb. *cho* (come) is not doubled but combined with *go*. Schönenberger (1990) calls this kind of construction *cross doubling*. The two other verbs show no doubling at all.

- (7) dass er kei Guetzli *goot* *go* bache (SG)

that he no cookies goes go-inf bake

"that he is not going to bake cookies"

- (8) a. dass er *chunt* *go* schneugge (SG)

that he comes go-inf pry

"that he is coming to pry"

- b. *dass er *chunt* *cho* schneugge (SG)

that he comes come-inf pry

"that he is coming to pry"

(St. Galler German: Schönenberger and Penner, 1995a; our translation)

Schönenberger and Penner (1995a, 1995b) point out the aspect-marking function of doubling verbs. In their opinion these verbs are not able to bear an inflectional morpheme while fulfilling their aspectual function. Therefore the non-finite form has to be copied onto a higher position. This copy has no aspectual features, hence it can be inflected. Support for this theory comes from the fact that verb doubling is inhibited when the position of the matrix verb is occupied by modals (see (9b)) or when temporal auxiliaries (see (9c))⁴ occupy the position of the matrix verb:

⁴ Swiss German, like Vorarlberg German has no Simple Past Tense, but instead uses "to be" + participle for expressing perfect and preterite tense.

- (9) a. dass er gaht *ga* ne Foreuue faa (BE)

that he goes go-inf a trout catch

"that he is going to catch some trout"

- b. dass er wet *ga* ne Foreuue faa (BE)

that he wants go-inf a trout catch

"that he wants to go catch some trout"

- c. dass er isch *ga* ne Foreuue faa (BE)

that he is go-inf a trout catch

"that he went to catch some trout"

(Bernese: Schönenberger and Penner, 1995; our translation)

For a more detailed discussion of this aspectual analysis cf. Schönenberger and Penner (1995a,b).

3. Diachronic development

The Swiss German *ga/go* is assumed to originate either in the infinitive or participle of the main verb *ga(a)/go* (go). The matter is still under debate. Since the exact origin of *ga/go* is of no further relevance here we will leave this discussion aside and use the term *non-finite form*. In certain contexts this non-finite form occurred with a subordinate infinitive clause to which it increasingly procliticized. (10) provides an example from 17th century Swiss German.

- (10) so hoch das Viech gahn weiden gaht (a. 1620; SWB 2, 323)

so high the cattle go-inf graze goes

"as high as the cattle goes to graze"

(Swiss German: Lötcher, 1993; our translation)

Subsequently a loss of semantic content and grammatical independence of the non-finite form took place and resulted in a new functional element. This particle and the subordinated infinitive-group are interpreted as a purposive clause that depends on infinitive-governing verbs.

As Löttscher (1993) points out there are some problems with this analysis. He therefore suggests that two processes took place at the same time. One is the grammaticalisation of the non-finite verb to a functional element as outlined above; the other is the formation of a verbal preposition out of the nominal preposition *gen/gan/gon* (to).

- (11) a. Ihr untertanen, so gan StUrban zinsend. (SWB 2,322)

You subjects, so to StUrban paying fees.

"You subjects, paying fees to StUrban."

- b. die kinder gen dienen schicken (SWB 2,323)

the children to serve send

"send the children to serve"

(Swiss German: Löttscher, 1993; our translation)

(12) illustrates that the nominal preposition *gen* (to) was not an infinitive of *ga* (go) since the two words exhibit distinct phonological manifestations.

- (12) So du gen schlafen gon wilt. (a. 1557, SWB 2,323 f.)

So you to sleep go want.

"So you want to go to sleep."

(Swiss German: Löttscher, 1993; our translation)

This strongly supports Löttscher's approach of two parallel developments, both of which result in a construction in which a (proclitic) bound morpheme together with an infinitive phrase constitutes a purposive clause.

In some regions the verbal preposition and the non-finite form of *go* were phonetically identical. This fact may have led to the (incorrect) assumption that a doubling of the verb

had taken place. For Swiss German this doubling process is assumed to have applied first to the verb *come* and in a second step to *begin* and *let*.

This assumption not only explains for the historical and geographical variation encountered with that particle, it moreover links the Swiss *go/ga* to the Vorarlberg German *gi*.

Because of the relationship and geographical neighbourhood of Swiss German and Vorarlberg German it is plausible to assume the same diachronic origin for *gi* as for the Swiss German *ga/go*. In Vorarlberg German, however, the element *gi* (to) has never been phonologically identical with the infinitive *go* (go). As a result, even though the same construction with a subordinate infinitive clause exists in Vorarlberg German, it could not be mistaken for verb doubling. Consequently, no over-generalization to other verbs took place.

4. Vorarlberg German *gi* in contrast to Swiss German *ga*

The Vorarlberg German *gi* has two manifestations. On the one hand it is a preposition with a directional interpretation, comparable to the English *to* as can be seen in (13):

- (13) a. dass er *gi* Wian goht (VBG)

that he to Vienna goes

"that he is going/will go to Vienna"

- b. dass er vo dött bis *gi* Breagaz siacht (VBG)

that he from there sees 'as far as' to Bregenz

"that he sees as far as Bregenz from there"

On the other hand it occurs with a subordinate infinitive clause (14) like its Swiss counterpart:

- (14) a. dass d'Katz *gi* muusa goht (VBG)

that the cat *gi* 'catch mice'-inf goes

"that the cat goes/is going to catch mice"

- b. dass er *gi* d'Katz füatra kunnt (VBG)
 that he *gi* the cat feed-inf comes
 "that he comes/is coming to feed the cat"

In contrast to the Swiss *go/ga* its Vorarlberg German "counterpart" can only be governed by motion verbs like *go*, *drive*, *come*, *climb* and the like. The most striking difference, however, is the following: in Vorarlberg German temporal auxiliaries or modal verbs in the matrix position of a sentence do not affect the *gi*-construction:

- (15) dass er *gi* d'Katz füatra ganga isch (VBG)
 that he *gi* the cat feed-inf gone is
 "that he has gone to feed the cat"

- (16) dass a Katz *gi* muusa go wet (VBG)
 that a cat *gi* 'mice-catch'-inf go wants
 "that a cat wants to go catch mice"

This rules out the possibility of applying the aspectual approach of Schönenberger and Penner (1995b) to the Vorarlberg German *gi*. Although direction or rather purpose is always there in sentences with a *gi*-construction, we do not believe in a purely aspectual function of *gi*. This is supported by the observation that native speakers of Vorarlberg German deny any difference between (14a, repeated for convenience as (17)) und (18); nevertheless they would never produce (18):

- (17) dass d'Katz *gi* muusa goht (VBG)
 that the cat *gi* 'catch mice'-inf goes
 "that the cat goes/is going to catch mice"

- (18) dass d'Katz muusa goht (VBG)
 that the cat 'catch mice'-inf goes
 "that the cat goes/is going to catch mice"

5. Questions

So far we have shown that the Vorarlberg German *gi*+inf construction does not correspond to the Swiss German Doubling Verb Construction. Several questions arise. First, what kind of element is *gi*? Is it a preposition, is it a complementizer or is it a particle belonging to inflectional morphology indicating a non-finite form? Second, what is the status of *gi*+infinitive? We will address these questions below and present a preliminary analysis.

6. On the nature and status of *gi*

As we have already seen, when occurring together with a noun, *gi* is certainly a preposition, marking the goal of a movement in a direction, see (13) above. Another example is provided in (19):

- (19) D Oma goht *gi* Fealdkirch. (VBG)
 The granny goes *gi* Feldkirch.
 "Granny goes/is going to Feldkirch."

Now we want to examine what kind of element *gi* is in a construction such as (20):

- (20) Er goht *gi* schaffa. (VBG)
 He goes *gi* work-inf
 He works./He is going to work.

When (20) is translated into Standard German one either gets an infinitival complement sentence like (21) or an embedded VP as in (22).

- (21) Er geht (weg), um zu arbeiten (StandardG)
 He goes (away), to work-inf.
 "He goes (in order) to work."

- (22) Er geht arbeiten. (StandardG)
 He goes work-inf.
 "He goes (in order) to work."

It can be seen that none of its Standard German renderings ((21), (22)) corresponds exactly to the Vorarlberg German construction in (20). We will argue however, that (20) is the Vorarlberg German version of the Standard German (22).

7. The distribution of arguments in the *gi+inf* construction

7.1 Basic observations

In this section we will present some basic observations regarding the *gi+inf* construction. First, consider (23) and (24), where the direct object of the non-finite verb cannot occur to the left of *gi*.

- (23) a. dass er gi eassa goht (VBG)
 that he *gi* eat-inf goes.
 "He goes/is going (in order) to eat."
 b. *dass er eassa gi goht (VBG)
 that he eat-inf *gi* goes.
 "He goes/is going (in order) to eat."
 (24) a. dass er gi Brot kofa goht. (VBG)
 that he *gi* bread buy-inf goes.
 "He goes/is going (in order) to buy bread."
 b. *dass er Brot gi kofa goht. (VBG)
 that he bread *gi* buy-inf goes.
 "He goes/is going (in order) to buy bread."

Considering (23), one is tempted to assume that *gi* takes as its complement a nominalized *V*⁰. (24a) is no counterexample: *Brot* (bread) could be incorporated (see Bayer 1993 on Bavarian *zum*-constructions). But looking at some more data it is obvious that this cannot be the case or is at least very implausible:

- (25) a. dass er gi a/mi rots Fahrrad steala goht (VBG)
 that he *gi* a/my red bike steal-inf goes
 "that he goes (away in order) to steal a/my red bike"
 b. *dass er a/mi rots Fahrrad gi steala goht (VBG)
 that he a/my red bike *gi* steal-inf goes
 "that he goes (away in order) to steal a/my red bike"

Even with focus interpretation (25b) is judged ungrammatical. It cannot denote an alternation between *red* and *blue* or *bike* and *car*. Likewise it is not possible to contrast the verb such as *buy* versus *steal*. The only case in which the direct object shows up in front of *gi* is with contrastive stress on the demonstrative pronoun, picking out one particular *red bike*, illustrated in (26):

- (26) dass er DES rote Fahrrad gi kofa goht (VBG)
 that he THIS red bike *gi* buy-inf goes
 "that he goes (away in order) to buy this red bike ((and not the other))"

This suggests that *gi* takes at least VP as its argument.

7.2 Pronouns

In sentences with pronouns it can be observed that pronouns also have a special distribution:

- (27) a. Er goht sich / 'a gi wäscha. (VBG)

He_i goes himself_i / him_j gi wash-inf.

"He_i goes (in order) wash himself_i / him_j."

- b. *Er goht gi sich wäscha. (VBG)

He goes gi himself wash-inf.

"He goes (in order) wash himself."

- c. Er goht gi dr Hans wäscha. (VBG)

He goes gi the Hans wash-inf.

"He goes (in order) wash Hans."

This patterns with Standard German, where pronouns are generally preferred occurring in front of full DPs:

- (28) a. Der Kater schnurrt, weil ihn die glückliche Besitzerin sanft krault. (StdG)

the tom cat purrs because him gently the happy owner pets

"The tom cat purrs because the happy owner pets him gently."

- b. ?Der Kater schnurrt, weil die glückliche Besitzerin ihn sanft krault. (StdG)

the tom cat purrs, because the happy owner gently him pets

"The tom cat purrs, because the happy owner pets him gently."

This behaviour of pronouns can be accounted for e.g. in the approach of Cardinaletti and Starke (1994), who assume that due to their deficient status pronouns have to leave the VP and move to some higher licensing position (in their approach, the specifier of some higher agreement projection).

7.3 Indirect Objects

Now let us examine in some more detail how big the embedded verbal projection can be. One would expect that the complement of *gi* is the complete VP. However, this does not hold for indirect objects, as the following data show.

- (29) a. *dass sie gi am Raphael/anam Ma healfa goht (VBG)

that she gi the Raphael-DAT/a man-DAT help-inf goes

"that she goes/is going (in order) to help Raphael/a man"

- b. dass sie am Raphael/anam Ma gi healfa goht (VBG)

that she the Raphael-DAT/a man-DAT gi help-inf goes

"that she goes/is going (in order) to help Raphael/a man"

- (30) a. *Er goht gi am Raphael/anam Ma a Zückerle schenka. (VBG)

He goes gi the Raphael-DAT/a man-DAT a candy-ACC give-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to give a candy to Raphael/a man."

- b. Er goht am Raphael/anam Ma gi a Zückerle schenka. (VBG)

He goes the Raphael-DAT/a man-DAT gi a candy-ACC give-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to give a candy to Raphael/a man."

These data reveal that at PF only the direct object is included in the projection dominated by *gi*. This is confirmed by the fact that inverted sequences give rise to ungrammaticality, see the examples in (31):

- (31) a. *Er goht gi a Buach anam Ma schenka. (VBG)

He goes gi a book-ACC to a man-DAT give-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to give a book to a man."

- b. *Er goht a Buach gi anam Ma schenka. (VBG)

He goes a book-ACC *gi* to a man-DAT give-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to give a book to a man."

- c. ?Er goht a Buach anam Ma gi schenka. (VBG)

He goes a book-ACC to a man-DAT *gi* give-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to give a book to a man"

- (32) a. Er goht für d'Oma gi nan Kuacha hola. (VBG)

He goes for the Granny *gi* a cake-ACC get-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to bring a cake for Granny."

- b. Er goht gi nan Kuacha für d Oma hola. (VBG)

He goes *gi* a cake-ACC for the Granny get-inf.

"He goes/is going (in order) to bring a cake for Granny."

We see that it is by no means possible to have the indirect object inside of *gi*. Note that the acceptability of (32b) is no counterexample since *für d Oma* ('for Granny') is not an indirect object here but belongs with *nan Kuacha* ('a cake'), i.e. the direct object here is the complex constituent *nan Kuacha für d Oma* ('a cake for Granny'). VBG is like Standard German in that extraction from such a construction is impossible, as (33) shows:

- (33) *Was_t goht er *gi t* für d'Oma hola? (VBG)

What goes he *gi t* for the Granny get-inf?

What is he going to get for Granny?/What does he get for Granny?"

7.4 Adverbs

Adverbs which modify the subordinated infinitive have to occur inside the *gi*-construction (34a). (34b) is only grammatical when the adverb is meant to modify the matrix verb:

- (34) a. dass'r gi adächtig beata goht (VBG)

that he *gi* raptly pray-inf goes

"that he goes/is going to pray in a raptly way"

- b. dass'r adächtig gi beata goht (VBG)

that he raptly *gi* pray-inf goes

"that he goes/is going to pray raptly"

"that he goes raptly/is raptly going to pray "

- c. *dass'r gi beata adächtig goht (VBG)

that he *gi* pray-inf raptly goes

"that he goes/is going to pray raptly"

When modifying the matrix verb the adverb has to occur in front of the *gi*+inf construction (35a). Extraposition of the entire *gi*+inf phrase is preferred here, (35b) sounding slightly better than (35a):

- (35) a. dass'r gschickt uf'n Bom uff *gi* d'Katz ahahola kleattert (VBG)

that he skilfully up-the tree up *gi* the cat get-down-inf climbs

"that he climbs skilfully/is skilfully climbing up the tree to get the cat down"

- b. dass'r gschickt uf'n Bom uff kleattert *gi* d'Katz ahahola (VBG)

that he skilfully up-the tree up climbs *gi* the cat get-down-inf

"that he climbs skilfully/is skilfully climbing up the tree to get the cat down"

- c. *dass'r uf'n Bom uff *gi* d'Katz ahahola gschickt kleattert (VBG)

that he skilfully up-the tree up climbs *gi* the cat fetch-down-inf

"that he climbs skilfully/is skilfully climbing up the tree to get the cat down"

If an adverb modifies the whole sentence it also occurs in front of the *gi*-construction, but extraposition is no longer preferred, both (36a) and (36b) are equally acceptable.

- (36) a. dass'r all i'd'Kircha gi beata goht (VBG)
 that he always in the church *gi* pray-inf goes
 "that he is always going to church to pray/that he always goes to church to pray"
- b. dass'r all i'd'Kircha goht gi beata (VBG)
 that he always goes in the church *gi* pray-inf
 "that he is always going to church to pray/that he always goes to church to pray"
- c. *dass'r gi beata all goht (VBG)
 that he *gi* pray-inf always goes
 "that he is always going to pray/that he always goes to pray"

(34c), (35c) and (36c) show that no adverb can intervene between the *gi*+construction and the matrix verb in a verb-final sentence, suggesting that no position is available between them.

Also note that a *gi*+inf construction can be extraposed or left-dislocated:

- (37) a. weil er [gi's neu Auto aluaga] kunnt (VBG)
 because he *gi* the new car look-at-inf comes
 "because he comes/is coming to look at the new car"
- b. weil er kunnt [gi's neu Auto aluaga] (VBG)
 because he comes *gi* the new car look-at-inf
 "because he comes/is coming to look at the new car"

- (38) [Gi schifahra go] isch türar (VBG)
gi ski-inf go-inf is more expensive
 "To go skiing is more expensive."

Summing up, only direct objects or adverbs modifying the infinitive are allowed to occur inside *gi*+inf constructions. Indirect objects, pronouns (even with accusative case) or direct objects with contrastive stress as in (26) have to scramble out of the projection headed by *gi*. Presumably they need to move to some higher licensing position. All this indicates that *gi* is not merely a morphological marker but rather projects a phrase of its own. This raises the question of the status of *gi*.

8. *gi* as a prepositional complementizer?

Kayne (1999) deals with a similar problem in Romance languages. He discusses the nature of infinitival constructions with *de/di* in French and Italian and argues for an analysis of *de/di* as prepositional complementizers. He states that the infinitives seem to have nominal properties and do not form a constituent with *de/di*, a fact that is named *Verbalnomina* (verbal nouns) in traditional German grammars. To demonstrate their nominal properties Kayne notes that infinitives can be preceded by the definite article:

- (39) il mangiare la carne il venerdì (It)
 the eat-inf the meat the Friday
 (Italian: Kayne, 1999)

Additionally, infinitival phrases are very often licensed by the *de/di* element, which is otherwise used as a preposition with a noun:

- (40) Jean a essayé de chanter. (Fr)
 Jean has tried *de* sing-inf
 (French: Kayne, 1999)

- (41) Le nozze di Figaro (It)
The wedding *di* Figaro

Kayne argues that *de* and *di* should be analysed as complementizers which take a non-finite complement. One prediction is, therefore, that the relevant constructions should display doubly-filled COMP effects. In (42), for example, both SpecCP and C⁰ are occupied (by *où* and *de*, resp.), which renders the sentence ungrammatical:

- (42) *Je lui ai dit où d'aller (Fr)
I him have said where *de* go-inf
(French: Kayne, 1984; our translation)

Like other German dialects, however, Vorarlberg German allows for doubly-filled COMP so that this prediction is hard to test. An instance of doubly-filled COMP in Vorarlberg German is given in (43):

- (43) I woß ned, mit weam dass i reda söll. (VBG)
I know not, with whom that I speak should
"I don't know with whom to speak."

Nevertheless, if *gi* were the head of a CP it should be possible for negation to occur inside the *gi*-construction. A French example with a negated infinitival *de*-clause is given in (44), also showing that negative elements in French (and in Italian) have to follow *de/di*.

- (44) a. Je lui ai dit de ne voir personne. (Fr)
I him told *de* neg see no one.
"I told him not to see anyone"
- b. *Je lui ai dit ne de voir personne. (Fr)
I him told neg *de* see no one.
"I told him not to see anyone"

(French: Kayne, 1984)

Interestingly this seems to be excluded in Vorarlberg German, as can be seen from the following examples, where the negative element can not occur inside *gi*:

- (45) a. dass er neamat gi bsuacha goht (VBG)
that he nobody *gi* visit-inf goes
"that he has not gone to visit anybody"
- b. *dass er gi neamat bsuacha goht (VBG)
that he *gi* nobody visit-inf goes
"that he has not gone to visit anybody"
- (46) a. dass er ned gi d'Maria bsuacha goht, abr da Hans (VBG)
that he not *gi* the Maria visit-inf goes, but the Hans
"that he doesn't go to visit Maria, but Hans"
- b. *dass er gi ned d'Maria bsuacha goht, abr da Hans (VBG)
that he *gi* not the Maria visit-inf goes, but the Hans
"that he doesn't go to visit Maria, but Hans"

As expected, consequently, Vorarlberg German does not allow double-negation. If sentences containing *gi*-constructions indeed consisted of two CPs they would accommodate two NEG-domains. Again, this prediction is not borne out by the data:

- (47) a. *dass er ned gi nemat bsuache goht (VBG)
that he not *gi* nobody visit goes
"that he doesn't go to visit anybody"
- b. *dass er ned nemat gi bsuacha goht (VBG)
that he not nobody *gi* visit goes
"that he doesn't go to visit anybody"

- c. *dass er ned ned gi d'Maria bsuacha goht (VBG)
 that he not not gi the Mary visit-inf goes
 "that he does not go to not visit Mary"

Analysing *gi* as a prepositional complementizer seemed to have the advantage of being able to account for the two occurrences of *gi*, i.e. *gi*'s appearance as either a directional preposition that takes a DP-complement or as a prepositional complementizer that takes an IP-complement. Considering the above data, however, one is led to conclude that *gi* in Vorarlberg German does not project a CP.

9. Vorarlberg German *gi* in contrast to Standard German *zu*:

Next, let us compare Vorarlberg German *gi*-infinitives with the Standard German *zu*(to)-infinitives, the phrasal status and syntactic position of *zu* still being obscure. Vorarlberg German also has a *zu*-infinitive which behaves like its Standard German equivalent, as illustrated in (48).

- (48) a. Sie heat vergeassa, dr Hans azrüafa. (VBG)
 She has forgotten, the Hans up-to-call
 "She has forgotten to call up Hans."
 b. Sie hat vergessen, Hans anzurufen. (StandardG)
 She has forgotten, Hans up-to-call
 "She has forgotten to call up Hans."

gi- and *zu*-infinitives are in complementary distribution. As we already pointed out above, only verbs of directed motion select *gi*. All other verbs take *zu*-infinitives. An infinitive clause can only contain one of these two elements.

Another systematic difference between the two constructions is found in their syntactic behaviour. Recall from section (7.1) above that in *gi*-infinitives the direct object must occur inside the *gi*-construction. In contrast, Vorarlberg German and Standard German *zu*-infinitives never allow for any material to intervene between *zu* and the non-finite verb.

This holds also of separable prefixes. Whereas not even these can intervene between *zu* and the infinitival verb, as (49) shows, they are not separated from the verb in the *gi*+inf construction:

- (49) Sie goht gi dr Hans arüafa. (VBG)
 She goes *gi* the Hans up-call
 "She goes/is going (in order) to call up Hans."

Although the two constructions are not exactly parallel they nevertheless share the same properties with respect to coordination. Consider the contrast between (50) and (51):

- (50) a. Er isch gi Brot kofa und gi Kuacha eassa ganga. (VBG)
 He is *gi* bread buy-inf and *gi* cake eat-inf gone.
 "He went (in order) to buy bread and to eat cake."
 b. Er hat Brot zu kaufen und Kuchen zu essen vergessen. (StandardG)
 He has bread to buy-inf and cake to eat-inf forgotten
 "He forgot to buy bread and cake."
 (51) a. *Er isch gi Brot kofa und Kuacha eassa ganga. (VBG)
 He is *gi* bread buy-inf and cake eat-inf gone.
 "He went (in order) to buy bread and eat cake."
 b. *Er hat Brot zu kaufen und Kuchen essen vergessen. (StandardG)
 He has bread to buy-inf and cake eat-inf forgotten
 "He forgot to buy bread and cake."

In (50) each infinitival clause consisting of a verb and its object is preceded by *gi/zu*. In (51) the same two infinitival clauses are coordinated under one *gi/zu*, resulting in ungrammaticality. This seems to suggest that coordination of two infinitival clauses is impossible both under *gi* and *zu*. But now consider (52):

- (52) a. Er kunnt gi'd Musikanta aluaga und alosa (VBG)

he comes gi the musicians see and hear

"He comes to see and hear the musicians."

- b. weil ich die Musiker zu sehen und hören gekommen bin (StandardG)

because I the musicians-ACC to see and hear come am

"because I came to see and hear the musicians."

Both (52a) and (52b) are grammatical. On the surface (52) differs from (51) in that both infinitival verbs in (52) share the same object. However, (52a) and (52b) only allow to interpret the two events as taking place simultaneously. That is, the seeing and the hearing have to take place at the same time. This is confirmed by (53), which can be only interpreted in a way that the musicians are each simultaneously seen and heard one after another.

- (53) weil ich die Musiker nacheinander zu sehen und hören gekommen bin (StdG)

because I the musicians-ACC in-succession to see and hear come am

"because I came to see and hear the musicians in succession."

This is reminiscent of coordination of two NP under one D^0 .

- (54) *die Mutter_i und Architektin_j (StandardG)

the mother and architect-fem

"the mother and architect"

(54) can only refer to one individual (a woman with two professions). It cannot refer to two different (female) individuals. The standard assumption is that the definite article works as an operator picking out one referent. Therefore it is not possible to coordinate two NPs under an article that refer to two different entities.⁵ Perhaps (51) and (54) are

⁵ Note that this does not hold for plurals, where the article refers to sets of entities:

(i) The pilots, mine workers and shoemakers were on strike, the truck drivers were not.

ungrammatical for the same reason. Ch. Huber (p.c.) suggests that it could be argued that also *gi* functions as operator, picking out an event. Since in (51) there are two events coordinated under one *gi* that are not anchored in the same entity (or the same set of entities), the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

Finally, observe that the *gi*+inf construction differs from the Standard German purposive *um-zu* construction in that wh-movement out of a *gi*-construction is possible.

- (55) a. Was_i goht sie *gi t* kofa? (VBG)

what goes she *gi t* buy-inf

"What is she going to buy?"

- b. *Was geht sie um *t* zu kaufen (VBG)

what goes she in-order-to *t* to buy-inf

"What is she going in order to buy *t*?"

In this respect *gi*+inf constructions rather pattern with Standard German constructions such as (56), from which extraction of a wh-word is also possible.

- (56) Was geht Hans *t* kaufen? (StandardG)

what goes John *t* buy-inf

"What does he buy/is he going to buy?"

References

- Bayer, Josef (1993): Zum in Bavarian and Scrambling. In: W. Abraham und J. Bayer (eds.) *Dialektsyntax. Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 5*, 50–70.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke (1994): The Typology of Structural Deficiency. On the Three Grammatical Classes. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4/2: 41–109.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1984): On Certain Differences Between French and English. In: R. S. Kayne *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1999): Prepositional Complementizers as attractors. *Probus* 11, 39–73.
- Lötscher, Andreas (1993): Zur Genese der Verbverdopplung bei gaa, choo, laa, aafaa ("gehen", "kommen", "lassen", "anfangen") im Schweizerdeutschen. In: W. Abraham und J. Bayer (eds.) *Dialektsyntax. Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 5*, 180–200.
- Schönenberger, Manuela (1990): Doubling Verbs. Unpublished Ms. Université de Genève.
- Schönenberger, Manuela and Zvi Penner (1995a): Cross-dialectal variation in Swiss German: Doubling Verbs, Verb-Projection Raising, Barrierhood, and LF movement. In: H. Haider, S. Olsen and S. Vikner (eds.) *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Amsterdam: Kluwer.

Schönenberger, Manuela and Zvi Penner (1995b): Probing Swiss-German Clause Structure by means of the Placement of Verbal Expletives: Tun "do" Insertion and Verb Doubling. In: Z. Penner (ed.) *Topics in Swiss German Syntax*. Bern: Lang.

Summary

From the data presented in this paper it is obvious that the VBG *gi*+inf construction merits further research and deserves to be investigated more thoroughly. For the moment we want to draw the following, preliminary, conclusions. *gi* projects a phrase that licenses infinitives. The phrase headed by *gi* has internal structure. This follows from the fact that in the regular case, non-pronominal direct object DPs must remain inside *gi* whereas pronouns and indirect objects move leftwards to higher licensing positions above *gi*. However, the phrase projected by *gi* does not exhibit the properties of a full CP.

Sabine Klampfer, Katharina Korecky-Kröll & Wolfgang U. Dressler

MORPHOLOGICAL POTENTIALITY IN CHILDREN'S OVERGENERALIZATION PATTERNS: EVIDENCE FROM AUSTRIAN GERMAN NOUN PLURALS¹

1. Introduction

The acquisition of German noun plurals is a hotly debated issue in numerous recent studies in psycholinguistics (e.g. Clahsen 1999, Pinker 1999: 221-229, Köpcke 1998, Bartke 1998, Ewers 1999, Szagun 2000, Schaner-Wolles 2000). These studies can be assigned to two contrasting approaches:

The first approach is represented by single-mechanism models which deny the split of processing into a rote-learning mechanism and a rule-learning mechanism and assume analogical or schematic learning based on factors such as similarity, consistency and frequency of morphological patterns (cf. connectionist models: Szagun 2000, Elsen in print; schema-models: Köpcke 1998, Bittner & Köpcke 2001, Hahn 1999, Ewers 1999, Behrens & Kiekhöfer 2000, Behrens 2001).

The second approach is represented by dual-mechanism models which contrast rule learning to rote-learning. Rule-governed plural formation is usually called regular, whereas irregular plural formation is considered to be lexically stored and accessed by lexical look-up. This general approach can be further divided into at least two approaches: the first (well known) approach assumes only -s plurals to be regular, all the other plural formations (suffixes -e, -(e)n, -er, umlaut, zero and the combination of umlaut with suffixes -e and -er) to be irregular (Clahsen 1999, Bartke 1998, Pinker 1999, Marcus et al. 1995) – the other (less radical) approach assumes more than one regular type of plural

¹ The present study was supported by the Austrian Academy of Sciences and by the 'Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung' (P13681-SPR). We would like to thank Dorit Ravid (Tel Aviv University) for her valuable help in establishing the test design and for very fruitful discussions. Many thanks also to Gregor Laaha (Department of mathematics and applied statistics, BOKU Vienna) for his cooperative assistance in statistical matters. In fact, this contribution is a sequel to Klampfer, Ravid, Korecky-Kröll, Laaha & Dressler (in prep.), which focusses on correct responses and where overgeneralizations are only very briefly dealt with.