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

---

*Editors’ note:* This work was originally published in Brandt, Patrick & Eric Fuß (eds.). 2006. Form, structure, and grammar. A Festschrift presented to Günther Grewendorf on occasion of his 60th birthday (Studia grammatica 63), 55–77. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. The layout and citation style have been adapted to the format chosen for the present volume; in addition, small textual changes have been made by adding the missing Standard German glosses for the examples (20a,b), (37a), and part of the English translation for (30a).
verb. Thus, the participles in (1) have their main accent on the vowel marked in italics, and they never bear the participial ge-:

(1) be-schädigt (‘damaged’), er-litten (‘suffered’), ge-horcht (‘obeyed’), übersetzt (‘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 (‘halved’), gödel-isier (‘treated in Gödel’s manner’)
    b. berliniert (‘talked Berlinian’), miaut (‘mewed’), schmarzien (‘sponged’), stibiat (‘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 ge- (or ja-) is present in cases like (2):

(3) a. sə het åłs kliː us jəbəsəuɑnt (Döring 1912: 36)
    sie hat alles gleich aus posɑuɑnt
    ‘she trumpeted everything at once’
    b. eəf hoda sıç gəbålwiːəd (Sperschneider 1959: 74)
    erst hat.er sich balbiert
    ‘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. 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.

---

1Prefixes thus differ sharply from particles such as aus in (3a). (Cf. Müller (2002) for a study of particles.)
2By 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.
3Except for Yiddish and (major parts of) Low German. Cf. Schmid (2005) for some comparative information.
13 Observing non-finite verbs

(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, 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?
    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 (9c), (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
    '... that Valère saw Marie give them to Jan' (Haegeman 1994: 510)

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:\(^7\)

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) \quad & \text{a. } ij \text{ hāwe musd } \text{giːe hāve } \text{müssen gehen} \\
& \text{Ich habe müssen gehen} \\
& \text{‘I had to go’} \\
& \text{b. } ij \text{ hāwəse kund } \text{saːe hāve.sie könnten sehen} \\
& \text{Ich habe.sie können sehen} \\
& \text{‘I could see them’} \\
& \text{c. } ij \text{ hāmn wuld drafe hāve.ihn wollen treffen} \\
& \text{Ich habe.ihn wollen treffen} \\
& \text{‘I wanted to meet him’} \\
& \text{d. } de \text{ hāsd suld kume hāst sollen kommen} \\
& \text{Du hast sollen kommen} \\
& \text{‘you were supposed to come’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^6\)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.
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e. de håsd darfd  drinke
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  hir:rd  si:je
sie hat.ihn hören singen
‘she heard him sing’
j. mør hunn  halfd  drâ:e
wir haben.ihn helfen tragen
‘we helped him to carry [s.t.]’
k. mør hun[n]  lå:sd  le:e
wir haben.ihn lassen liegen
‘we left him lying’
l. hudørnij  sa:d  lo:fe
habt.ihr.ihn.nicht sehen laufen
‘haven’t you seen him run’
m. hå:dørscche  nj  he:sd  size
habt.ihr.sie nicht heißen sitzen
‘haven’t you told them to sit’

n. se hun  dud  schi:wundscharje
sie haben tun  schieben.und.schergen (stoßen)
‘they helped in every way’
o. se hunn  waisd  danze
sie haben.ihn 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) (geheːsan), 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 lä:sd in (9k); di:d for dud 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 hedsn neç braɔ xd sə gam (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 hâds mʊsd måxə
    er hat.es müssen.ss machen.in
    ‘he had to do it’

---

8No term is established in the literature. Weldner (1991) calls the form “participial infinitive”.
9As a participle, brauch- from (12a) selects the V₃ it selects: a hâd neç sə komŋ gəbraɔ xd (‘he didn’t have to come’).
10The 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.
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c. a håd hen sölđ  gr:  (ib., 85)
er hat hin sollen.ss gehen.IN
‘he was supposed to go there’
d. a hådsç hen lo:sd färə  (ib., 86)
er hat.sich hin lassen.ss fahren.IN
‘he had himself carried there’
e. a hådsç hen lo:sa färə  (ib., 86)

Supines dûrf- (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’), heiβ- (‘order’), hör- (‘hear’), lern- (‘learn’), seh- (‘see’), spür- (‘feel’).

In Ruhla (Regel 1868: 116ff.) there are just simple supines of dûrf- (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, soll, wöll).

Sondershausen has simple and complex supines of the same verbs: dûrf- (dærft), könn- (kunt, kænt), mög-/möcht- (moxt, meçt), muss- (mut, mit), soll- (solt, silt), 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/mɪʃə nu:(s)ʃmɪːʃə rausschmeißen.IN
   wir hätten.ihn müssen.ss/cs/in expel.IN
‘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.IN
‘we had to wait long’

b. mä jång håt e pfærr mö:gt gewær; å:ber mä fra:  (ib., 56)
   mein Sohn hat ein Pfarrer mögen.ss werden.IN, aber meine Frau
   håt’ß nёт wöll hå:  
‘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 huːən doːdrʊː soː seːr mösd lach (Reichardt 1914: 205)
ich habe darüber so sehr müssen ss lachen.ın
‘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 vermer kςɪ: var, hatʃ im hɔft khɛntɔ fʁiːla
‘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- (terftɑ), soll- (søtɑ) and möcht- (mɛçtɑ) are in use.

Returning to the supine mainland, we look into Altenburg.\textsuperscript{12} The dialect has simple supines of, at least, hör- (hier), könn- (kunnt), lass- (lußt), lern- (larnt), mög/-möcht- (mucht), müss- (mußt), soll- (sульт), 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
    sульт hule sollen.ss holen.IN’
    (Daube 1895: 56)
    ‘you are surely not supposed to carry any pancakes on such a truck’

With some verbs – at least müss- (muß), helf- (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
    schlagen.IN
    (Daube 1897: 47)
    ‘so it seemed as though she should have to spend her life as an old spinster’

\textsuperscript{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
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
‘ich will ihn lassen aufmarschieren’
‘I want to deploy him’

The regular infinitive does appear on V₂, though, whenever it selects V₃ to the left, e.g.:

(21) a. wos der nich glei widder ward ausfrasse
was Ihr nicht gleich wieder werdet ausfressen.IN (auslößeln)
kunne
können.IN
‘which you will not be able to compensate for immediately’

b. mer mußte’n gieh loße
man mußte ihn gehen.IN lassen.IN
‘one had to let him go’

b. doß mer hette de Fliegen ibber de Fansterscheim kunnt
däß man hätte die Fliegen über die Fensterscheiben können.ss
loofe hiere
laufen.IN hören.IN
‘that one could have heard the flies run across the windows’

Judging from Daube, Altenburg is thus like Oberschwöditz 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)).

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

(22) *dɪ syːʁ meʃč wiːd duɪc ʊ sɑɡɑ duɪc lɔs ɿəɛf* (W)
   *die saure Milch wird durch ein Säckchen durch lassen.*
   ‘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. *ɪç mɛcɑ ɿ ai dɪʃfd ɡədɑnts* (W)
   *ich möchte auch dürfen.*
   ‘I want to be allowed to dance, too’

b. *ɪç mɛcɑ ned med dəbɛi ɡəsɛi* (W)
   *ich möchte nicht müssen.*
   ‘I don’t want to be forced to be present’

With *möcht-* (mečd), one could expect the infinitives *dɪʃfd* in (23a) and *mis* in (23b); instead, we find the complex supines *dɪʃfd* and *med*. But we also see here a strange prefix *gə* on the infinitives *dɑnts* and *sɛi*. 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 (24a) 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 Hämern near Sonneberg, many more verbs select the gerund: helf- (‘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):

\[(24)\]

\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{miə blaem draːdn} & \text{(Sperschneider 1959: 40)} \\
& \quad \text{wir bleiben stehen.g} \\
& \quad \text{‘we stay standing’} \\
& \quad b. & \text{ʃdarm wen iç ne döid} & \text{(ib., 75)} \\
& \quad \text{sterben.g wenn ich nur täte} \\
& \quad \text{‘if I only would die’}
\end{align*}\]

In (24a), the gerund \(draːdn\) (‘stand’, with suffix \(-n\)) is selected by \(blaem\) (‘stay’); in (24b), the gerund \(fdarm\) (‘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):

\[(25)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{bamme den hirz läufen senn} & \quad \text{(Regel 1868: 102)} \\
\text{wenn.wir den Hirsch laufen.g sehen} & \quad \text{‘when we see the deer run’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{15}\)See *Deutscher Sprachatlas*, map 54 (auszutrinken) for the German situation at large, and *Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz*, vol. III (pp. 1 and 2) for details in Switzerland.
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(26) a. mäi såchen den hirz lauf
    wir sahen den Hirsch laufen.IN
    'we saw the deer run'

b. dæːr häːt d’n düːfel sā: barwes läuf
    der hat den Teufel sehen.IN barfuß laufen.IN
    '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
    bleib stehen.G!
    ‘stand!’

b. blei bəsitzən
    bleib sitzen.G!
    ‘stay sitting!’

c. əs bleit bəschtenna¹⁶
    es bleibt stehen
    ‘it stays standing’

(28) a. iç blai b(ə)sidsn
    ich bleibe sitzen.G
    ‘I remain seated’

b. a is bəliːçŋ gəblim
    er ist liegen.G geblieben.P
    ‘he stayed lying’

c. iç sol b(ə)sidsn blai
    ich soll sitzen bleiben
    ‘I am supposed to remain seated’

(29) … bəʃdagŋ gəblim …
    (... daß ich) stecken.G geblieben.P (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. 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:

(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 khân mıç niç mıî: su sı:rə ob jəstråptsı: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 *(ba)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-* is prefixed, as in *ɛə wil ɛəla ɛəla ɛə kon ned ɡəfəla* (‘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).
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(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 mußmar sough das muß.mar sagen.IN 'one must say so'
    b. mår kåå gösough man kann sagen.IN 'one can say'
    c. ich waarsch soughan ich werde’s sagen.G 'I will say it'

In (32), the gerund (müßan) 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 runtar müßan reiß ich werde’s runter müssen.G reißen.IN 'I probably have to tear it down'
    b. mår warns måch müßan wir werden’s machen.IN müssen.G '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 (gøreiß, gämåch).
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. 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 ārāb dun (Dellit 1913: 168)
    ich werde’s müssen.cs herab tun.G
    ‘I probably have to put it down’

b. mɔ 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

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 gaarbat
    ich habe helfen.IN gearbeitet.P
    ‘I helped working’

(ii) ich wüür half arbatan
    ich würde helfen.IN arbeiten.G
    ‘I would help work’
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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, im-
mediate 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 medi-
ated 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):

\[
\begin{align*}
(36) & \quad a. \quad \text{ich glaube es haben tun zu können} \\
     & \quad \text{‘I believe I was able to do it’} \\
     & \quad b. \quad * \text{ich glaube es zu haben tun können} \\
     & \quad c. \quad \text{ik geloof het te hebben kunnen doen}
\end{align*}
\]

(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 impos-
sible.\(^{21}\) This, as Merkes (1895: 66f.) notes, is all the more remarkable as its coun-
terpart in Dutch (36c) is quite unobjectionable (and the only choice).

It is not known what this sharp difference between Dutch and German is in-
duced 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 phe-
nomenon’ 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 substi-
tution 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.
Tilman N. Höhle

(37)  
a. da braucht mensch 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. baŋ a siç ned fon an bryçd las us tso fny:tsa  
   wenn er sich nicht von ihm braucht lassen.in an zu schnauzen.g  
   ‘if he doesn’t need to be snapped at by him’ (W)
c. hä bruchd sich ned funan böscheid las zu sœ:wə (S)  
   er braucht sich nicht von ihm Bescheid lassen.in zu sagen.g  
   ‘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- (tso fny:tsa), and sag- (zu sœ:wə). 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. er wyəds ned wöld hun  
   er wird’s nicht wollen.cs haben.g  
   ‘he won’t want to have it’
b. er wyəd(s) fund lås maxə  
   er wird’s schon lassen.in machen.g  
   ‘he will have it done’

In (38a), woll- appears as a supine (wöld), 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. er kon σi iu lås gokom  
   er konnte ihn ja lassen.in kommen.in  
   ‘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 blulß emol vun dan loß derstreeche  
   der braucht sich’s bloß mal von dem lassen.st erklären.in  
   ‘he only needs to let him explain it to him’
13 Observing non-finite verbs

b. käsd mə heləf gəʃri:
   kannst mir helfen.IN schreiben.IN
   '[you] can help me to write'

Here, lass- and helf- 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 ərəb gəris
     er wird's nicht können.cs herab reißen.IN
     '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 V₁’s requirement is mediated to V₃ if V₂ 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 at diʁfd gədɑːnts: dürf- (diʁfd) requires an infinitive; the ge-infinitive (gədɑːnts) 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

24This 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 dās net könnt gespräche/gespräch, ban ich’s net seiwer häd
gesie
   wenn ich’s nicht selber hätte
   gesie
gesehen
   ‘I couldn’t say that if I hadn’t seen it myself’

(ii) ich war das fileicht niimāls richdich könnt gespräche/gespräch
    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 bəycsd kend tɔ laːsɔ (W)
daß du das nicht brauchst könnt.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 wæːrens noch villmåː mütt hürrn (Regel 1868: 117)
wir werden’s noch oft müssen.IN hören.g
‘we will have to hear that often’

b. hæː würds net woll hüːr
er wird’s nicht wollen.IN hören.IN
‘he probably doesn’t want to hear it’

(43) süː wæːrns üːr mütt gån̂n or gː
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 Häämmern (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. dɔ kɔsd mɪç əmɔː fɛdɔmɛçɔ (Weldner 1991: 217)
du kannst mich mal vettermicheln.IN
‘leave me alone’

b. mɔ kond sɪç ned lɔs bɔdiːn (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:
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Both möcht- (meçd) and könn- (kend) select a ge-infinitive. In this constellation we expect the ge-infinitive required by the first verb to be displaced to the last verb. Thus, the single verb gəarwəd apparently satisfies the selectional requirements 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’


It seems possible that (47) follows the same pattern:

(47) a. œ wirsd ned we:sd tsəra:gd tsə komə
    er wird nicht wissen.cs zurecht zu kommen.g
    ‘he probably doesn’t know how to get along’

b. si wirsd dos ned bʁyçd tsə dən
    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 requirements. Similarly in (47b): the zu-gerund tsə dən required by brauch- (bʁyçd) 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. də wirfda ned kend na: gəsə (Weldner 1991: 132)
da wirst.du nicht können.cs nein sagen.in
    ‘there you probably cannot say no’

b. də wirfda hə: kend gəkom
    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 hǐx sən or gəsən (W)
     ich möchte sie hören.IN singen.IN
     ‘I want to hear her sing’

   b. də kəsən ən sə: ləyf or gəloeyf (W)
     du kannst ihn sehen.IN laufen.IN
     ‘you can see him run’

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

(50)  a. iç meçd ən gən hǐx bɔsoyənə bɔs (W)
     ich möchte ihn gern hören.IN Posaune blasen.IN
     ‘I want to hear him play the trombone’

   b. mə kəndə dn həns məx in gəbə sə: abwəd (W)
     wir konnten den Hans immer im Garten sehen.IN arbeiten.IN
     ‘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 waːr ən lɔs ɾof or ɾofə (W)
     ich werde ihn lassen.IN rufen.IN/G
     ‘I will have [s.o.] call him’

   b. mə waːn ən ned sə: lɔs fuːd ge: or gen (W)
     wir werden ihn nicht so lassen.IN fort gehen.IN/G
     ‘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. si wiːd ən sə: kom (W)
     sie wird ihn sehen.IN kommen.IN
     ‘she will see him come’

   b. sə wiːd sə hǐx sən (W)
     er wird sie hören.IN singen.IN
     ‘he will hear her sing’

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. *ich tät lieber arbeiten* 
   ‘I would prefer to work’

b. *er täte mich heissen* fort gehen
   ‘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. *ich werde's machen*
   ‘I will do it’

b. *er wird's nicht machen* können
   ‘he is probably not able to do it’

(55) a. *ich werde's runter müssen* reißen
   ‘I probably have to tear it down’

b. *er wird nicht dürfen* lachen
   ‘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):

\[(56)\]
\[
a. \text{bene nach dn lætzte Krieg vertriewe sein wurn}
   \quad \text{welche nach dem letzten Krieg vertrieben.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{p sind worden.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{‘who were expelled after the last war’ (Weldner 1997: 99)}

\[b. \text{o wiʁd gʁɑːŋ gəwɑː:sd sein}
   \quad \text{er wird krank gewesen.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{p sein.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{‘he probably was ill’ (Weldner 1991: 165)}

\[c. \text{eɪ had dɔs fond kond gəmɔxd gəhɔː: / fond}
   \quad \text{ihr hättet das schon können.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{p haben.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{ss gemacht.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{p können haben.}\]
   \hspace{1cm} \text{‘you could have done that already’ (ib., 200)}

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 \(fden\) and \(lem\), but there are also special long forms \(fdenə\) and \(lemə\). 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):

\[(i)\]
\[
dəs æ ned gəarwɔd kend
   \quad \text{daß er nicht arbeiten könnte}
   \hspace{1cm} \text{‘that he couldn’t work’ (Weldner 1991: 158)}
\]

\[(ii)\]
\[
gück emå, bi dær äkel noch gehepf kunn
   \quad \text{guck mal, wie der Ekel noch springen kann}
   \hspace{1cm} \text{‘look how that bloke still can jump’ (Weldner 1999: 57)}
\]
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Weldner 1991: 113). These verbs must follow the gerund they select, as in (57).
(Recall also (25).)

(57) a. iç waʁ setsə blin
    ich werde sitzen.G bleiben.G
    ‘I will remain seated’

   b. iç meçd leinə gəбли:
    ich möchte liegen.G bleiben.IN
    ‘I want to remain lying’

   c. mə hunən amfəx ʃdenə gəлəsə
    wir haben.ihn einfach stehen.G gelassen.P
    ‘we simply left him standing [there]’

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

(58) iç glaɪ dɔs ɚ br: gəwənliç ørem wiʁd ʃden / gəwənliç
    ich glaube, daß er wie gewöhnlich herum wird stehen.G gewöhnlich
    wiʁd ørem ʃden (W)
    wird herum stehen.G
    ‘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 jə li:wə los khʊn gəsai (Luthardt 1963: 370)
    du hättest’s ja lieber lassen.IN können.IN sein.IN
    ‘you should have preferred to abstain from it’

   b. iç həусə ɬos khʊn gəməx (ib., 370)
    ich habe’s.ihn lassen.IN können.IN machen.IN
    ‘I could make him do it’

27With 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 / stihning / sötznig / stecknig / ausnig
    ‘there he stayed lying standing sitting stuck out’

(Sommer 1906: vol. 1: 31, 39, 46, 66, 397)
(60) ich würd. ihn nicht haben.IN lassen.IN können.IN rufen.IN

‘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.
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