Chapter 13

Observing non-finite verbs:
Some 3V phenomena in German-Dutch

Tilman N. Höhle

1 Non-finite forms

The system of non-finite verb forms of Standard German and Standard Dutch
is rather poor. It comprises just three forms: the bare infinitive, the *zu*-infinitive,
and the participle. While the *zu*-infinitive is just the bare infinitive with the prefix
zu (or *te*, etc.) attached to it, the form of the participle is somewhat more subtle.

It has the 'weak' suffix *-t* (or *-d*), with the stem usually unmodified; or it has
the 'strong' suffix *-en* (often developed into *-e*), usually with ablaut of the stem
vowel. In most parts of Low German and in Frisian, this is all there is. In part of
southern Low German (Ostfälisch), the participle in addition bears the prefix *e-*.
In High German and most of Dutch, it instead bears the prefix *ge-* according to
rather peculiar rules.

The fundamental condition in Standard German (and many High German dialects), as proposed in Curme ([1922]: 257), is whether or not the first syllable of
the stem bears the main word accent. A prefix never bears the main accent of the

---

verb.[1] Thus, the participles in (1) have their main accent on the vowel marked in italics, and they never bear the participial *ge-*:

(1)   be-sch*ä*dig*t* ('damaged'), er-l*i*tt*en* ('suffered'), ge-h*o*rch*t* ('obeyed'), übers*e*tz*t* ('translated')

When the verb has no prefix, its first syllable may escape main accent because of a verbal suffix that attracts stress (*-ier*, *-isier*), as in (2a); or for any other (often unknown) reason, as in (2b):

(2)   a.   halb-*ier*t* ('halved'), gödel-is*ier*t* ('treated in Gödel's manner')
      b.   berl*i*ner*t* ('talked Berlinian'), mi*au*t* ('mewed'), schmar*o*tz*t* ('sponged'), stib*i*tz*t* ('filched')

Absence of main accent on the first syllable is sufficient for the absence of participial *ge-*. It is also almost necessary. In Standard German, just one verb lacks *ge-* idiosyncratically, i.e., immediately before the accent (viz., the 'passive auxiliary' *werd-*). In many dialects, more verbs idiosyncratically do without the prefix.

In some dialects, the accent condition is insufficient. E.g., in Sondershausen (3a) and in Hämmern (near Sonneberg, (3b)) the prefix *gə-* (or *jə-*) is present in cases like (2):

(3)   a.   sə hɛt åləs kliːç   uːs jəbosåʊnt   (Döring 1912: 36)
           sie hat alles gleich aus pos*au*n*t*

           'she trumpeted everything at once'

      b.   eəʃd hodə siç   gəbålwiːəd   (Sperschneider 1959: 74)
           erst hat.er sich balb*ier*t*

           'first he shaved'

In such dialects, *ge-* is absent just before a verbal prefix, as in (1) (and idiosyncratically with certain verbs). This is also the rule in Standard Dutch.

The rules governing the form of participles are formally interesting upon explicit analysis.[2] But to the extent that the system of non-finite forms has attracted attention, it is mostly restricted to the 'substitute infinitive' exemplified in (4), which all members of the German-Dutch linguistic continuum are supposed to have.[3]

---

[1] Prefixes thus differ sharply from particles such as *aus* in (3a). (Cf. Müller (2002) for a study of particles.)

[2] By a 'formally explicit analysis' I mean a theory expressed in a model-theoretic framework such as (R)SRL; cf. Richter (2000). For steps towards grammatical research on German-Dutch within this framework, cf., e.g., Meurers (2000), Reinhard (2001), Bouma (2003), and references therein.

[3] Except for Yiddish and (major parts of) Low German. Cf. Schmid (2005) for some comparative information.

(4) a. sie soll ihn haben schnarchen hören
         'she is said to have heard him snore'

     b. wenn ich ihn doch hätte schnarchen hören!
         'if I only had heard him snore!'

The construction is puzzling in that the 'perfect auxiliary' *hab-* ordinarily requires its verb complement to be a participle, not an infinitive, cf. (5), (7); and the position of *hab-* is counter to the ordinary rule of leftward selection in the Standard German verb complex,[4] cf. (6), (7).

(5) a.   sie soll ihn schnarchen gehört haben

     b.   wenn ich ihn doch schnarchen gehört hätte!

(6) a. * sie soll ihn haben schnarchen gehört

     b. * wenn ich ihn doch hätte schnarchen gehört

(7) a. * sie soll ihn schnarchen hören haben

     b. * wenn ich ihn doch schnarchen hören hätte

Thus, four questions pose themselves:

(8)   i.   How can a different form appear where a participle is required?

      ii. Why is it, of all forms, the bare infinitive that replaces the participle?

      iii. Why is the participle only replaced when it (a) is selected by a particular perfect auxiliary and (b) selects another verb in a non-participial form by itself?[5]

      iv. Why cannot *hab-* occur in the ordinary word order here?

There is an extensive literature that seeks (or presupposes) causal connections between answers to these questions (primarily, questions (8ii) and (8iv)); cf. Schmid (2005) and references therein; also contributions in Seuren & Kempen (2003).

---

[4]I take a *verb complex* (*vc*) to be either *pure* or *impure*. The head of a *vc* is a verb or a *pure vc*. Assuming strictly binary branching, the non-head in a *pure vc* is a verb or a particle or a *pure vc*. In an *impure vc* it is any other verbal projection, and it follows the head, e.g., in Standard German (i), West Flemish (ii), and (19c), (21c) below. (This can look confusingly similar to clause or conjunct initial preposed (finite or non-finite) verbs; cf. Höhle (1997).)

 (i)   ... daß dir hätten die Knie zittern können
       '... that your knees could have trembled'

 (ii) ... da ze Valère Marie zag an Jan geven   (Haegeman 1994: 510)
       '... that Valère saw Marie give them to Jan'

[5]In some variants of German the third verb can be replaced by some pronominal, as in *das hättest du nicht müssen* ('you wouldn't have had to do that'). I leave that aside. Still, it is clear from cases like this that the causal link from (8iiib) to (8ii) found by Kurrelmeyer (1910: 167ff.) for the early times has got lost.

It is hardly possible, though, to maintain any truly causal connection between (8iv) and the rest in view of the fact that there are speakers who find (7) quite unobjectionable (cf., e.g., Patocka 1997: 279). Although this fact does not make (7) any more palatable to Standard speakers, it would seem to exclude any explanatory account that goes beyond descriptive correlations.

A similar caveat applies to question (8ii). There is a large Middle German area where it is not the infinitive that substitutes for the participle. We will also see that not only participles can be replaced (question (8i)) and that there are remarkable displacement phenomena that surface when three (or more) verbs are related such that V_1 selects V_2 and V_2 selects V_3 (question (8iii)).[6] Thus, the substitute infinitive is just one special case in the family of what I call '3V phenomena'; a case whose very simplicity leads astray many attempts to understand it plainly in terms of what strikes the eye. The observations reported on below should thus be conducive to any more reliable research into the non-finite system.

2 Substitutes

Trebs (1899) reports on the dialect of Oberschwöditz (part of Trebnitz, NW of Zeitz). The participle is formed just as in Standard German. In place of the Standard's substitute infinitive, this dialect has special forms not used elsewhere in the language. These are the data:[7]

(9)   a. ij   håwe musd   giːe
        ich habe müssen gehen

        'I had to go'

   b. ij   håwəse kund   saːe
        ich habe.sie können sehen

        'I could see them'

   c. ij   håmn   wuld   drafe
        ich habe.ihn wollen treffen

        'I wanted to meet him'

   d. de håsd suld   kume
        du hast sollen kommen

        'you were supposed to come'

---

[6]For general information on this area, Spangenberg (1989) and Rowley (1989) can be consulted. Spangenberg (1993a) has accumulated much detailed information. The *Thüringisches Wörterbuch* (ThürWb) can also be useful.

[7]The relevant data from Trebs (1899: 7, 20ff.) are reproduced here in full. Weise (1906) took up and commented on part of the data; with this exception, they have been ignored in the literature.

e. de håsd darfd driŋke
   du hast dürfen trinken

   'you were allowed to drink'

f. de håsd muchd lo:fe
   du hast mögen laufen

   'you wanted to run'

g. e håd larnd få:re
   er hat lernen fahren

   'he learned to ride'

h. e hådn   måchd gefri:re
   er hat.ihn machen gefrieren

   'he made him freeze'

i. se hå:dn   hi:rd siŋe
   sie hat.ihn hören singen

   'she heard him sing'

j. mər hunn   halfd drå:e
   wir haben.ihm helfen tragen

   'we helped him to carry [s.t.]'

k. mər hun[n]   lå:sd le:e
   wir haben.ihn lassen liegen

   'we left him lying'

l. hudərnij   sa:d lo:fe
   habt.ihr.ihn.nicht sehen laufen

   'haven't you seen him run'

m. hå:dərsche nij   he:sd size
   habt.ihr.sie nicht heißen sitzen

   'haven't you told them to sit'

n. se hun   du:d schi:wundscharje
   sie haben tun schieben.und.schergen (stoßen)

   'they helped in every way'

o. se hunn   waisd danze
   sie haben.ihm weisen tanzen

   'they taught him to dance'

These forms are built, it seems, by suffixing *-d* to the bare stem. This suffix looks like the weak participial suffix; but the participle bears the prefix *ge-*. Sometimes

the participle's vowel is different, e.,g., with *dürf-* in (9e) (gedorfd); and several verbs of course have a strong participle, e.g., *seh-* in (9l) (gesaːn), *heiß-* in (9m) (geheːsən), *tu-* in (9n) (gedåːn), and *weis-* in (9o) (gewisən). Exploiting classical terminology, I will call such forms "supine".[8]

In this dialect, then, a supine, rather than an infinitive, substitutes for a participle. But there is more. When the perfect auxiliary has subjunctive form, the supine changes likewise:

(10) a. ij hedəs misd   wise
          ich hätte.es müssen wissen

          'I should have known it'

      b. ij hedn   kend   drafe
          ich hätte.ihn können treffen

          'I could have met him'

Cf. (9a,b). The same would happen with these forms:

(11) *weld* for *wuld* in (9c); *seld* for *suld* in (9d); *mejd* for *muchd* in (9f); *lesd* for *låːsd* in (9k); *diːd* for *duːd* in (9n)

The suffix *-d* is here attached not to the stem but to something similar to forms of the preterite subjunctive. I will call this the "complex supine", in distinction to the "simple" supine in (9).

The situation in Kranichfeld (SW of Weimar) is partially similar to Oberschwöditz. There is a (substitute) simple supine with *brauch-*,[9] *müss-*, *soll-*, as in (12a-c):[10]

(12) a. eç hɛdsn   neç brɑʊxd   sə gaːn   (Schachtschabel 1910: 85)
          ich hätte.es.ihm nicht brauchen.ss zu geben.G

          'I wouldn't have had to give it to him'

      b. a håds   mʊsd   måxə   (ib., 84)
          er hat.es müssen.ss machen.IN

          'he had to do it'

---

[8]No term is established in the literature. Weldner (1991) calls the form "participial infinitive".

[9]As a participle, *brauch-* from (12a) follows the V₃ it selects: a *håd neç sə komŋ gəbrɑʊxd* ('he didn't have to come').

[10]The position in (12c-e) of the particle *hen* (in a verb complex with a branching head) is typical of part of Thuringia. (This is another similarity to Standard Dutch.) See the map in Maurer (1926) for the regional distribution, and cf. Weldner (1991: 210f.) for one local dialect.

From now on, the verb form is often indicated on the Standard German gloss: CS for complex supine; G for gerund; IN for infinitive; P for participle; SS for simple supine; ST for bare stem.

c. a håd hɛn sʊld   gɪ: (ib., 85)
    er hat hin sollen.ss gehen.ɪɴ
    'he was supposed to go there'

d. a hådsç   hɛn lo:sd   få:rə   (ib., 86)
    er hat.sich hin lassen.ss fahren.ɪɴ
    'he had himself carried there'

e. a hådsç hɛn lo:sə få:rə   (ib., 86)

Supines *dürf-* (dɔrfd), *könn-* (kund), *mög-* (muxd), *woll-* (wuld) occur under the same conditions. Occasionally, also *lass-* appears as a supine, as in (12d). But unlike Oberschwöditz, Kranichfeld has also the substitute infinitive as seen in (12e). This is usual with *lass-*, and it is the only choice with *fühl-* ('feel'), *helf-* ('help'), *heiß-* ('order'), *hör-* ('hear'), *lern-* ('learn'), *seh-* ('see'), *spür-* ('feel').

In Ruhla (Regel 1868: 116ff.) there are just simple supines of *dürf-* (durft), *könn-* (konnt), *mög-/möcht-* (moijt), *muss-* (mutt), *soll-* (sollt), *woll-* (wollt); otherwise, the substitute infinitive is found. Still, there is something extra: *konnt*, *sollt* and *wollt* freely alternate with *t*-less forms *konn*, *soll*, *woll* (which are different from the infinitives *könn*, *söll*, *wöll*).

Sondershausen has simple and complex supines of the same verbs: *dürf-* (dærft), *könn-* (kunt, kænt), *mög-/möcht-* (moxt, meçt), *muss-* (mʊt, mɪt), *soll-* (solt, sɪlt), *woll-* (wolt). Their distribution is much less clear than in Oberschwöditz. It appears they sometimes alternate freely with each other and with the bare (substitute) infinitive. Thus, one of Döring's (1912) examples is this:

(13) mə hædn   mʊt/mɪt/mɪsə   nu:(s)ʃmɪ:ßə   (Döring 1912: 37)
      wir hätten.ihn müssen.ss/cs/ɪɴ rausschmeißen.ɪɴ
      'we would have had to expel him'

There are at least some supines in Bleicherode near Nordhausen (cf. ThürWb s. v. *sollen*), but I have not found any north of this. Southward, we find supines in Obermaßfeld (near Meiningen), but only with *müss-* (mößt) and *mög-* (mö:gt):

(14) a. mi honn lang mößt   wært   (Spieß 1873: 56)
          wir haben lange müssen.ss warten.ɪɴ
          'we had to wait long'

      b. mä jåŋg håt e pfærr mö:gt   gewæ:r;   å:ber mä   fra:
          mein Sohn hat ein Pfarrer mögen.ss werden.ɪɴ, aber meine Frau
          håt'ß nét wöll   hå: (ib., 56)
          hat's nicht wollen.ɪɴ haben.ɪɴ
          'my son wanted to be a pastor, but my wife didn't want it'

All other verbs form the substitute infinitive, such as *woll-* (wöll) in (14b). In nearby Wasungen, only *müss-* has a supine (mösd), as in (15). These are the southernmost supines I have seen.

(15)   ich hu:ən do:edrü: so: se:ɐr mösd   lach   (Reichardt 1914: 205)
        ich habe darüber so sehr müssen.ss lachen.ɪɴ

        'I had to laugh about it so much'

Roughly, then, the supine is found throughout the Thuringian area, excepting the most northern and the southern fringe, with large differences in detail from one local dialect to the next.

But it is also found outside this area. Thus, Hanke (1913: 65, 69) reports on the simple supine of *soll-* (sult) and *könn-* (kunt) in a part of Silesia. Graebisch (1907), covering a larger part of Silesia, has found in addition *müss-* (mußt), *mög-/möcht-* (mucht) and *dürf-* (durft), but also *brauch-* (braucht). In eastern Bavarian, supines of *müss-* (miaßt), *möcht-* (mecht), *könn-* (kunnt, kennt), *woll-* (woit), *soll-* (sollt) are found in scattered places (Patocka 1997: 260ff., 264).

Looking westward, I have not found any supine west of the Fulda region, with the exception of two regions near the border to French. Labouvie (1938: 105) reports on substitute forms of *brauch-*, *dürf-*, *könn-*, *mög-/möcht-*, *müss-*, *soll-*, *woll-* in Dillingen on the Saar river similar to forms of the preterite subjunctive with the strong participial suffix -*en* attached to them, e.g., (16):

(16)   a. du hättest das nicht bräuchten zu verraten   (Labouvie 1938: 132)
          'you wouldn't have had to give that away'

        b. … daß ich nicht habe dürften kommen   (ib., 123)
          '… that I wasn't allowed to come'

        c. ich hätte gern möchten zu Fuß gehen   (ib., 112)
          'I would have liked to go on foot'

These forms are in no way sensitive to the mood (subjunctive or indicative) of the perfect auxiliary, even though they are formally a variant of the complex supine.

In part of Alsace, by contrast, there are complex supines that regularly participate in the subjunctive system; cf. Philipp (1987: 135f.). One variant of these systems is found in Strasbourg:[11]

(17)   a. van's vɛrmɛr ksɪ: va:ʀ, hatʃ ɪm hɔft khɛntə ʃpɪ:lə
          'if it had been warmer, you could have played in the yard'
                                 (Philipp & Bothorel-Witz 1989: 327)

---

[11]Thanks to Marthe Philipp for giving me (17b,c) in personal communication.

    b. ich hätt wotte gehn
      'I would have liked to go'

    c. ich hätt mieste uffpasse
      'I should have paid attention'

These forms are similar to finite preterite subjunctive forms. They occur in place of the substitute infinitive when the perfect auxiliary is in subjunctive form. In addition to *könn-*, *woll-* and *müss-* in (17), also *dürf-* (tɛʀftə), *soll-* (sɔtə) and *möcht-* (mɛçtə) are in use.

    Returning to the supine mainland, we look into Altenburg.[12] The dialect has simple supines of, at least, *hör-* (hiert), *könn-* (kunnt), *lass-* (lußt), *lern-* (larnt), *mög-/möcht-* (mucht), *müss-* (mußt), *soll-* (sullt), *woll-* (wullt). As usual, they are used in 3V configurations when selected by (indicative or subjunctive) perfect *hab-*. It is thus surprising that with *sollt*, the selecting verb can also be the 'future auxiliary' *werd-*, which ordinarily requires a bare infinitive:

(18) uf su en   Ristwogen warn   Se doch nich iernd Pfannkuchen
     'auf so einem Rüstwagen werden Sie doch nicht   Pfannkuchen

     sullt   hule   (Daube 1895: 56)
     sollen.ss holen.IN'

     'you are surely not supposed to carry any pancakes on such a truck'

With some verbs – at least *müss-* (muß), *help-* (half), and *hör-* (hier) – an infinitive is replaced by a form that might either be a *t*-less supine (reminiscent of forms in Ruhla) or a bare stem:

(19) a. su schien's, all sal   se all alle Jungfer sich dorchs Lam   muß
        so schien's, als sollte sie als alte Jungfer sich durchs Leben müssen.ST

        schlo   (Daube 1897: 47)
        schlagen.IN

        'so it seemed as though she should have to spend her life as an old spinster'

---

[12] My report is based on an inspection of the extant volumes of Daube's 'reader'. Statements in Pasch (1878: 80) and Weise (1900: 154f.) are largely verified by it, but Weise (1906: 195ff.) only partially so.

    The infinitive has a Schwa suffix when the stem ends in a consonant; otherwise, it has no suffix. In Daube, *(d)er* (as in (21a) below) is always 'you (pl.)', never 'he', contrary to Weise (1900: 14).

    b. wulln se mir die Sochen widder half   uf'n   Buckel hiebe?
        wollen Sie mir die Sachen wieder helfen.st auf.den Rücken heben.in

                                                  (Daube 1895: 61)

        'do you wish to help me get the stuff back on my back?'

    c. mer hette kunnt   ene Schteckenahle uf de Are hier
        man hätte können.ss eine Stecknadel   auf die Erde hören.st

        folle   (Daube 1897: 29)
        fallen.in

        'one could have heard a needle fall on the ground'

The bare stem appears as a substitute for the participle and the infinitive at least with *lass-* (loß):

(20)   a. ich hob mer en   Zwarnsfonn loß   gabe   (Daube 1905: 56)
          'ich habe mir einen Zwirnsfaden lassen geben'

          'I had them give me a thread'

     b. ich will en loß   ufmorschiere   (ib., 55)
          'ich will ihn lassen aufmarschieren'

          'I want to deploy him'

The regular infinitive does appear on V_2, though, whenever it selects V_3 to the left, e.g.:

(21)   a. wos der nich glei   widder ward   ausfrasse
          was Ihr nicht gleich wieder werdet ausfressen.in (auslöffeln)

          kunne   (Daube 1897: 20)
          können.in

          'which you will not be able to compensate for immediately'

     b. mer mußte'n   gieh   loße   (ib., 16)
          man mußte ihn gehen.in lassen.in

          'one had to let him go'

     c. doß mer hette de Fliegen ibber de Fansterscheim   kunnt
          daß man hätte die Fliegen über die Fensterscheiben können.ss

          loofe   hiere   (Daube 1905: 21)
          laufen.in hören.in

          'that one could have heard the flies run across the windows'

Judging from Daube, Altenburg is thus like Oberschwödlitz in that it shows no substitute infinitive; instead it has a supine and something like a substitute stem.

Some of these forms, however, are not only induced by perfect *have*, but also by 'future' and 'modal' auxiliaries, replacing the infinitive (question (8i)).[13]

In passing, we note that there is a region where a substitute infinitive on *lass-* is not only induced by perfect *have* (question (8iiia)). Constellations such as (22) with the 'passive auxiliary' *werd-* are fully acceptable (and the only choice) in Barchfeld (east of Bad Salzungen):[14]

(22) dɪ syːʁ meʋiç wiʁd duʁç ə sagçə duʁç lɔs lœʏf   (W)
die saure Milch wird durch ein Säckchen durch lassen.ɪɴ laufen.ɪɴ

'the sour milk is passed through a sackcloth'

Many similar examples can be found in the *Koch- und Backrezepte* from Steinbach-Hallenberg (SE of Schmalkalden).

The Barchfeld dialect also provides a constellation that is somewhat similar to (18) above:

(23) a. iç meçd aɪ diʁfd gədɑːnts   (W)
ich möchte auch dürfen.cs tanzen.ɪɴ

'I want to be allowed to dance, too'

b. iç meçd ned med dɔbɛɪ gəsɛɪ   (W)
ich möchte nicht müssen.cs dabei sein.ɪɴ

'I don't want to be forced to be present'

With *möcht-* (meçd), one could expect the infinitives *diʁf* in (23a) and *mis* in (23b); instead, we find the complex supines *diʁfd* and *med*. But we also see here a strange prefix *gə* on the infinitives *dɑːnts* and *sɛɪ*. This is part of a larger system of non-finite verb forms.

---

[13]The dialect of Rudolstadt as exemplified in Sommer (1906) is broadly similar (as Weise 1900: VI notes). It differs, e.g., in that there are substitute infinitives with most verbs (next to simple supines and some bare stems).

[14]My information on Barchfeld comes from three sources: the monograph by Heinrich Weldner (1991), which is by far the finest work of its kind; a series of booklets that contain dialect texts and various informations (Weldner [1994] through 2000, available with the Verein Heimatgeschichte Barchfeld); and, most importantly, Weldner has been overwhelmingly generous in sharing his native speaker judgement and his linguistic insight with me in an extended correspondence. I am also grateful for his detailed comments on an earlier version of these pages. Examples from these personal communications are marked "W". (The supines induced by *möcht-* in (23) and *brauch-* in (41) below complement the distributional statement in Weldner (1991: 132f.).)

3 Further non-finite forms

In addition to the bare infinitive, Frisian has another non-finite form. It looks like the infinitive with a suffix *-n* attached to it. In honour of a long tradition, this is often called the "gerund". Frisian has no *te*-infinitive; rather, *te* is prefixed to the gerund. The bare gerund is selected by sensory verbs such as *see, hear, feel*, etc. A few verbs, among which *stand*, *sit* and *lie* are prominent, appear as gerunds when selected by *stay* or *go*.

There is but little information on the gerund in Dutch; cf. Marle (1994) and references therein. Low German has two areas with a *zu*-gerund in *-ene*. In a large Swabian area the *zu*-gerund is conspicuous in that it ends in *-et* etc. The more typical gerund in *-e(n)* is found on the border to Italian and in eastern Low German,[15] and also, fortunately, throughout the Thuringian area, with much variation in detail. E.g., Oberschwöditz, Kranichfeld, Bad Frankenhausen, and Sondershausen have just the *zu*-gerund. Thus, *brauch-* ('need') in (12a) above selects the *zu*-gerund *sə ga:n* ('to give'), where *-n* is the gerundial suffix. In Altenburg the gerund is also selected by *bleib-* ('stay') and *hab-* ('have'). In Hämmern near Sonneberg, many more verbs select the gerund: *help-* ('help'), *hör-* ('hear'), *seh-* ('see'), *spür-* ('feel'), *mach-* ('make'); *bleib-* ('stay'), *hab-* ('have'), and *lass-* ('let'); *werd-* ('future aux') and *tu-* ('do'); e.g., from Sperschneider (1959):

(24) a. miə blaem dra:dn   (Sperschneider 1959: 40)
         wir bleiben stehen.G

         'we stay standing'

      b. ʃdarm   wen iç ne döid   (ib., 75)
         sterben.G wenn ich nur täte

         'if I only would die'

In (24a), the gerund *dra:dn* ('stand', with suffix *-n*) is selected by *blaem* ('stay'); in (24b), the gerund *ʃdarm* ('die', with stem-final *b* and suffix *-n* developed into *m*) is selected by *döid* ('do').

Regel (1868) reports that in Ruhla the gerund can be selected by *hear* and *see*, but only when selection is to the left, as in (25); otherwise the bare infinitive is required, as in (26):

(25) bamme   den hirz   låufen   senn   (Regel 1868: 102)
      wenn.wir den Hirsch laufen.G sehen

      'when we see the deer run'

---

[15]See *Deutscher Sprachatlas*, map 54 (*auszutrin<u>ken</u>*) for the German situation at large, and *Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz*, vol. III (pp. 1 and 2) for details in Switzerland.

(26) a. mäi såchen den hirz   låuf   (ib., 102)
          wir sahen   den Hirsch laufen.ɪɴ
          'we saw the deer run'

      b. dæːr häːt d'n düːfel säː   barwes låuf   (ib., 127)
          der   hat den Teufel sehen.ɪɴ barfuß laufen.ɪɴ
          'he saw the devil run barefoot'

In Steinach (north of Sonneberg), the gerund is selected by a (large) subset of the
selectors in Hämmern. There is a delightful additional caprice, though. In a small
area that used to include Sonneberg, Steinach, and a few small villages north
of these (Spechtsbrunn, Siegmundsburg, Altenfeld, Neustadt, Gabel), the gerund
can have the special prefix *bə-*. This *be*-gerund occurs if and only if it is the verb
complement of *bleib-* ('stay'). The examples that can be found in the literature
are reproduced in (27)–(29):

(27) a. blei bətraatən   (Schleicher 1894: 71)
          bleib stehen.ɢ!
          'stand!'

      b. blei   bəsitzən   (ib., 62)
          bleib sitzen.ɢ!
          'stay sitting!'

      c. əs bleit   bəschtenna[16]   (ib., 62)
          es bleibt stehen
          'it stays standing'

(28) a. iç blai   b(ə)sidsn   (Luthardt 1963: 289)
          ich bleibe sitzen.ɢ
          'I remain seated'

      b. a is bəliːçŋ   gəbliːm   (ib., 289)
          er ist liegen.ɢ geblieben.ᴘ
          'he stayed lying'

      c. iç   sol b(ə)sidsn blai   (ib., 290)
          ich soll sitzen   bleiben
          'I am supposed to remain seated'

(29) ...   bəʃdagŋ gəbliːm   ...   (Sperschneider 1959: 95)
      (... daß ich) stecken.ɢ geblieben.ᴘ (wäre)
      '... that I would have got stuck'

In (23) above, we were intrigued by a prefix *ge-* appearing on the infinitives of *sei-* and *tanz-*. This prefix is similar to the *be-* of the *be-*gerund in that it is bound to non-finite verbs in particular contexts. We had an instance of it even earlier in (14b). There, the form *gewæ:r* is built by attaching *ge-* to the bare infinitive of *werd-* ('become'). This is the rule for the *ge-*infinitive throughout.[17] Just like the participial prefix, this *ge-* obeys the rule(s) we discussed with (1)–(3) above. (But unlike the participle, *ge-* infinitives do not idiosyncratically do without *ge-*, it seems.)

The regional distribution of the *ge-*infinitive partially overlaps that of the supine in the Thuringian area. The northern border of the prefix is north of Nordhausen (cf. Haushalter 1884 and Rudolph 1924/1925); the border in the south is somewhere near Bad Mergentheim (cf. Wolf 1998). In the west, Fulda is within the area, but the border is probably not far from it. In the east, the border is not far from Sonneberg, which is inside (cf. Rosenkranz 1938: map 9a). Rudolstadt and Kranichfeld are outside, but a story about Rottenbach near Rudolstadt shows several instances of the prefix (Firmenich 1846: 169). Gamstädt near Erfurt is within the area (Spangenberg 1993b: 33), and so is Bad Frankenhausen. There is, thus, a small northern and a substantial southern region that has *ge-* but no supine. Similarly, there is a large eastern region that has the supine but no *ge-*. But in the rest, both phenomena occur, roughly from Nordhausen to Wasungen and from Fulda to Erfurt.

The basic cooccurrence condition for the *ge-*infinitive is that it is selected by *könn-*, as in (30a) from Stützerbach near Ilmenau and in (30b) from Sondershausen:[18]

(30)   a.   dos muß mer ne laß,   gearbt   konn er   (ThürWb s.v. *lassen*)
              das muß man ihm lassen.IN, arbeiten.IN kann er

              'we must grant him this – work, he can'

      b.   iç khån mıç nıç   mı: sʊ sı:rə ob jəʃtråptsı:rə   (Döring 1912: 36)
              ich kann mich nicht mehr so sehr ab strapazieren.IN

              'I can no longer exert myself that much'

---

[16]The form *(bə)schtenna* is special; see the exposition concerning (57) below.

[17]I am aware of one exception. In a region near Fulda, the bare infinitive of stems ending in *r* takes *-n*. According to Noack (1938: 49) the *-n* is dropped when *ge-* ist prefixed, as in *ɛʌ wil fɔaʌn ɛ:wəʌ ɛʌ kon ned gəfɔaʌ* ('he wants to drive, but he cannot drive'). – For information on the Fulda region, see also Weber (1959), Wegera (1977), Wild (1991).

[18]Heiligenstadt is unusual in that the *ge-*infinitive (selected by *könn-*) appears to be optional; cf. Firmenich (1846: 199f.). According to Rudolph (1924/1925: 263), only epistemic *könn-* takes the *ge-*infinitive in Rottleberode (near Nordhausen).

(Recall (3) for the accent condition.) In Sondershausen, *könn-* is the only selector for the *ge*-infinitive. But through most of the *ge*-area, *mög-/möcht-* also selects it, as in (14b). In some places additional verbs can select *ge-*. E.g., Frank (1898: 41) illustrates *dürf-* and *müss-* for Bad Frankenhausen, Haushalter (1884: 14) cites *woll-* and *lass-* as selectors from a publication in the region of Nordhausen. The text in Firmenich (1846: 169) concerning Rottenbach has *woll-* and *soll-*.

4 Displacement

Leaving substitutes aside, we now have, in some places, six non-finite forms: the bare infinitive, the *ge*-infinitive, the bare gerund, the *zu*-gerund, the *be*-gerund, the participle. We illustrate some of this with Sonneberg data from Schleicher (1894: 62f.).

Comparing the forms in (31), we see that *müss-* selects the bare infinitive, *könn-* the *ge*-infinitive, and *werd-* the bare gerund:

(31) a. döös mußmər sough
       das   muß.man sagen.ɪɴ
       'one must say so'

   b. mər kåå gəsough
      man kann sagen.ɪɴ
      'one can say'

   c. ich waarsch soughən
      ich werde's sagen.ɢ
      'I will say it'

In (32), the gerund (müßən) is selected by *werd-*, and it selects the bare infinitive (reiß, måch). The freedom of word order that there is does not affect these relations.

(32) a. ich waarsch runtər müßən   reiß
       ich werde's runter müssen.ɢ reißen.ɪɴ
       'I probably have to tear it down'

   b. mər warns   måch   müßən
      wir werden's machen.ɪɴ müssen.ɢ
      'we probably have to do it'

The situation in (33) is structurally identical. The gerund (künna) is selected by *werd-*, and it selects the *ge*-infinitive (gəreiß, gəmåch).

(33)   a. ich waarsch runtər künna gəreiß
           'I am probably able to tear it down'

        b. ich waarsch schä gəmåch künna
           'I am probably able to do it'

Finally, the substitute infinitive *höör* in (34) selects the gerund (singa):

(34)   ich houna   höör   singa
      ich habe.ihn hören.IN singen.G

      'I heard him sing'

Thus, everything is just as one would expect.[19]

    However, this is atypical. Other dialects for which sufficient data are available never accord to these plain expectations, even in close vicinity to Sonneberg. They rather display a rich array of additional 3V phenomena.

    In Kleinschmalkalden (north of Schmalkalden, east of Barchfeld and Bad Salzungen), *muss-* again selects the bare infinitive, and *werd-* selects the gerund. But a constellation similar to (32) looks different here:

(35)   a. iç wæʃ   müd   əråb dun   (Dellit 1913: 168)
           ich werde's müssen.CS herab tun.G

           'I probably have to put it down'

        b. mə wæn   müd   glün   (ib., 143)
           wir werden müssen.CS klagen.G

           'we probably have to go to law'

In a 3V configuration, the gerund selected by *werd-* is regularly replaced by the (complex) supine, hence the form *müd* ('must'). This is just like the substitution we have seen for Altenburg in (18). Remarkable is the fact that *glün* and *dun* are, by their suffix *-n*, unmistakably gerunds, even though *müd* would require them

---

[19]With one exception: in (i), (ii), *help* would be expected to be a participle/gerund but appears as an infinitive. This is likely related to an anomaly with *help* in Wasungen (Reichardt 1914: 207) that is well-known from Swabian (cf. Heilmann 1999: 61ff.). (Cf. also Schmeller 1821: 380f. for a similar anomaly with *go* in Bavarian.)

   (i)   ich hou half   gəarbət
       ich habe helfen.IN gearbeitet.P

       'I helped working'

   (ii) ich wüür half   arbətən
       ich würde helfen.IN arbeiten.G

       'I would help work'

to be infinitives. The gerundial form that *werd-* requires is thus displaced to a verb where it plainly does not belong.

We can say that in the Sonneberg data (32)f. the formal requirement of a verb V_n is satisfied immediately by its verb complement V_{n+1}. In (35), in contrast, immediate satisfaction of V_1's requirement is excluded when the complement V_2 selects a verb V_3 by itself. Apparently, satisfaction of V_1's requirement is mediated to V_3, while V_2 appears in a substitute non-finite form.[20]

The differing behaviour of Sonneberg and Kleinschmalkalden with respect to displaced (mediated) selectional requirements is reminiscent of a well-known difference between Dutch and Standard German. Examples such as (36a) with a displaced *zu*-infinitive used to be a topic of traditional German syntax ever since they were observed (and criticized) by Grimm (1837: 949):

(36)   a.   ich glaube es haben tun zu können
             'I believe I was able to do it'

     b.   * ich glaube es zu haben tun können

     c.   ik geloof het te hebben kunnen doen

(Cf., e.g., Curme [1922]: 259.) The majority of Standard speakers feel more or less uneasy with this construction. But the deeper problem is that the construction in (36b), which conforms to our grammatical expectations, is absolutely impossible.[21] This, as Merkes (1895: 66f.) notes, is all the more remarkable as its counterpart in Dutch (36c) is quite unobjectionable (and the only choice).

It is not known what this sharp difference between Dutch and German is induced by. The same question would seem to arise for the Thuringian dialects that have displaced gerundial forms and the Sonneberg dialect that does not.

With respect to constructions such as (36), our dialects are even farther away from Dutch (while their word order properties are conspicuously similar). The displaced *zu* is perfectly natural in, e.g., Rudolstadt, Barchfeld, and Steinbach-Hallenberg:[22]

---

[20]This formulation insinuates that the displacement of form is more than just an 'edge phenomenon' but involves the selectional system. Cf. Bader (1995) and references therein for the former, and our final section for relevant data. It seems natural that questions (8i, iii) for substitution find a similar answer. These considerations, though, are really beyond the pretensions of this report.

[21]Cf. Meurers (2000) for thorough development of this point.

[22]My information on Steinbach-Hallenberg stems from the data in Anita Steube's (1995) article and from her tutorial correspondence, for which I am deeply grateful. Data from the latter source are marked "S". Some dialect texts can be found in the booklets *Sellemoa* and *Koch- und Backrezepte*.

(37) a. da braucht mersch Pitschen nur lasse   zu merken
      da braucht man.es Pitsch   nur lassen zu merken

      'one just needs to make Pitsch notice it'   (Sommer 1906: vol. 1: 70)

    b. bɑn   ə sıç ned fʊn ən bʀʏçd lɔs   ʊːn tsə ʃnyːtsə
      wenn er sich nicht von ihm braucht lassen.ıɴ an zu schnauzen.ɢ

      'if he doesn't need to be snapped at by him'   (W)

    c. hä bruchd sich ned   fuːnən   bəschaid lås   zu sœːwə   (S)
      er braucht sich nicht von.ihm Bescheid lassen.ıɴ zu sagen.ɢ

      'he doesn't need to take advice from him'

We expect to find the *zu*-gerund required by *brauch-* on *lass-*, but *lass-* is an infinitive, and in place of the infinitive that *lass-* requires we find the *zu*-gerund on *merk-*, *schnauz-* (tsə ʃnyːtsə), and *sag-* (zu sœːwə).[23] This corresponds exactly to constructions well-known from Bern (Bader 1995; Hodler 1969), Gurin (Comrie & Frauenfelder 1992), and Zürich (Cooper 1995).

Returning to the Kleinschmalkalden data, we see a variation of (35) in (38a):

(38) a. ə wyəds ned wöłd   hun   (Dellit 1913: 143)
      er wird's nicht wollen.cs haben.ɢ

      'he won't want to have it'

    b. ə wyəd(s) ʃund lås   maxə   (ib., 137)
      er wird's   schon lassen.ıɴ machen.ɢ

      'he will have it done'

In (38a), *woll-* appears as a supine (wöłd), and its verb complement is a gerund (hun) rather than the infinitive that *woll-* ordinarily requires. In (38b), the gerund expected on *lass-* is not replaced by a supine but by an infinitive (lås); and the complement again appears as a gerund (maxə), rather than the expected infinitive.

The same kind of displacement can be seen with the *ge*-infinitive:

(39) a. ə kon   ən iu lås   gəkom   (Dellit 1913: 137)
      er konnte ihn ja lassen.ıɴ kommen.ıɴ

      'he could let him come'

---

[23]Altenburg, on the other hand, prefers to drop the *zu*-gerund in this constellation:

  (i) dar braucht sich's bluß emol vun dan loß   derstreeche   (Daube 1895: 38)
     der braucht sich's bloß mal   von dem lassen.sᴛ erklären.ıɴ

     'he only needs to let him explain it to him'

b. kåsd   mə heləf   gəʃri: (ib., 168)
kannst mir helfen.ɪɴ schreiben.ɪɴ

'[you] can help me to write'

Here, *lass-* and *help-* appear as infinitives, even though *könn-* ordinarily requires a *ge-*infinitive. Instead, their complement (*komm-* or *schreib-*) appears with *ge-*.

What happens, then, when a gerund selector (e.g., *werd-*) and a *ge-*infinitive selector (e.g., *könn-*) come together? There was no problem in (33), but now displacing the form would require that one verb be marked for both gerund and *ge-*infinitive. What we actually find is this:

(40)   ə wyəds ne(d) könd   əråb gəris   (Dellit 1913: 137)
er wird's nicht können.cs herab reißen.ɪɴ

'he probably isn't able to tear it down'

Thus, *könn-* does find its *ge-*infinitive (gəris), but *werd-* does not find any gerund.[24]

It thus seems that V$_1$'s requirement is mediated to V$_3$ if V$_2$ selects a bare infinitive, as in (35), (37)–(39). This much seems to be necessary and also sufficient for displacement to occur.

The situation in Bad Salzungen is largely identical (Hertel 1888). Looking back to the Barchfeld examples (23), we now recognize the displaced *ge-*infinitive, e.g., in *iç meçd aɪ diʁfd gədɑ:nts*: *dürf-* (diʁfd) requires an infinitive; the *ge-*infinitive (gədɑ:nts) is required by *möcht-*. However, in the rare case where additional configurations of verbs can be observed, we find that the displacement of forms can actually be more involved. In (41), *könn-* (kend) requires its verb complement *les-* to be a *ge-*infinitive; but *les-* instead appears as the *zu-*gerund required by

---

[24]This is so in all dialects with displacement that I have seen, with one exception. Speakers of Steinbach-Hallenberg are split. There are some who strongly prefer the form *gespräche* in (i) and (ii) to *gespräch*, the latter being the *ge-*infinitive required by the supine *könnt*, while the former in addition bears the gerundial *-e*. Cf. Steube (1995: 432). Others have the judgements reversed.

(i)   ich wüür dås net   könnt   gespräche/gespräch, ban   ich's net   seiwer häd
ich würde das nicht können sagen,   wenn ich's nicht selber hätte
gesie   (S)
gesehen

'I couldn't say that if I hadn't seen it myself'

(ii) ich war   das fileicht   niimåls richdich könnt   gespräche/gespräch   (S)
ich werde das vielleicht niemals richtig   können sagen

'perhaps I will never be able to say that clearly'

I am grateful to Anita Steube and Eberhard Jäger for discussing this issue with me.

brauch-. Thus, the *zu*-gerund required by V_1 is mediated to V_3 even when V_2 selects a *ge*-infinitive.

(41) dɔs de dɔs ned bʀүçsd kend   tsə la:sə   (W)
      daß du das nicht brauchst können.cs zu lesen.G

      'that you need not be able to read that'

As a further dimension of variation, displacing the gerund need not be obligatory. In Wasungen (Reichardt 1914) and in Ruhla, it is optional:

(42) a. mäi wæ:rens no:ch villmå: mütt   hürrn   (Regel 1868: 117)
          wir werden's noch oft   müssen.IN hören.G

          'we will have to hear that often'

      b. hæ: würds net   wöll   hü:r   (ib., 116)
          er   wird's nicht wollen.IN hören.IN

          'he probably doesn't want to hear it'

(43) sü: wæ:rns   ü:r mütt   gånn *or* gå: (ib., 117)
      sie werden's ihr müssen.IN geben.G/IN

      'they probably have to give it to her'

In Steinach, displacement of the gerund does not seem to occur (as in (55) below). This also applies to Coburg (Hermann 1957) and Hämmern (Sperschneider 1959).

For a more systematic picture of one local dialect, we look into Barchfeld. First, the *ge*-infinitive. The *ge*-prefixes appear in accordance with (1)f. (with some verbs doing idiosyncratically without *ge-* in the participle; Weldner (1991: 113)). Therefore, no *ge-* is to be expected in (44):

(44) a. də kɔsd   miç əmɔ: fedɚmeçəʊ   (Weldner 1991: 217)
          du kannst mich mal   vettermicheln.IN

          'leave me alone'

      b. mə kond sıç ned lɔs   bədi:n   (W)
          man konnte sich nicht lassen.IN bedienen.IN

          'one couldn't enjoy service'

In (44a), the verb *vettermichel-* has its word accent on the third syllable, hence there is no *ge-*. In (44b), the *ge*-infinitive must be displaced toward the last verb *bedien-*. This verb's word accent is on the second syllable (because of the prefix *be-*)·, hence again no *ge-* here.

In (45), an interesting constellation arises:

(45) ə meçd lɪwɚ kend   gəaʁwəd   (W)
      er möchte lieber können.cs arbeiten.in
      'he would prefer to be able to work'

Both *möcht-* (meçd) and *könn-* (kend) select a *ge*-infinitive. In this constellation
we expect the *gə*-infinitive required by the first verb to be displaced to the last
verb. Thus, the single verb *gəaʁwəd* apparently satisfies the selectional require-
ments of two different verbs.

   This kind of situation is well known from Swiss German. Thus, in the Bernese
example (46), the *zu*-infinitive *z'häuffe* ('to help') is required by both *schiint*
('seems') and *probiere* ('try'):

(46) dr Hans schiint sine   Fründe   probiere   z'häuffe   (Bader 1995: 22)
      der Hans scheint seinen Freunden versuchen zu.helfen

      'Hans appears to try to help his friends'

See also Comrie & Frauenfelder (1992: 1058) and Cooper (1995: 187ff., 193).
   It seems possible that (47) follows the same pattern:

(47) a. ə wiʁd ned we:sd   tsəʁa:çd tsə komə   (W)
          er wird nicht wissen.cs zurecht zu kommen.g

          'he probably doesn't know how to get along'

      b. sɪ wiʁd dɔs ned bʁʏçd   tsə dʊn   (W)
          sie wird das nicht brauchen.cs zu tun.g

          'she probably doesn't need to do that'

In (47a), *wiss-* (we:sd) requires a *zu*-gerund. The bare gerund that *werd-* requires
should be displaced, and the *zu*-gerund *tsə komə* conceivably satisfies both re-
quirements. Similarly in (47b): the *zu*-gerund *tsə dʊn* required by *brauch-* (bʁʏçd)
conceivably also satisfies *werd-*. Alternatively, (47) might belong to the class of
(48) where the gerund from *werd-* must be unrealized in the way discussed with
(40) above because of the *ge*-infinitive required by *könn-*,

(48) a. dɔ: wiʁʃdə ned kend   nɑ: gəsɔ:ɪ   (Weldner 1991: 132)
          da wirst.du nicht können.cs nein sagen.in

          'there you probably cannot say no'

      b. də wiʁʃd hɔ: kend   gəkom   (W)
          du wirst haben.in können.cs kommen.in

          'you were probably able to come'

(The complex supine *kend* is induced by *werd-* in (48a) but by the infinitive *hab-*
in (48b).)

Displacement of the *ge*-infinitive is usually obligatory, but there is a class of configurations where it is dispreferred or even impossible, viz., with *hear* and *see*. In short examples such as (49) the *ge*-infinitive seems possible, but the bare infinitive is preferred:

(49) a. iç meçd sə hi:ʁ   seŋ *or* gəseŋ   (W)
         ich möchte sie hören.ɪɴ singen.ɪɴ
         'I want to hear her sing'

     b. də kɔsd ən sɛ: lœʏf *or* gəloeʏf   (W)
         du kannst ihn sehen.ɪɴ laufen.ɪɴ
         'you can see him run'

With more complex examples such as (50), the *ge*-infinitive is felt to be deviant:[25]

(50) a. iç meçd ən gaʁn hi:ʁ   bosœʏnə blɔ:s   (W)
         ich möchte ihn gern hören.ɪɴ Posaune blasen.ɪɴ
         'I want to hear him play the trombone'

     b. mə kondə dn hɑns ɪmɐ in goʁdə sɛ: aʁwəd   (W)
         wir konnten den Hans immer im Garten sehen.ɪɴ arbeiten.ɪɴ
         'we could always see Hans work in the garden'

The displacement of the gerund is dispreferred under slightly more inclusive conditions. With *lass-*, displacement seems possible, but not obligatory:

(51) a. iç wa:ʁ ən lɔs   ʁʊf *or* ʁʊfə   (W)
         ich werde ihn lassen.ɪɴ rufen.ɪɴ/ɢ
         'I will have [s.o.] call him'

     b. mə waʁn ən ned so: lɔs   fuʁd ge: *or* gen   (W)
         wir werden ihn nicht so lassen.ɪɴ fort gehen.ɪɴ/ɢ
         'we won't let him leave like this'

With *hear* and *see*, the bare infinitive is strongly preferred even in simple examples such as (52):

(52) a. sɪ wiʁd ən sɛ: kom   (W)
         sie wird ihn sehen.ɪɴ kommen.ɪɴ
         'she will see him come'

     b. ə wiʁd sə hi:ʁ   seŋ   (W)
         er wird sie hören.ɪɴ singen.ɪɴ
         'he will hear her sing'

---

[25]The data in Steinbach-Hallenberg are similar; cf. Steube (1995: 433).

The periphrastic *do* (which is not particularly popular in Barchfeld) ordinarily requires a gerund, as in (53a), but this is left unrealized with *heiß-* ('tell'), as in (53b):

(53) a. iç dɛd lɪwɚ aʁwədə   (Weldner 1991: 158)
          ich täte lieber arbeiten.G

          'I would prefer to work'

     b. ə dɛd mɪç hɛis fuʁd ge: (W)
          er täte mich heißen.IN fort gehen.IN

          'he would tell me to leave'

5 Word order

We have noted that details of selection and substitution sometimes correlate with the order of verbs in the verb complex. Thus, in Standard German (and various dialects, including, e.g., Zaans (Hoekstra 1994)), the order $V_1 <$ (i.e., before) V_2 correlates with the substitute infinitive on V_2. In Kranichfeld and Altenburg, $V_2 < V_3$ correlates with the substitute supine and stem on V_2. In Ruhla, $V_n < V_{n+1}$ correlates with the infinitive (instead of the gerund) on V_{n+1}. We now turn to observations on displacement.

In Steinach (near Sonneberg), *werd-* requires the gerund, as in (54). But in (55), with the order $V_2 < V_3$, immediate satisfaction is excluded, and displacement is avoided as well. Nearby Hämmern is similar (Sperschneider 1959: 32).

(54) a. iç wa:ʃ måxŋ   (Luthardt 1963: 290)
          ich werde's machen.G

          'I will do it'

     b. a weʌds ne: gəmåx khünʌ   (ib., 290)
          er wird's nicht machen.IN können.G

          'he is probably not able to do it'

(55) a. iç wa:ʃ råu müs rais   (ib., 290)
          ich werde's runter müssen.IN reißen.IN

          'I probably have to tear it down'

     b. a weʌd ne: döf låx   (ib., 370)
          er wird nicht dürfen.IN lachen.IN

          'he is probably not allowed to laugh'

In Barchfeld, the order of verbs is less variable, selection to the right being strictly adhered to. (Cf. Weldner 1991: 199f.) There are two main exceptions: participles and special gerunds.[26]

Participles precede the auxiliary they are selected by (except, optionally, if the latter is in finite form). We thus have the relative order seen in (56):

(56)　a.　bene　nåch dn　lætzte Krieg vertreewe　sein wurn
　　　　　welche nach dem letzten Krieg vertrieben.P sind worden.P

　　　　　'who were expelled after the last war'　　　　　(Weldner 1997: 99)

　　　b.　ə　wiʁd gʁɑːŋg gəwɑːsd　sɛɪn　　　　　(Weldner 1991: 165)
　　　　　er wird krank　gewesen.P sein.G

　　　　　'he probably was ill'

　　　c.　ɛɪ　had　dɔs ʃond kond　　　gəmɔxd　gəhɔː　／　ʃond
　　　　　ihr hättet das schon können.ss gemacht.P haben.IN　　schon

　　　　　gəmɔxd　kond　gəhɔː　　　　　　　　　(ib., 200)
　　　　　gemacht.P können haben.IN

　　　　　'you could have done that already'

The gerund (sɛɪn) in (56b) and the *ge*-infinitive (gəhɔː) in (56c) immediately satisfy their selector's requirements, even though they select a verb V_3 by themselves. A similar constellation was seen in (54b). This thus requires our sketch of the displacement rule (discussed with (35) above) to be modified: it must be order sensitive such that the immediate satisfaction by V_2 of V_1's formal selectional requirement is excluded only if $V_2 < V_3$. (This might also apply to (36a); but it does not apply to the substitution case (4).)

The situation with special gerunds is similar. The ordinary gerunds of *steh-* ('stand') and *lieg-* ('lie') are *ʃden* and *lɛɪn*, but there are also special long forms *ʃdenə* and *lɛɪnə*. They must be selected by *bleib-* ('stay') or *hab-*, *lass-*, *seh-* (cf.

---

[26]As a third exception, *könn-* can follow its *ge*-infinitive, but only when finite (while in (54b) it is a gerund):

　(i)　dɔs ə　ned　gəaʁwəd kend　　　　　　(Weldner 1991: 158)
　　　　daß er nicht arbeiten　könnte

　　　　'that he couldn't work'

　(ii)　gück emå, bi　dær äkel noch gehepf　kunn　　　(Weldner 1999: 57)
　　　　guck mal, wie der Ekel noch springen kann

　　　　'look how that bloke still can jump'

Weldner 1991: 113).[27] These verbs must follow the gerund they select, as in (57). (Recall also (25).)

(57)   a. iç waːʁ setsə   blin   (W)
           ich werde sitzen.ɢ bleiben.ɢ
           'I will remain seated'

       b. iç meçd lɛɪnə   gəbliː   (W)
           ich möchte liegen.ɢ bleiben.ɪɴ
           'I want to remain lying'

       c. mə hʊnən   aɪnfɑx ʃdenə   gələsə   (Weldner 1991: 113)
           wir haben.ihn einfach stehen.ɢ gelassen.ᴘ
           'we simply left him standing [there]'

They thus differ sharply from *werd-*, which must precede the gerund it selects:

(58)   iç glaɪ   dɔs ɚ bɪː gəweːnliç   əʀem wiʁd ʃden   / gəweːnliç
       ich glaube, daß er wie gewöhnlich herum wird stehen.ɢ   gewöhnlich
       wiʁd əʀem   ʃden   (W)
       wird herum stehen.ɢ
       'I believe that he will hang about as usual'

This is why *werd-* is standardly involved in the displacement of gerunds while *bleib-* etc. are not.

There is a rare constellation in (59) and (60) (from Steinach and Wasungen) that is, in a sense, complementary to (56c) and (57b):

(59)   a. du hesds   jå liːwə los   khün   gəsai   (Luthardt 1963: 370)
           du hättest's ja lieber lassen.ɪɴ können.ɪɴ sein.ɪɴ
           'you should have preferred to abstain from it'

       b. iç håusnʌ los   khün   gəmåx   (ib., 370)
           ich habe's.ihn lassen.ɪɴ können.ɪɴ machen.ɪɴ
           'I could make him do it'

---

[27]With the long gerund and two supines (but no *be*-gerund), Barchfeld thus has eight non-finite verb forms.

The few bare gerunds found in Sommer (1906) (Rudolstadt) are all selected by *bleib-*. Otherwise, the verbs that in Barchfeld take the special gerund select a Thuringian adjective in *-nig*, e.g.:

(i)   da   blieb'r   liegnig / stihnig   / sötznig / stecknig / ausnig
      'there he stayed lying   standing sitting stuck   out'
                                         (Sommer 1906: vol. 1: 31, 39, 46, 66, 397)

(60) ich wü:ərən ned hå: laəs   kön   gəruf
      ich würde.ihn nicht haben.ɪɴ lassen.ɪɴ können.ɪɴ rufen.ɪɴ

      'I wouldn't have been able to have [s.o.] call him'   (Reichardt 1914: 207)

What is unusual here is the order in the verb complex: $V_2 < V_1 < V_3$, where V_2 is *lass-* and V_1 is *könn-*. The varying direction of selection does not seem to disturb the usual displacement relations: the last verb (V_3) is selected to the right by *lass-*; this is sufficient for the *ge*-infinitive (required by *könn-*) to be mediated to V_3, it appears.

References

Bader, Thomas. 1995. Missing and misplaced *z'* in Bernese Swiss German. In Zvi Penner (ed.), *Topics in Swiss German syntax*, 19–28. Bern: Lang.

Bouma, Gosse. 2003. Verb clusters and the scope of adjuncts in Dutch. In Pieter A.M. Seuren & Gerard Kempen (eds.), *Verb constructions in German and Dutch*, 5–42. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Comrie, Bernard & Uli Frauenfelder. 1992. The verbal complex in Gurinerdeutsch. *Linguistics* 30. 1031–1064.

Cooper, Kathrin E. 1995. Topics in Zurich German syntax. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Lingustik* 38.

Curme, George O[liver]. [1922]. *A grammar of the German language.* 2nd rev. ed. New York: Frederick Ungar.

[Daube, Ernst] Sporgel. 1895. *Noch Feierohmds. E Lasebuch in Altenborjscher Mundort. Zweetes Heft.* Altenburg.

[Daube, Ernst] Sporgel. 1897. *Noch Feierohmds. E Lasebuch in Altenborjscher Mundort. Drittes Heft.* Altenburg.

Daube, Ernst (Sporgel). 1905. *Noch Feierohmds. E Lasebuch in Altenborjscher Mundort. Viertes Heft.* Altenburg.

Daube, Ernst (Sporgel). 1908. *Noch Feierohmds. E Lasebuch in Altenborjscher Mundort. Fünftes Heft.* Altenburg.

Dellit, Otto. 1913. *Die Mundart von Kleinschmalkalden (Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Wortschatz).* Marburg.

Deutscher Sprachatlas. [1927ff.] Marburg: Elwert. [http://www.diwa.info].

Döring, Edmund. 1912. *Beiträge zu einer Laut- und Wortlehre der Sondershäuser Mundart* (Beilage zum Programme des Fürstlichen Gymnasiums mit Realschule zu Sondershausen, Ostern 1912). Sondershausen.

Firmenich, Johann Matthias (ed.). 1846. *Germaniens Völkerstimmen, Sammlung der deutschen Mundarten in Dichtungen, Sagen, Mährchen, Volksliedern u.s.w.* Vol. 2. Berlin.

Frank, Julius. 1898. *Die Frankenhäuser Mundart.* Halle. [Universität Leipzig Phil. diss.]

Graebisch, Friedrich. 1907. I. Ich habe gehen müssen und Verwandtes. II. Ich habe ihn singen hören und Verwandtes. *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Mundarten* [2]. 181–185.

Grimm, Jacob. 1837. *Deutsche Grammatik.* Vierter Theil. Göttingen.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. Verb raising as verb projection raising: Some empirical problems. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25. 509–522.

Hanke, Lothar. 1913. *Die Wortstellung im Schlesischen.* Breslau.

Haushalter, B[runo]. 1884. *Die Mundarten des Harzgebietes.* Halle.

Heilmann, Axel. 1999. *Die VP im Schwäbischen.* University of Stuttgart Phil. diss.

Hermann, Eduard. 1957. *Die Coburger Mundart.* Aus dem Nachlass des Verfassers hg. v. Adolf Siegel. Coburg.

Hertel, L[udwig]. 1888. *Die Salzunger Mundart.* Meiningen.

Hodler, Werner. 1969. *Berndeutsche Syntax.* Bern: Francke.

Hoekstra, Eric. 1994. Woordvolgorde en het Infinitivus-pro-Participio Effect in het Zaans. *Taal en Tongval* 46. 132–141.

Höhle, Tilman N. 1997. Vorangestellte Verben und Komplementierer sind eine natürliche Klasse. In Christa Dürscheid, Karl-Heinz Ramers & Monika Schwarz (eds.), *Sprache im Fokus. Festschrift für Heinz Vater zum 65. Geburtstag*, 107–120. Tübingen: Niemeyer. [Chapter 11 in this volume, pp. 417–433].

Koch- und Backrezepte aus der Steinbach-Hallenberger Küche, Hg. v. d. Mundartgruppe im Verein „Heimatliches Brauchtum" Steinbach-Hallenberg. o. O. [2005]. [distributed by Touristinformation Steinbach-Hallenberg].

Kurrelmeyer, William. 1910. Über die Entstehung der Konstruktion „Ich habe sagen hören". *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung* 12. 157–173.

Labouvie, Erich. 1938. *Studien zur Syntax der Mundart von Dillingen an der Saar.* Marburg.

Luthardt, Emil. 1963. *Mundart und Volkstümliches aus Steinach, Thüringerwald und dialektgeographische Untersuchungen im Landkreis Sonneberg, im Amtsgerichtsbezirk Eisfeld, Landkreis Hildburghausen und in Scheibe im Amtsgerichtsbezirk Oberweißbach, Landkreis Rudolstadt.* Universität Hamburg Phil. diss. [masch.]

Marle, J[aap] van. 1994. Oppervlakte-gelijkvormigheid als conditionerende factor bij taalverandering. Iets over de resten van het gerundium in het Middelnederlands en de Nederlandse streektalen. *Taal en Tongval* 46. 14–32.

Maurer, Friedrich. 1926. *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung.* Heidelberg.

Merkes, Peter Wilhelm. 1895. *Der neuhochdeutsche Infinitiv als Teil einer umschriebenen Zeitform. Historisch-grammatische Betrachtungen.* Leipzig. [Universität Göttingen Phil. diss.]

Meurers, Walt Detmar. 2000. *Lexical generalizations in the syntax of German nonfinite constructions.* Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340, Bericht Nr. 145. Universität Stuttgart/Universität Tübingen.

Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex predicates: Verbal complexes, resultative constructions, and particle verbs in German.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Noack, Fritz. 1938. *Die Mundart der Landschaft um Fulda.* Marburg.

Pasch, Ed[uard]. 1878. *Das Altenburger Bauerndeutsch, eine sprachliche Studie.* Altenburg.

Patocka, Franz. 1997. *Satzgliedstellung in den bairischen Dialekten Österreichs.* Frankfurt/Main: Lang.

Philipp, Marthe. 1987. Les verbes modaux en alsacien. In Claude Buridant (ed.), *Romanistique – Germanistique. Une confrontation*, 133–137. Strasbourg: Association des Publications près les Universités de Strasbourg.

Philipp, Marthe & Arlette Bothorel-Witz. 1989. Low Alemannic. In Charles V. J. Russ (ed.), *The dialects of Modern German. A linguistic survey*, 313–336. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Regel, Karl. 1868. *Die Ruhlaer Mundart.* Weimar.

Reichardt, Edinhard. 1914. Die Wasunger Mundart, 2. Teil. *(Schriften des Vereins für Sachsen-Meiningische Geschichte und Landeskunde.* 71. Heft.) Hildburghausen.

Reinhard, Sabine. 2001. *Deverbale Komposita an der Morphologie-Syntax-Semantik-Schnittstelle: ein HPSG-Ansatz.* Universität Tübingen Phil. diss.

Richter, Frank. 2000. *A mathematical formalism for linguistic theories with an application in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar.* Universität Tübingen Phil. diss.

Rosenkranz, Heinz. 1938. *Mundart und Siedlung im Gebiet der obern Saale und des nördlichen Frankenwalds.* Jena.

Rowley, Anthony R. 1989. East Franconian. In Charles V. J. Russ (ed.), *The dialects of Modern German. A linguistic survey*, 394–416. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rudolph, Fritz. 1924/1925. Dialektgeographie des Honsteinischen. *Teuthonista* 1. 193–200, 257–285. [map after p. 320].

Schachtschabel, Otto. 1910. *Die Mundart von Kranichfeld in Thüringen.* Universität Straßburg Phil. diss.

Schleicher, August. 1894. *Volkstümliches aus Sonneberg im Meininger oberlande.* Zweite [unveränderte] Aufl. Sonneberg. 1st edn. 1858.

Schmeller, Joh[ann] Andreas. 1821. *Die Mundarten Bayerns grammatisch dargestellt.* München.

Schmid, Tanja. 2005. *Infinitival syntax. Infinitivus pro participio as a repair strategy.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

"Sellemoa önnern alle Schloos", 2. Heft. "Vun Waschett, Huis u Hoof". Hg. v. d. Mundartgruppe im Verein "Heimatliches Brauchtum" Steinbach-Hallenberg. o. O. o. J.

Seuren, Pieter A.M. & Gerard Kempen (eds.). 2003. *Verb constructions in German and Dutch.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sommer, Anton. 1906. *Bilder und Klänge aus Rudolstadt in Volksmundart.* Gesammt-Ausgabe, 1. Band und 2. Band. 17. Aufl. Rudolstadt.

Spangenberg, Karl. 1989. Thuringian. In Charles V. J. Russ (ed.), *The dialects of Modern German. A linguistic survey*, 265–289. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Spangenberg, Karl. 1993a. *Laut- und Formeninventar thüringischer Dialekte.* Beiband zum Thüringischen Wörterbuch. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Spangenberg, Karl. 1993b. Zur Erforschung der Umgangssprache in Thüringen. In Wolfgang Lösch (ed.), *Beiträge zur Dialektforschung in Thüringen. Heinz Rosenkranz zum 80. Geburtstag*, 17–33. Jena.

Sperschneider, Heinz. 1959. *Studien zur Syntax der Mundarten im östlichen Thüringer Wald.* Marburg.

Spieß, Balthasar. 1873. *Die Fränkisch-Hennebergische Mundart.* Wien.

Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz. [1962ff.] Bern: Francke.

Steube, Anita. 1995. Flexibler Umgang mit funktionalen Kategorien: Unterstützung aus einer Mundartgrammatik. In Gotthard Lerchner, Marianne Schröder & Ulla Fix (eds.), *Chronologische, areale und situative Varietäten des Deutschen in der Sprachhistoriographie. Festschrift für Rudolf Große*, 421–434. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.

Thüringisches Wörterbuch. [1965ff.] Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Trebs, Emil. 1899. *Beiträge zur osterländischen Mundart* (Beilage zum Programm des Gymnasiums zu Fürstenwalde a. Spr. Ostern 1899. Progr.-Nr. 75). Fürstenwalde.

Weber, Edelgard. 1959. *Beiträge zur Dialektgeographie des südlichen Werra-Fuldaraumes* (Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 15). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Wegera, Klaus-Peter. 1977. *Kontrastive Grammatik: Osthessisch-Standardsprache. Eine Untersuchung zu mundartbedingten Sprachschwierigkeiten von Schülern am Beispiel des ‚Fuldaer Landes'.* Marburg.

Weise, Oskar. 1900. *Syntax der Altenburger Mundart.* Leipzig.

Weise, Oskar. 1906. Ich habe gehen müssen und Verwandtes. – Ich habe ihn singen hören und Verwandtes. *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Mundarten* [1]. 193–196–198.

Weldner, Heinrich. 1991. *Die Mundart von Barchfeld an der Werra* (Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik. Beihefte). Stuttgart: Steiner.

Weldner, Heinrich. [1994]. *Onse klai Waelt. Heimat zwischen Rhön und Thüringer Wald.* o.O.

Weldner, Heinrich. 1995. *Von Land und Leuten, Liedern und Lauten.* o.O.

Weldner, Heinrich. 1997. *Eindrücke und Ausdrücke.* o.O.

Weldner, Heinrich. 1999. *Erlebtes, Erlesenes und Erhörtes.* o.O.

Weldner, Heinrich. 2000. *Jakob Ludwig Güths "Bärfelser Ditsch" (rezensiert und kommentiert).* o.O.

Wild, Katharina. 1991. Zur Satzgliedstellung in den „Fuldaer" deutschen Dialekten Südungarns. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 58. 24–43.

Wolf, Norbert Richard. 1998. Zum verbalen „Präfix" *ge-* in Dialekten Unterfrankens. In Werner Bauer & Hermann Scheuringer (eds.), *Beharrsamkeit und Wandel. Festschrift für Herbert Tatzreiter zum 60. Geburtstag*, 337–345. Wien: Praesens Verlag.