Complementation in Cimbrian and in Saurian: Some comparative notes

Ermenegildo Bidese (University of Trento)

1. Complementation in Cimbrian[1]

1.1 Introduction

Both traditional descriptions[2] and more formal works[3] on the grammar of Cimbrian recognize two distinctive word order patterns in the embedded clauses. More precisely, Grewendorf, Poletto (2009) assumed a 'hybrid system of complementation' in Cimbrian, distinguishing between declarative clauses introduced by the conjunction *ke* 'that' and those introduced by *az* 'that', each with its specific word order (see 1.3, below). Moreover, Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli (2012) discovered the same "binary" pattern in the relative clauses (see 1.4, below). Later, further analyses confirmed the same result with regard to adverbial clauses, as well as to indirect interrogatives (Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli 2014). In addition, the question of whether or not Cimbrian would simplify this complex complementation system by discarding one of both patterns and evolving into a unitary system has been raised (see Kolmer 2012; Bidese Tomaselli 2016).
In following sections, I revise the results of previous research and provide a comprehensive picture of the Cimbrian system of complementation. This will serve as the basis for comparing Cimbrian and Saurian (see § 2).

1.2 The Cimbrian main clause

We begin our description of Cimbrian subordinate clauses by presenting the typical word order pattern that characterizes main declarative clauses. Despite different analyses, all researchers agree that the finite verb moves into the left periphery of the Cimbrian main clause[4]. This becomes clear when we consider the positions of the negation adverb *nèt* 'not' (see 1), the clitic pronouns (see 2) and the separable verbal particles (see 3) as diagnostics for the position of the finite verb:

(1) Dar **geat** *nèt* ka Tria haüt
he goes not to Trento today
'He will not go to Trento today'

(2) Haüt **geat**=*ar* *nèt* ka Tria
today goes=he.CL not to Trento
'Today, he will not go to Trento'

(3) Dar **geat** ***vort*** haüt
he goes PRT today

---

[1] This work is an extension of joint research on Cimbrian syntax with Andrea Padovan and Alessandra Tomaselli (see Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli 2012, 2013, 2014; Bidese, Tomaselli 2016, 2018). It has been funded by the European 7th Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration, Grant Agreement no. 613465. The data collection for Saurian was made possible via a project funded by the Autonomous Region Trentino-South Tyrol (decision No. 177, 24th June 2017). Members of the research project are Alessandra Tomaselli (University of Verona), Helmut Weiß, and Thomas Strobel (University of Frankfurt am Main), and myself. We are deeply grateful to Lucia Protto, who assisted us to contact the informants and to collect the data, and to our excellent Saurian speakers for their competence and patience: LAR (35 years old), ERM (51 years old), FER (53 years old), ARM (70 years old), AUG (71 years old), GRA (76 years old), and ART (76 years old).
[2] See Schweizer ([1954] 2008), Tyroller (2003); Panieri *et al.* (2006).
[3] See Bidese (2008); Grewendorf, Poletto (2009, 2011, 2015); Padovan (2011); Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli (2012, 2013, 2014); Kolmer (2012); Grewendorf (2013); Bidese, Tomaselli (2016); Padovan, Casalicchio (2018).
[4] See, in particular, Grewendorf, Poletto (2011); Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli (2012 and 2014); Grewendorf (2013).

'He will leave today'

The same can be assumed for full NPs (see 4):

(4) [Haüt] [dar nono] **khint** nèt atz Lusérn
today the grandpa comes not to Luserna
'Today, the grandpa will not come to Luserna'

With regard to (4) it should be noted that Cimbrian – unlike German and the other Germanic languages and similarly to other Germanic minority languages spoken in Italy – allows more than one phrasal constituent before the finite verb (see Bidese, Cognola, Padovan 2012). When the subject-NP is realized in a low position, the expletive element *-da* must appear mandatorily to the right of the finite verb (see 5) (see Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli 2012):

(5) Haüt **khint**=*(t)a* dar nono atz Lusérn
today comes=EXPL.CL the grandpa to Luserna
'Today, the grandpa will come to Luserna'

The syntax of the main clauses can be summarized as follows: The fact that the finite verb precedes both the negation and the verbal particle is indicative that it moves out of the vP. Furthermore, the clitization of both the pronominal clitics and the expletive element *-da* to the right of the verb demonstrates that the finite verb occupies a position above the TP. That means that, very similarly to the other Germanic languages (with the well-known exception of English), the finite verb in Cimbrian enters the CP and targets the head of a projection at the left periphery of the sentence (see Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli 2012). Unlike other Germanic languages, but in line with the syntax of many German-based minority varieties spoken in Italy, Cimbrian shows a Split-CP (see Rizzi 1997); among the CP-projections in the left periphery, a projection (that is [Spec, CP]) is revealed to be the dedicated position for the subject-NP (see Bidese, Tomaselli 2018). The topography of the Cimbrian main clause can be represented as follows:

	[TopP	[FocP	... [FinP	[Fin^0	[WP^5	[TP	[NegP	[vP	[Aux	[VP	[DP/PP	[DP
a	Gestarn		*dar pua*	**hatt**					~~**hatt**~~	gesek	in has	~~*dar pua*~~
b	*Gestarn			**hatt**		*dar pua*			~~**hatt**~~	gesek	in has	~~*dar pua*~~
c	Gestarn			**hatt**=*(t)a*					~~**hatt**~~	gesek	in has	*dar pua*
d	Gestarn			**hatt**=*ar*					~~**hatt**~~	gesek	in has	
e	Haüt			**geast**=*(t)o*			nèt			~~**geast**~~	ka Tria	

1.3 The subordinate declarative clauses: az versus ke

As noted in the introduction, subordinate declarative clauses display a binary pattern:

(i) Strong assertive (see 6), assertive (see 7), and weak assertive (see 8) verbs usually introduce objective clauses by means of the conjunction *ke*, borrowed from Romance languages:

[5] WP = Wackernagelposition.

(6) a Si khütt **ke** [dar **geat** *nèt* ka Tria haüt]
she says that he goes not to Trento today
'She says that he will not go to Trento today'

b Si khütt **ke** [haüt **geat**=*ar* *nèt* ka Tria]
she says that today goes=he.CL not to Trento

(7) a Si boazt **ke** [dar **geat** ***vort*** haüt]
she knows that he goes PRT today
'She knows that he will leave today'

b Si boazt **ke** [haüt **geat**=*ar* ***vort***]
she knows that today goes=he.CL PRT

(8) I gloabe **ke** [haüt **khint**=*(t)a* dar nono atz Lusérn]
I believe that today comes=EXPL.CL the grandpa to Luserna
'I believe that today the grandpa will come to Luserna'

As a robust body of research has established, the word order pattern of these kinds of subordinate sentences is perfectly symmetrical to that of the main declarative clause. Specifically, both the negation adverb and the separable verbal particle follow the finite verb (see 6 and 7). There is no cliticization to the subordinating conjunction *ke* 'that'. Both the subject clitics (see 6b and 7b) and the expletive element *-da* (see 8) encliticize to the right of the final verb, precisely as they do in the main clauses. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that, in these sentences, Cimbrian displays a kind of embedded V2 that clearly differs from what is known from other embedded V2-languages such as Islandic and Yiddish[6]. Moreover, in all the sentences above (see 6-8), the verb in the finite sentence is in the indicative mood, even with a weak assertive main predicate (see 8).
In summary, we can conclude that the finite verb in the main clauses and the subordinating conjunction *ke* 'that' in the embedded clauses do not occupy the same structural position. In this regard, Cimbrian behaves very differently from most Germanic languages and from German dialects. This can be explained by assuming that this variety developed a fully-fledged Rizzi-CP with the conjunction *ke* being basis-generated in a very high projection, most likely [SubordP] (see Bhatt, Yoon 1991), and the finite verb moving to [Fin^0], as illustrated in the schema below (see 9):

(9) $[_{SubordP}$ ***ke*** $[_{ForceP}$ $[\ldots$ $[_{FinP}$ **Vfin**–*cl* $[_{TP}$ $[_{NegP}$ NEG $[_{vP}$ PRT-~~**Vfin**~~]]]]]]]

(ii) The second pattern is represented by declarative subordinate clauses introduced by the autochthonous (modal) conjunction *az* 'that'. This is usually the case with main verbs that have factive (= non-assertive) (see 10), volitional (see 11), or weak assertive (= affectional) semantics (see 12):

(10) 'Z tuat=mar ånt **azz**=*ar* *nèt* **gea** ka Tria haüt
EXPL does=(to)me.CL PRT that=he.CL not goes.SUBJ to Trento today
'I regret that he will not go to Trento today'

(11) Si bill **azz**=*ar* ***vort*****gea** haüt

[6] See Franco (2010) for Islandic and Holmberg (2015) for Yiddish, and the bibliographies cited therein. For an approach that correlates the semantic category of the finite verb and the word order pattern in the embedded sentences in the Scandinavian languages, see Bentzen (2014).

she want that=he.CL PRT-goes.SUBJ oggi
'She wants that he leaves today'

(12) I speràr **az**=*ta* **khemm** dar nono atz Lusérn haüt
I hope that=EXPL.CL comes.SUBJ the grandpa to Luserna today
'I hope that grandpa comes to Luserna today'

In (10-12), the word order pattern is clearly different from that in (i); hence, it also differs from that of the main clauses. In fact, both the negation (see 10) and the separable verbal particle (see 11) mandatorily precede the finite verb. Further phenomena characterizing this word pattern are the clitization of both the subject clitics (see 10 and 11) and the expletive *–da* (see 12) to the right of the complementizer *az* and not to the right of the finite verb on one hand, and the subjunctive mood in all the sentences on the other. Unlike (i), the word order pattern in (ii) displays a highly distinctive trait that has been assumed for many Germanic languages: The subordinating conjunction *az* occupies the same structural position that hosts the final verb in the main clauses, [Fin^0], which prevents it from moving out of its basic position in the vP. The following schema reproduces this second word order pattern (see 13):

(13) $[_{SubordP}$ $[_{ForceP}$ $[\dots$ $[_{FinP}$ **az**–*CL*/–*EXPL* $[_{TP}$ $[_{NegP}$ NEG $[_{vP}$ PRT-**Vfin**]]]]]]]

The comparison between (i) and (ii) in (14a) versus (14b) summarizes the binary pattern of declarative embedded clauses in Cimbrian once again.

(14) a $[_{SubordP}$ ***ke*** $[_{ForceP}$ $[\dots$ $[_{FinP}$ **Vfin**–*CL*/–*EXPL* $[_{TP}$ $[_{NegP}$ NEG $[_{vP}$ PRT-~~**Vfin**~~]]]]]]]

b $[_{SubordP}$ $[_{ForceP}$ $[\dots$ $[_{FinP}$ **az**–*CL*/–*EXPL* $[_{TP}$ $[_{NegP}$ NEG $[_{vP}$ PRT-**Vfin**]]]]]]]

To conclude, it is important to remark that the two patterns are by no means interchangeable. In fact, they are functionally specialized, as (14a) prototypically encodes an epistemic or assertive predication that presupposes the positive truth validity of the embedded sentence (+VERIDICAL). Syntactically, the embedded declarative sentence behaves like a main one and is much more independent. By contrast, (14b) expresses a non-assertive or volitional predication, which results in an embedded sentence that does not allow such a positive inference (-VERIDICAL)[7].

1.4 The relative clauses: ke versus bo

Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli (2012) provided a robust body of evidence showing that the binary pattern discovered in the embedded declarative sentences also occurred in relative clauses. Unlike the pattern in (1.3), traditional grammars do not recognize two different patterns in relative clauses. They have mentioned only *bo-(da)* as an indeclinable introducing element for all types of relative clauses (see Bacher 1905, 191; Tyroller 2003, 235; Panieri *et al.* 2006, 342)[8]; nevertheless, fieldwork data brought another possibility to light: Once again, the element *ke* is borrowed from the Romance languages, as a relative particle. Even in this case, there is clear evidence that the distribution of the two patterns (*ke* versus *bo-*) is governed by different functional and structural rules, and not simply the general replacement of the original *bo-* by the new *ke* as a result of language contact:

[7] For the correlation between declarative and volitional contexts and complementizer selection in other languages, see Giannakidou (2009 and 2013) and Damonte (2010). For a more theoretical explanation of the situation in Cimbrian, see Bidese (2017b).

[8] They do not usually distinguish different types of relative clause. Tyroller (2003, 235) made a semantic distinction between "descriptive" (*beschreibende*) and "distinctive" (*unterscheidende*) relative clauses without any hint to diverging word order patterns or to different relative particles. This is not really useful for our purposes.

(i) Although *bo-* remains possible, non-restrictive (= appositive) relative clauses are frequently introduced by *ke*. This pattern is widespread among young speakers but, in some cases, such as when the head of the relative clause is a proper name, it is the favorite choice in the group of the older speakers as well. Example (15) is an utterance of a non-restrictive relative subject clause, whereas (16) and (17) represent some object ones:

(15) Dar Mario, **ke** 'z **iz** *nèt* a dèstarz mentsch, khint pitt üs
the Mario, REL EXPL is not an easy person, comes with us
'Mario, who is not an easy person, will come with us'

(16) Di Maria, **ke** i **khenn**=*se* vo djüngom, grüazt=me nemear
the Maria REL I know=her.CL since young greets=me.CL no more
'Maria, who I know since I was young, isn't talking to me any more'

(17) Dar Mario, **ke** dar vorsitzar **khennt**=*en* vo djüngom, grüazt=en nemear
the Mario REL the president knows=him.CL since young greets=him.CL no more
'Mario, whom the president knows since he was young, isn't talking to him any more'

(ii) Restrictive relative clauses allow only *bo-* as introducing element, whereas *ke* is totally excluded. The relative particle *bo-* is invariant for both case, nominative and accusative (see 18 versus 19), as well as for number numerus (see 20 versus 21):

(18) 'Z proat^{i}, **bo**=*da* iz attn tisch izz=e=z^{i} gearn
the bread REL=EXPL is on-the table eat=I.CL=it.CL gladly
'I like to eat the bread which is on the table'

(19) 'Z proat^{i}, **bo**=*da* khoaft dar nono izz=e=z^{i} gearn
the bread REL=EXPL buys the grandpa eat=I.CL.it.CL gladly
'I like to eat the bread my grandpa buys'

(20) Dar öpfl, **bo**=*do* *nèt* **isst**, darvault
the apple REL=we.CL not eat rots
'The apple we don't eat will rot'

(21) Di öpfln, **bo**=*bar* *nèt* **èzzan**, darvauln
the apple REL=we.CL not eat, rot
'The apples we don't eat will rot'

Comparing (i) and (ii), it is easy to note that the identical characteristics we observed above (see 1.3), for the declarative clause introduced by *ke* on one hand, and for those introduced by *az* on the other, appear here in non-restrictive relative clauses and in restrictive relative clauses, respectively. In fact, relative clauses introduced by *ke*

(i) realize the negation after the finite verb (see 15),
(ii) show no expletive particle *-da* for the NP-subject (see 17), and
(iii) encliticize clitic elements on the right of the finite verb and not on the right of the relative element (see 16 and 17).

In addition, *ke* does not encode any phrasal arguments, since a resumptive subject pronoun must take on the syntactic role in all sentences (the expletive pronoun *'ꝛ* for the subject in 15, *-se* and *-en* for the object in 16 and 17). By contrast, in restrictive relative clauses,

(i) the negation is realized preverbally (see 20 and 21),
(ii) the expletive subject *–da* must be in place both with subject relatives (see 18) and with object relatives in which the subject is an NP (see 19)[9], and, eventually,
(iii) clitics appear encliticized onto the relative element *bo-* and not onto the finite verb (see 20 and 21).

Furthermore, *bo-* encodes syntactic roles, namely the subject in (18) and the object in (19-21).

In summary, the syntax of relative clauses in Cimbrian (see 22a-b) displays the same double distribution observed previously for the embedded declarative clauses (see 14 a-b):

(22) a [$_{SubordP}$ ***ke*** [$_{ForceP}$ [… [$_{FinP}$ **Vfin**–*CL* [$_{TP}$ [$_{NegP}$ NEG [$_{vP}$ ~~**Vfin**~~]]]]]]]

b [$_{SubordP}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [… [$_{FinP}$ ***bo***–*CL*/–*EXPL* [$_{TP}$ [$_{NegP}$ NEG [$_{vP}$ **Vfin**]]]]]]]

As noted by Bidese (2017a and 2017b), such a distribution does not occur by chance. Embedded clauses introduced by *ke* are less integrated than those introduced by *aꝛ* or *bo-*.

1.5 Adverbial clauses

Looking at the subordination cases that were presented in (1.3) and (1.4), one could imagine that the symmetrical word order is related to the import of the subordinating element *ke* into the complementation system of Cimbrian. This is not the case at all; in fact, the converse is true. The double system of complementation (symmetrical versus asymmetrical) seems to have coexisted before *ke* was taken from Italian and represents a premise for why the subordinating conjunction *ke* was borrowed and inserted into the Cimbrian syntax as an element that only allows a symmetrical word order pattern. Evidence for this assumption is provided by the adverbial clauses.
In fact, the binary system of word order pattern observed above can also be found in this typology of embedded clauses and, crucially, only with autochthonous subordinating elements. Let us begin, unlike in (1.3) and (1.4), by considering the asymmetrical word order:

Adverbial clauses introduced by the temporal complementizers *vor* 'before' and *bal* 'when' only allow for the typical characteristics of the asymmetrical word order, namely

(i) preverbal negation (see 22) and separable verbal particles (see 23),
(ii) clitization to the right of the complementizer (see 24), and
(iii) the expletive particle *da-*, when the subject is a full NP (see 25).

(22) **Bal**=*ꝛ* *nèt* **renk** vil, mak=ma gian na sbemm
when=EXPL not rains a-lot can=IMP go to mushroom
'When it does not rain too much, one can go mushrooming'

(23) **Bal**=*do* ***å*khist**, rüaf=me å!
when=you.CL PRT=come.IIPS call=me.CL PRT

[9] For details, see Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli (2012).

'When you arrive, give me a call!'

(24) **Vor**=*do*=*mar*=*z* khoavst, mach=mar=z bizzan!
before=you.CL=(to)me.CL=it.CL buy.IIPS, let=(to)me.CL=it.CL know
'Let me know, before you buy it for me!'

(25) **Vor**=*da* 'z khint izzt, bèscht=z=en di hent
before =EXP the child eats, washes=it.CL=REFL.CL the hands
'Before eating, the child washes his hands'

The same pattern can be recognized for *mixed complementizer compounds*, which are subordinating elements that consist of two elements; in most cases, the determinans is an adverb borrowed from the Romance languages, whereas the primary word is the Cimbrian complementizer *az*. Consider the following examples and sentence (26), which exemplifies the word order pattern of all these compounds:

- with temporal meaning: ***intånto az*** 'while', ***fin/sin az*** 'until', ***fin/sin bal*** 'as long as', ***dopo az*** 'after';
- with concessive meaning: ***ånka az*** 'although' or ***seånka az*** 'despite the fact that';
- with final meaning: ***zoa az*** 'in order that'
- with modal (exclusive) meaning: ***åna az*** 'without'

(26) Da soin vortgånt, **åna** **az**=*ta*=*se* **sige** dar maistro
they are PRT=gone without that=EXPL=them.CL see.SUBJ the teacher
'They left without the teacher noted'

By contrast, the symmetrical pattern can be found in adverbials that encode a comparative meaning, for example ***asó […] ke*** 'so that', and with the causal complementizer ***umbrómm*** 'because':

(27) Dar iz geståant dahuam **umbromm** dar **iz** *nèt* geståant gerècht
he has remained at-home because he is not stayed well
'He remained at home, as he didn't feel well'

(28) I pin zorne **umbrómm** dar **rüaft**=*me* *nèt* *å*
I am angry because he calls=me.CL not PRT
'I'm angry, because he doesn't call me'

According to Gamillscheg (1912), *umbrómm* results from the complex form 'um + bromm', and represents a kind of complex complementizer that developed originally in order to differentiate between the causal complementizer *brómm* 'because' and the interrogative adverb *umbrómm* 'why'. In a second stage, the same form *umbrómm* encoded both functions, 'because' and 'why'. The first phase, in which *umbrómm* only means the interrogative adverb, was also attested by Zingerle (1869). This means that the second phase represents a very recent conflation of two parts (*um* + *bromm*) of a complex complementizer. For this reason, it is also justified to assume that *umbrómm* occupies a non-integrated (= non-parenthetical) position in the sentence, in exactly the same way as *ke* (see Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli 2014).

There is a body of evidence showing that V2-*weil*-sentences, which are clearly non-integrated, cannot be topicalized in German[10]. This is precisely the case for sentences that are introduced by *umbrómm* in

[10] See, among others, Antomo, Steinbach (2010), Antomo (2012) and Reis (2013).

Cimbrian (see 29). This also demonstrates that the subordinating element is located very high on the left periphery of the sentence, which is very similar to *ke*:

(29) *__Umbrómm__ i pin khrånk, gea-d=e nèt atti arbat haüt
because I am sick go-d=I.CL not to work today

Finally, it is interesting to observe that there is a class of adverbials that allows for the asymmetrical and for the symmetrical word orders (see 30a and 31a versus 30b and 31b), without any semantic specification:

(30) a **Bi**=*da*=*mar* **khütt** hèrta dar Gianni, atz Lusérn lebet=ma gerecht
as=EXPL=(to)me.CL says always the Gianni at Luserna lives=IMP well
'As Gianni is always saying, it is fine to live at Luserna'

b **Bi** 'z **khütt**=*(t)a*=*mar* hèrta dar Gianni, atz Lusern lebet=ma gerecht
as EXPL says=EXPL=(to)me.CL always the Gianni at Luserna lives=IMP well

(31) a Dar balt heft å **bo**=*da* ***au*höart** dar bege
the wood start PRT where=EXPL PRT-ends the path
'The wood starts where the path ends'

b Dar balt heft å **bo** 'z **höart**=*(t)a* ***au*** dar bege
the wood starts PRT where EXPL ends=EXPL PRT the path

1.6 Toward the discarding of the asymmetrical word order?

Some evidence seems to indicate that the Cimbrian system of complementation might extend the symmetrical word order and discard the asymmetrical one. First, the use of *ke* seems to be extending, at least for some speakers (see Kolmer 2012; Bidese, Padovan, Tomaselli 2013; Bidese 2017b); in fact, Padovan (2011) pointed out that the present-day use of *ke* differs from that in the Cimbrian texts of Bacher (1905), showing a clear increase of contexts in which *ke* is used. Second, as seen previously, *ke* as an element in non-restrictive relative clauses is not accepted by all speakers, and seems to be a new development; thirdly, the temporal subordinating conjunction *benn* 'when', which introduces the symmetrical word order (see Panieri *et al.* 2006, 258), tends to substitute *bal* 'when' (see 32-34) which, by contrast, only allows for the asymmetrical pattern:

(32) Bar hån gevairt, **benn** 'z **iz**=*ta* gerift dar Mario
we have celebrated as EXPL is=EXPL arrived the Mario
'When Mario arrived, we were happy'

(33) Di khindar spiln auzant, **benn** 'z renk *nèt*
the children play outside when it rains not
'When it does not rain, the children are used to play outside'

(34) **Benn** 'z **iz** khalt, snaibet=z
when it is cold snows=it
'When it is cold, it is going to snow'

It seems likely that *benn* originally only had the function of an interrogative adverb (see 35), or of a temporal adverb (see 36). It now seems to be extending to adverbial clauses, gradually replacing *bal*; hence, it is following the same developmental path as that of *umbrómm* (see Bidese, Tomaselli 2016):

(35) **Benn** pist=(t)o gånt nå sbemm da lest botta?
when are=you.CL gone to mushroom the last time
`When did you go mushrooming the last time?'

(36) **Benn** gea=bar nå sbemm, **benn** stea=bar in di bar
sometimes go=we.CL to mushroom, sometimes remain=we.CL in the bar
'We are used sometimes to go mushrooming, sometimes to remain in the bar'

In summary, the Cimbrian system of complementation displays a binary differentiation with regard to both the degree of sentence integration and the word order in the subordinate clause. The position of the negation and the separable verbal particles, the presence (or the absence) of the expletive *–da* and the element hosting clitics (complementizer versus finite verb) can be used as indicators in order to classify the types of subordinate clauses and their word order, and to predict how this system of complementation will evolve.

2. Complementation in Saurian: First hints for a comparison with Cimbrian

Saurian is the name of the German-based minority variety spoken in three small enclaves, namely Sauris di Sotto (*Dörf*), Sauris di Sopra (*Plozn*), and Lateis (*Latais*). They are located in the western part of the Carnic Alps; more precisely, in the upper Lumiei Valley in the province of Udine. About 50 years ago and in the decades that followed, Norman Denison from the University of Graz conducted intensive investigations of the Saurian community and its language, mainly from a sociolinguistic perspective (see, among others, Denison 1968, 1988, 1994 and 1997). In November 2017, together with my colleagues Alessandra Tomaselli (University of Verona), Helmut Weiß, and Thomas Strobel (University of Frankfurt/Main), I had the opportunity to conduct linguistic research in Sauris focusing on some syntactic phenomena, including the typology of the embedded clauses and their complementizers. We interviewed seven speakers of different ages using a standardized questionnaire for syntactic investigation that we administered in Italian. We not only asked the speakers to provide the translation, but also discussed possible variant sentences and forms with them. I will now present the first results with regard to a few types of embedded clauses. In future research, the aim will be to classify all types of subordinate clauses with their introducing elements, comparing the Cimbrian and the Saurian systems, for a better understanding of the Saurian model.
Before we examine the sentences, we should be aware of a fact that concerns the typology VO/OV. While there is no doubt that Cimbrian is a VO language with the residual use of OV, in particular for the position of the indefinite pronouns (see Grewendorf, Poletto 2005) and the syntax of the verbal particles (see Bidese, Schallert 2018), the basic typology of Saurian is far from being understood at this point in the research. It is clearly different from the OV-typology of Plodarisch (see Grewendorf, Poletto 2005), and resembles the VO/OV alternation of Mòcheno more closely, in which the two possibilities are linked structurally to the information structure of the sentence (see Cognola 2013; Cognola, Bidese 2013). This means that, syntactically, both word orders are possible (see 37a-c), and that only the pragmatic context and the information structure can clarify which of the two is correct:

(37) a Bein ot=ar^{i} **gesehn** *in vuks* der khjokhmon^{i}? (ARM)
when has=he.CL seen the.ACC fox the.NOM hunter
'When did the hunter see the fox?'

b Bein ot der khjokhmon *in vuks* **gesehn**? (ARM)
when has the.NOM hunter the.ACC fox seen

c Bein ot der khjokhmon **gesehn** *in vuks*? (ARM)
when has the.NOM hunter seen the.ACC fox

The OV word order is possible even in an infinitive clause, which is assumed to be the first context that shows a stable VO order (see 38a-b and 39):

(38) a I on=en geheart **vleitn** *'s gaigele* (AUG)
I have=him.CL heard play the fiddle
'I heard him playing the violin'

b I on=en geheart *'s gaigele* **vleitn** (AUG)
I have=him.CL heard the fiddle play

(39) De maurars seint derhinter *ana maure* **auf za zienan** (AUG)
the bricklayers are behind a wall PRT to build
'The bricklayers are building a wall'

Future research will show whether this first intuition can be confirmed or not. For the purposes of this article, we will compare the well-established generalization proposed for Cimbrian with the data collected for Saurian.

First, Saurian seems to realize the asymmetrical word order in a much more restricted form than is possible in the Cimbrian asymmetrical word order pattern. In fact, only some indicators of this pattern can also be found in Saurian, particularly the preverbal realization of the negative adverb (see 40-43):

(40) Houfe=ber as ar *net* **geat** in bolt (ART)
Hope=we.CL that he not goes in-the wood
'Hopefully, he won't go into the wood'

(41) I houfe as 's *neit*[11] **schnaibet** haite (LAR)
I hope that it not snows today
'I hope it won't snow today'

(42) I houfe as ar *neit* **khent** (LAR)
I hope that he not comes
'I hope he won't come'

(43) Soge=ber barum as de *net* **geast** mörgn (GRA)
tell=(to)me.CL why that you not go.IIPS tomorrow
'Tell me why you won't leave tomorrow'

The same seems possible for the separable verbal particles. In fact, they usually appear in the preverbal position, as in the following sentence (see 44, see also 39 above):

(44) Soge=ber barum as ar *hin***geat** mörgn (AUG)
tell=(to)me.CL why that he PRT-goes tomorrow
'Tell me why he will leave tomorrow'

However, whether the subject pronouns in (40-44) should be considered as clitic forms is not clear. Instead of being syntactic clitics, they seem to be homophonous non-accented preverbal forms, as they can appear in main clauses in a preverbal position showing exactly the same form (see 45-47):

[11] *Neit* is the alternative form of *net* and is mainly used in Sauris di Sopra (see Denison, Grassegger s.d., 201).

(45) **Ar** ot=mi gevörschet bein 's de daina mueter ot nou de hueste (AUG)
he has=me.CL asked whether as the your mother has still the cough
'He asked me if your mother still has a cough'

(46) **Ar** ist voischar as zbie bas ar mochet sehn (GRA)
he is more-clever as how what he would look
'He is more clever than he would look like'

(47) **Ar** singet in gonze tokh (LAR)
he sings the all day
'He sings all day long'

In addition, the same speaker that produced (41) confirmed that the postverbal position of the negation is also possible (see 48):

(48) I houfe as 's **schnaibet** *neit* haite (LAR)
I hope that it snows not today
'I hope it won't snow today'

If the finite verb is an auxiliary or a modal verb, the negation can also appear preverbal (see 49), but more typically after the finite verb (see 50-53):

(49) Soge=ber barum as de *net* **pist** gean geister (GRA)
tell=(to)me why that you not are gone yesterday
'Tell me why you didn't leave yesterday'

(50) Der Gianni ist khemen spote vaspegn ar **ot** *net* pakhemen de koriera zan der zait (ART)
The Gianni is arrived late because he has not gotten the bus in time
'Gianni arrived late because he missed the bus'

(51) I on net varstean barum as d'**ost** *net* gegriesset (ART)
I have not understand why that you have not greeted
'I didn't understand why you didn't say hello'

(52) I houfe as 's **tuet** *neit* schnaibn haite (LAR)
I hope that it does not snow today
'I hope it will do not snow today'

(53) Soge=ber bas as de[i] **bilt** *neit* essn de Maria[i] (LAR)
tell=(to)me what that she want not eat the Maria
'Tell me what Mary does not like to eat'

Other phenomena that support the conclusion that Saurian complementation is much more likely to be symmetrical than asymmetrical are (i) the embedded V2 (see 54 and 55) and (ii) the enclitization of object clitics on the finite verb (see 56-59):

(54) Böln houfn as mime do schnea **geat**=*ar* neit in bolt (GRA)
want hope that with this snow hoes=he.CL not in-the wood
'Hopefully, he won't go into the wood with such a snow'

(55) Haite plaib=i dehame **vaspegn** geister **on**=*i* kholt pakhemen (FER)
today remain=I.CL at-home because yesterday have=I could gotten
'I stay at home today, as yesterday I've gotten a cold'

(56) I deinkhe as ar **mussat**=*s* nou khouchn (FER)
I think that he must=it.CL still cook
'I think he still has to cook it'

(57) Ar ist oise simpatik as de **tuent**=*n* ola lodn (AUG)
he is so likable that they do=him.CL all invite
'He is such a likable person that everyone invites him'

(58) Ar ot=ber gevörschet ben der **meiget**=*me* helfn de maschine ze richtan (LAR)
he has=(to)me.cl asked whether you could=(to)me.CL help the car to fix
'He asked me if you could help me to fix the car'

(59) Ben d' **ot**=*mi* gesehn, ot=se=mi gegriesset gearn (ART)
when she has=me.CL seen, has=she.CL.me.CL greeted gladly
'When she saw me she greeted me gladly'

Example (59) is particularly significant, as it shows that there is no clitic clustering in the embedded context to the right of the complementizer, as it clearly appears in main context.

A second aspect in the syntax of complementation that I want to stress is that there are no differences between different types of embedded clauses, as we noted for Cimbrian. For example, comparing the two temporal complementizers *ben* 'when' and *zearnt as* 'once, as soon as', we note that there are no structural differences (see 60a and 60b):

(60) a **Ben** der khjokhmon **ot**=*si* geriert, der vuks ist intrunen (ARM)
when the hunter has=REFL moved, the fox is escaped
'Once the hunter moved, the fox escaped'

b **Zearnt as** der gjokhmon **ot**=*si* geriert, der vuks ist intrunen (ART)
as soon as the hunter has=REFL moved, the fox is escaped

There is no typological difference between the restrictive relatives and the non-restrictive one, not even in the relative clauses (see 61a and 61b):

(61) a Der mon as d'ost geister geriefet ist der orz (ART)
the man that you have yesterday called is the physician
'The man you yesterday called is the physician'

b De Maria, as du schoane kheinest, ot gehairatet main kusin (AUG)
the Maria that you already know has married my cousin
'Maria, whom you already know, married my cousin'

Finally, *as* 'that' is the only possible complementizer for the declarative clauses, for both those introduced by strong assertive matrix verbs and those introduced by weak assertive ones (see 62a and 62b):

(62) a I on=der gesot **as** d'r on net pageignt ihn, ma sai (ART)

I have=(to)you.CL told that we have not met him, but her
'I told you that we do not meet him but her'

b Der Gianni houfet **as** i muss=der neit riefn (LAR)
the Gianni hopes that I must=you.CL not call
'John hopes that I don't have to call you'

A last phenomenon concerns the evolution of the complementizer system. It is interesting to note that the youngest speakers (LAR) among our informants used the interrogative adverb *barum (as)* 'because' as a causal subordinating conjunction, whereas all the other speakers used *vaspegn* as the usual conjunction (see 63 and 64). This seems to suggest that a similar development toward a sole only clausal complementizer might be predicted, as noted previously for Cimbrian (see the above).

(63) a I pin zavridn **barum** mörgn maina touchter tuet=si mehln (LAR)
I am happy because tomorrow my daughter do=REFL marry
'I'm happy because tomorrow my daughter is going to get married'

b I pin schie zavridn **vaspegn** mörgn de maina touchter tuet=si hairatn (AUG)
I am very happy because tomorrow my daughter do=REFL marry

c I pin zavridn **vaspegn** mörgn maina touchter tuet mehln (GRA)
I am happy because tomorrow my daughter do marry

(64) a D'Anna ist zournich **barum as** der **tuet**=*se* nie lodn (LAR)
the Anna is angry because that you do=her.CL never invite
'Anna is angry because you never invite her'

b D'Anna ist zournich **vaspegn as** der **tuet**=*se* nie lodn (AUG)

c D'Anna ist zournich **vaspegn** der **tuet**=*se* nie lodn (ART)

d De Anna ist zournich **vaspegn** der tuet=se nie lodn (GRA)

3. Conclusion

The aim of this article was to compare the complementation systems of two German-based minority languages spoken in Italy, namely Cimbrian and Saurian. While the former has been investigated in depth in the last decade, the latter is scarcely known. The data show that the two systems are only comparable to a limited extent. In fact, Cimbrian displays a binary typology that cannot be recognized in Saurian, where both the syntax of clitics and the position of the finite verb in embedded clauses seem to be much more similar to that of the main clauses. I intend this conclusion as a first and preliminary result; only future investigations of these and other phenomena in Saurian syntax will show whether it can be confirmed. In the interests of comparison, it will be useful take a third minority variety in Italy into account. According to Cognola (2013, 194ff.), Mòcheno – particularly the varieties of Roveda and Fierozzo – could be interesting candidates.

References

Antomo M. (2012), I*nterpreting embedded verb-second. Causal modifiers in German*, in Constantinescu C., Le Bruyn B., Linke K., *Proceedings of ConSOLE XVII*, Leiden, SOLE Leiden University, 27-51.

Antomo M., Steinbach M. (2010), *Desintegration und Interpretation. Weil-V2-Sätze an der Schnittstelle zwischen Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik*, «Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft», 29(1), 1-38.
Bacher J. (1905), *Die deutsche Sprachinsel Lusern. Geschichte, Lebensverhältnisse, Sitten, Gebräuche, Volksglaube, Sagen, Märchen, Volkserzählungen und Schwänke, Mundart und Wortbestand*, Innsbruck, Wagner.
Bentzen K. (2014), *Embedded Verb Second (V2)*, «Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal», 1, 211-224.
Bhatt R., Yoon J. (1991), *On the composition of COMP and parameters of V2*, in Bates D. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 10th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)*, Stanford, Calif., The Center for the Study of Language and Information Publications, 41-53.
Bidese E. (2004), *Die Zimbern und ihre Sprache: geographische, historische und sprachwissenschaftlich relevante Aspekte*, in Stolz Th. (ed.), *„Alte" Sprachen. Beiträge zum Bremer Kolloquium über „Alte Sprachen und Sprachstufen" (Bremen, Sommersemester 2003)*, Bochum, Brockmeyer, 3-42.
Bidese E. (2008), *Die diachronische Syntax des Zimbrischen*, Tübingen, Narr.
Bidese E. (2017a), *Der kontaktbedingte Sprachwandel. Eine Problemannäherung aus der I-language-Perspektive*, in Tanaka S., Leiss E., Abraham W., Fujinawa Y. (eds.), *Grammatische Funktionen aus Sicht der japanischen und deutschen Germanistik*, Hamburg, Helmut Buske Verlag, 136-157.
Bidese E. (2017b), *Reassessing contact linguistics. Signposts Towards an Explanatory Approach to Language Contact*, «Zeitschrift für Dialektologie», LXXXIV(2-3), 3-42.
Bidese E., Padovan A., Tomaselli A. (2012), *A binary system of complementizers in Cimbrian relative clauses*, «Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax», 90, 1-21.
[Online: http://project.sol.lu.se/uploads/media/Bidese_et_al_WPSS90_02.pdf]
Bidese E., Padovan A., Tomaselli A. (2013), *Bilingual competence, complementizer selection and mood in Cimbrian*, in Abraham W., Leiss E. (eds.), *Dialektologie in neuem Gewand. Zu Mikro-/Varietätenlinguistik, Sprachenvergleich und Universalgrammatik*, Hamburg, Helmut Buske Verlag, 47-58.
Bidese E., Padovan A., Tomaselli A. (2014), *The syntax of subordination in Cimbrian and the rationale behind language contact*. «Language Typology and Universals – STUF Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung», 67(4) (Special Issue: Bidese E, Putnam M., German Complementizers in contact), 489-510.
Bidese E., Schallert O. (2018), *Partikelverben und sekundäre Prädikative im Zimbrischen*, in Rabanus S. (ed.), *Deutsch als Minderheitensprache in Italien. Theorie und Empirie kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandels*, Hildesheim, Olms, 145-182.
Bidese E., Tomaselli A. (2016), *The decline of asymmetric word order in Cimbrian subordination and the special case of umbrómm*, in Reich I., Speyer A. (eds.), *Co- and subordination in German and other languages*, Hamburg, Helmut Buske Verlag, 55-75.
Cognola F. (2013), *Syntactic variation and verb second. A German dialect in Northern Italy*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
Cognol F., Bidese E. (2013), *Aspetti sintattici del Mòcheno. Gli ordini OV/VO tra variazione e standardizzazione*, in Bidese E., Cognola F. (eds.), *Introduzione alla linguistica del Mòcheno*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 105-128.
Damonte F. (2010), *Matching moods: Mood concord between CP and IP in Salentino and southern Calabrian subjunctive complements*, in Benincà P., Munaro N. (eds.), *Mapping the left periphery*, Oxford/New York, Oxford University Press, 228-256.
Denison N. (1968), *Sauris: A trilingual community in diatypic perspective*, «Man», New Series, 3-4, 578-592.
Denison N. (1988), *Language contact and language norm*, «Folia Linguistica», XXII(1-2), 11-35.
Denison N. (1994), *Diachrone und synchrone Aspekte der Mundart der deutschen Sprachinsel Zahre*, in Hornung M. (ed.), *Die deutschen Sprachinseln in den Südalpen. Mundarten und Volkstum*, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York, Georg Olms, 223-236.
Denison N. (1997), *Language change in progress. Variation as it happens*, in Coulmas F. (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford (UK)/Cambridge, Mass. (USA), 65-80.
Denison N., Grassegger H. (s.d.), *Zahrer Wörterbuch / Vocabolario Saurano*. Graz, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Graz.

Franco I. (2010), *Issues in the syntax of Scandinavian embedded clauses*, «Working Papers in Scandinavian syntax», 86, 137-177.
Gamillscheg E. (1912), *Die romanischen Elemente in der deutschen Mundart von Lusern*, Halle/Saale, Max Niemeyer.
Giannakidou A. (2009), *The dependency of the subjunctive revisited. Temporal semantics and polarity*, «Lingua», 119(12), 1883-1908.
Giannakidou A. (2013), *(Non)veridicality, evaluation, and event actualization. Evidence from the subjunctive in relative clauses*, in: Taboada M., Trnavac R. (eds.): *Nonveridicality and Evaluation. Theoretical, Computational, and Corpus Approaches*, Leiden, Brill, 17-49.
Grewendorf G. (2013), *Satztypen und die linke / rechte Peripherie*, in Maibauer J., Steinbach M., Altmann H. (eds.), *Satztypen des Deutschen*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 652-679.
Grewendorf G., Poletto C. (2009), *Von OV zu VO: Ein Vergleich zwischen Zimbrisch und Plodarisch*, in Bidese E., Dow J.R., Stolz Th.(eds.), *Das Zimbrische zwischen Germanisch und Romanisch*, Bochum, Brockmeyer, 114-128.
Grewendorf G., Poletto C. (2009), *The hybrid complementizer system of Cimbrian*, in Moscati V., Servidio E. (eds.), *XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa Proceedings*, Siena, Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio, 181-194.
[Online: http://www.ciscl.unisi.it/doc/doc_pub/STiL-2009-vol3-special-IGG.pdf]
Grewendorf G., Poletto C. (2011), *Hidden Verb Second: the case of Cimbrian*, in Putnam M.T. (ed.), *Studies on German language-islands*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 301-346.
Grewendorf G., Poletto C. (2015), *Relative Clauses in Cimbrian*, in Di Domenico E., Hamann C., Matteini S. (eds.), *Structures, Strategies and Beyond. Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 393-416.
Holmberg A. (2015), *Verb Second*, in Kiss T., Alexiadou A. (eds.), *Syntax - Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook*, II, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 342-382.
Kolmer A. (2012), *Pronomina und Pronominalklitika im Cimbro. Untersuchungen zum grammatischen Wandel einer deutschen Minderheitensprache in romanischer Umgebung*, Stuttgart, Steiner.
Padovan A. (2011), *Diachronic clues to grammaticalization phenomena in the Cimbrian CP*, in Putnam M.T. (ed.), *Studies on German language-islands*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 279-299.
Padovan A., Casalicchio J. (2018), *Das zweifache Komplementierersystem im Zimbrischen. Romanische Entlehnung und Eigenentwicklung*, in Rabanus S. (ed.), *Deutsch als Minderheitensprache in Italien. Theorie und Empirie kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandels*, Hildesheim, Olms, 183-210.
Panieri L., Pedrazza M., Nicolussi Baiz A., Hipp S., Pruner C. (eds.) (2006), *Bar lirnen z'schraiba un zo reda az be biar. Grammatica del cimbro di Luserna / Grammatik der zimbrischen Sprache von Lusérn*. Regione Autonoma Trentino-Alto Adige / Autonome Region Trentino-Südtirol & Istituto Cimbro / Kulturinstitut Lúsern.
Reis M. (2013), *'Weil-V2'-Sätze und (k)ein Ende? Anmerkungen zur Analyse von Antomo and Steinbach (2010)*, «Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft», 32(2), 221-262.
Schweizer B. [1954] (2008), *Zimbrische Gesamtgrammatik. Vergleichende Darstellung der zimbrischen Dialekte*. Edited by Dow J.R., Stuttgart, Steiner.
Tyroller H. (2003), *Grammatische Beschreibung des Zimbrischen von Lusern*, Stuttgart, Steiner.
Zingerle von I. (1869), *Lusernisches Wörterbuch*, Innsbruck, Wagner.