

# DUAL COMPLEMENTATION IN THE DIALECT OF THE EOLIAN ISLANDS<sup>1</sup>

SARA N. CARDULLO<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract.** Research on the dialect of the Eolian archipelago, still in its infancy, has focused mainly on lexical and phonetic-phonological considerations, leaving morphosyntactic aspects for the most part unaddressed to date. This paper presents a descriptive account of data collected on two of the seven Eolian islands (Stromboli and Salina) in relation to its finite complementation system, and further attempts to contextualize this within the broader context of Southern Italian dialects where this topic has received much attention. Following previous studies, this paper uses Rizzi's (1997) architecture of the split Complementizer Phrase (CP) to examine the novel Eolian data. It thus emerges that the Eoliano dual complementizer system (*ca* vs *chə*), featuring an alternation conditioned by matrix predicate semantics, resembles heretofore documented systems only in part. The position of both Eoliano complementizers relative to fronted Topics/Foci ultimately leads me to propose a complementation structure not frequently attested in SIDs, and one that distinguishes it significantly from extreme SIDs, the category of dialects it is classified with.

**Keywords:** finite complementation, complementizer, left periphery, syncretic C-system, Eoliano (i.e. Italian dialect spoken in the Eolian islands).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Eolian islands are a volcanic archipelago situated just above the north-eastern corner of Sicily (Messina province, which they are a part of) and are made up of seven main islands: (from West to East) Alicudi, Filicudi, Salina, Lipari, Vulcano, Panarea, Stromboli.

The aim of this paper is twofold: (a) to present the dual complementizer system found in the Eolian islands, as documented through original research on the islands of Salina and Stromboli<sup>3</sup>, and (b) to contextualize these results within the diachronic and diatopic microvariation found in southern Italian systems of complementation (cf. Rohlfs

---

<sup>1</sup> Following Fanciullo (1983, 1995), and his conclusion that the variation between the islands is not linguistically “pertinent” enough to consider them separate varieties (1995: 101, fn 2), I will be writing of Eoliano in the singular, until compelling data to the contrary emerges (cf. § 5).

<sup>2</sup> University of Cambridge, Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics, St John's College, snc33@cam.ac.uk.

<sup>3</sup> The data was collected during fieldtrips taken in October 2018 and April 2019 for the author's Master's thesis (Università di Pisa, Italy). It was also elaborated in part in the context of an internship with the ERC project *Microcontact. Language Variation and Change from the Italian Heritage Perspective* (Universiteit Utrecht, The Netherlands).

1933, 1969, 1972, 1983; Leone 1995; Ledgeway 2003, 2005, 2006, 2012, 2013; Manzini & Savoia 2005; Damonte 2005, 2006, 2009; De Angelis 2013, 2017; Colasanti 2018a, 2018b; Groothuis 2019). More specifically, it compares Eolian finite complement clauses with those of the two macro-groups of southern Italian dialects, the Upper Southern Italian dialects and the Extreme Southern Italian dialects (hereafter USIDs and ESIDs, respectively), where this topic has received much attention. Following the studies on the complementation systems of these varieties, the syntactic framework adopted is Rizzi's (1997) cartography of the split Complementizer Phrase (hereafter CP). Finally, this study observes whether or not the two islands investigated present noteworthy differences with respect to this phenomenon. Some remarks will also be made on *dopo che* ('after that') and *prima che* ('before that') adverbial clauses.

Bartoli's areal norm of the isolated area, frequently – and perhaps sometimes unjustifiably – applied to islands, would lead to the expectation that Eoliano present a more conservative version of the varieties of the Messina province. Indeed, the *Carta dei dialetti italiani* (Pellegrini 1997), classifies the Eolian islands as an ESID speaking-area, and Fanciullo (1995: 101) has defined Eoliano a Sicilian dialect; both of these conclusions have been drawn according to phonological criteria. However, it is noteworthy that Eoliano's linguistic behavior has been likened to that of the dialects of Sicily's other minor islands, in particular Lampedusa and Ustica, in that it presents linguistically heterogeneous traits on all levels of grammar, that are representative of different areas of Sicily and Southern Italy (Ruffino 1977, 1992; Fanciullo 1995).

In particular, while Eoliano's tonic vowel system is decidedly Sicilian, its atonic vowels are more similar to those found in USIDs (these have been termed “napoletaneggiante” [Fanciullo 1983: 23]). The presence of (diphthongizing) metaphony distinguishes it strongly from Messinese, while conversely rendering it more similar to central/southeastern Sicily and many USIDs. Finally, Eoliano presents lexical items otherwise found in dialects spoken in disparate provinces and regions in Southern Italy (Fanciullo 1995: 102–104).

Thus, Eoliano, like Lampedusano and Usticano, presents traits that diverge significantly from the geographically nearest Sicilian dialect (Messinese for Eoliano, Agrigentino for Lampedusa, and Palermitano for Ustica) (Fanciullo 1995: 104–105; Ruffino 1997). The potential historical reason for this “heterogeneous” and typically micro-insular linguistic behavior is that these minor islands have been repopulated relatively recently (Ustica in the mid 1700s, Lampedusa in 1843) following natural or man-made disasters (cf. 1544 Pillage of Lipari, the largest of the Eolian islands). An important implication is that modern-day Eoliano is likely a more recent dialect, derived from a pan-southern *koiné* (Fanciullo 1995; Ruffino 1997: 32).

“Sta di fatto che il ripopolamento delle Eolie con immigrati provenienti da tutta la Sicilia (nonché dall'Italia meridionale) dovè proporvi [...] la costituzione d'un tipo dialettale “sopracampanilistico”, se così si può dire, in cui risultano diluiti, o scomparsi affatto, i tratti più particolari, e avvantaggiati i tratti comuni a tutti (o quanto meno, alla maggior parte) dei nuovi arrivati”<sup>4</sup> (Fanciullo 1995: 104-105). While he underlines the

<sup>4</sup> “The fact of the matter is that the repopulation of the Eolian islands by immigrants from all over Sicily (as well as from Southern Italy) must have induced the creation of a “trans-provincial” type of dialect, if we can call it that, in which the more particular traits become diluted, or disappear completely, while the traits shared by all (or at least, by the majority) of the new arrivals are advantaged” (translation S.C.).

necessity of studies determining the varieties that originally composed this common language, and their respective contributions, his description of several “anti-Messinese” linguistic traits and the general linguistic areas they correspond to is nonetheless valuable, and suggests the constituting varieties may include USIDs as well as ESIDs (Fanciullo 1995: 102–104). Importantly, he predicts that the traits favored in the formation of a specifically Eolian dialect are the more commonly shared, less idiosyncratic ones.

Though the Eolian islands have been the object of two major linguistic studies (Coray 1930, Fanciullo 1983, 1995)<sup>5</sup>, research focusing specifically on morphosyntax is thus far extremely limited, as both scholars adopt a *Wörter und Sachen*<sup>6</sup> approach advancing ethnolinguistic, lexical, and phonological considerations.

However, Fanciullo (1995: 102) makes an important observation about Eoliano complement clauses which here deserves particular attention: Eoliano – like most Romance languages – diverges from the characteristic behavior of many ESIDs<sup>7</sup> in presenting the obviation effect, i.e. in employing the infinitive where the subjects of the matrix and subordinate clauses are coreferential (1), instead of a finite clause in the present indicative introduced by a complementizer (2).

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| (1) | ncuminciau      mi      parra                      accussi  |  |
|     | (s).he began      COMP      (s).he.speaks      like.so  |  |
|     | ‘(s).he began to speak in this way’   | (Messina province, Ganfi 2018: 202) <sup>8</sup>   |
| (2) | usamu                      mättiri                      // *usamu      chə      mittemu               |  |
|     | we.use                      put.INF                      we.use                      COMP      we.put |  |
|     | ‘we have the habit of putting [...]’  | (Eolian islands, adapted from Fanciullo 1995: 102) |

This finding, which certainly merits further attention, is significant in the preliminary conclusion it allows us to draw in the context of this study, namely that Eoliano infinitival complement clauses do not present prototypical ESID behavior, or at least they do not behave as the ESIDs geographically nearest them do.

## 2. ESID DUAL COMPLEMENTATION

ESIDs include the linguistic varieties spoken in Southern Calabria below the Cetraro-Bisignano-Melissa isogloss, those spoken in Southern Puglia beneath the Taranto-

<sup>5</sup> The second study (Fanciullo 1983) was initially intended as a verification of the data collected in the first (Coray 1930).

<sup>6</sup> The *Wörter und Sachen* movement, established in the early 1900s, advocates the importance of studying words (*Wörter*) in close relation to the study and understanding of their referents (objects, ideas, institutions, or more generally, *Sachen* ‘things’).

<sup>7</sup> Generally speaking, the varieties which show infinitive loss include the dialects of the province of Messina, along with southern Calabrian and Salentino dialects (cf. §2). N.B. the city of Messina itself, as well as western Sicilian dialects, do in fact present the infinitive.

<sup>8</sup> Examples are transcribed and example locations are cited according to the source from which they are taken.

Ostuni isogloss, and the dialects of Sicily (Loporcaro 2013: 145). Excepting central and western Sicily, most ESIDs show a Balkan-style dual complementizer system, conventionally assumed to arise from contact with Greek<sup>9</sup> (Rohlf's 1933, 1972, 1969; Ledgeway 1998, 2005, 2006, 2013; De Angelis 2013). The two complementizers present a high degree of microvariation, where one is derived from QUIA (> *ca*), while the other from QUOD (> *cu*, in Salento only) or MODO (> (*m*)*i* in Messina and Reggio Calabria city center, > (*m*)*u* in the provinces of Catanzaro and Reggio Calabria, > *ma* in Catanzaro city center and outskirts, Ledgeway 2003: 89)<sup>10</sup>.

Table 1

ESID dual complementation  
(adapted from Rohlf's 1969: § 786–a)

	penso che verrà 'I think that he will come'	voglio che lui mangi 'I want him to eat'
Sicily	pensu ca vèni	vògghiu chi mmanciassi
Sicily (Messina province)	critu ca vèni	ògghiu mi mancia
Southern Calabria	pensu ca vèni	vogghiu mu/mi mangia
Salento (Southern Apulia)	crisciu ca vène	ogghiu cu mmancia

The two complementizers alternate according to the semantics of the matrix clause predicate: declarative and epistemic predicates such as the cognates of *dire* 'to say', *pensare* 'to think', *credere* 'to believe', select the complementizer *ca*, whereas *mi/mu/cu* (the specific form depending on the region) is used with verbs of volition such as the cognates of *volere* 'to want' and *aspettare* 'to wait for' (Rohlf's 1982, 1969; Ledgeway 2003, 2005).

This semantically based alternation underlies a cooccurring modal distinction of the event expressed in the embedded clause. Declarative and epistemic predicates introduce propositional embedded clauses and have deictic tense, while those of volition "typically characterize the state or events of their complements as unrealized at the time of speaking" (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 31) and introduce embedded clauses whose tense can be characterized as anaphoric, or dependent on the tense of the main clause predicate (Calabrese 1993; Ledgeway 2016: 1015). Indeed, most southern Italian dialects today lack a morphological present subjunctive<sup>11</sup>, and the choice of complementizer has been interpreted as a way to express the mood of the subordinate clauses, now codified

<sup>9</sup> Ledgeway (2005) has convincingly argued that it is ESID and not USID split complementation that has Greek origin, in contrast to Rohlf's (1969: §786–a) initial claims that both dialect groups share a unitary complementation system.

<sup>10</sup> A persuasive and recent case for Bertoni's (1905, 1916) hypothesis that these forms (with the exception of *ca*) derive from \*QUOMODO is made in Groothuis (forthcoming) and Andriani *et al* (2020).

<sup>11</sup> The present subjunctive is generally replaced by the present indicative in subordinate clauses and by the imperfect subjunctive in main clauses. Traces of the present subjunctive are found in Central Salento, generally in the third persons ([ku ssenta/'ssentane] 'that (s)he sits'/'that they sit') (Loporcaro 2013: 135–136). Significantly, this does not exclude the possibility of having a dual complementizer system. The present subjunctive may also be found in jussive and optative main clauses (cf. Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014; Colasanti & Silvestri 2018).

invariably in the present indicative (Rohlf's 1969: 61; Manzini & Savoia 2005: 653; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 31; Colasanti 2018a); however, these two strategies for marking modality (among others, such as verb movement) are not mutually exclusive. Following the literature, I will also use the terms 'propositional' and '*irrealis*' to refer to the declarative/epistemic and volitional complementizers, respectively.

While the propositional complementizer *ca* typically precedes constituents raised into the CP<sup>12</sup> – such as the topicalized subject “*la Lia*” (3) and the contrastive focus “*krai*” (‘tomorrow’) (4) – the *irrealis* complementizer *cu* has been demonstrated to follow them (5–6, where 5 features a clitic left-dislocated direct object). “Only clitic elements may intervene between it and the embedded verb. [...] Consequently, any topicalised or focused phrases always precede such complementisers” (Ledgeway 2005: 365).

- (3)<sup>13</sup>    *addzu*    *tittu*            **ka**    *la Lia*    *ene*  
 I.have    said.PPLE    COMP    the Lia    she.comes  
 ‘I said that Lia is coming/will come’
- (4)        *addzu*    *tittu*            **ka**    *KRAI*        *ene*  
 I.have    said.PPLE    COMP    tomorrow    (s)he.comes  
 ‘I said that she is coming/will come tomorrow’  
 (Salento, Calabrese 1993: 38)
- (5)        *oyyu*    *lu*        *libbru*    **ku**        *lu*        *kkatta*    *lu*        *Maryu*  
 I.want    the        book        COMP    it.ACC    he.buys    the        Mario  
 ‘(As for) the book, I want Mario to buy it’
- (6)        *oyyu*    *KRAI*            **ku**        *bbene*    *lu*        *Maryu*  
 I.want    tomorrow        COMP    comes    the        Mario  
 ‘I want Mario to come TOMORROW’  
 (Salento, Ledgeway 2005: 365)

This relative positioning *vis-à-vis* left-dislocated elements has been taken as important evidence in support of a complementation distribution that mirrors that of standard Italian finite and non-finite complementizers in Rizzi's (1997) original elaboration of the split-CP: *ca* (like st. It. *che*) lexicalizes the Force head (Force<sup>o</sup>), while *mi/mu/ma/cu* lexicalize the Fin head (Fin<sup>o</sup>)<sup>14</sup> (like st. It. *di*), as seen in the schema below (Ledgeway 2005: 366):

Structure 1. ESID split complementation  
 [<sub>ForceP</sub> *ca* [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> *mi/cu* [<sub>IP</sub> ...]]]]]

At this point, it is important to mention that traces of QUID > *chi* have been documented in positions occupied by both complementizers in dialects of the Messina

<sup>12</sup> The cartographic structure of the split-CP (Rizzi 1997; Benincà & Poletto 2004) I am assuming is as follows: [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FrameP</sub> HTop, Sc-sett [<sub>TopP</sub> LD-Top [<sub>FocP</sub> ConF, Inff, IndefQ [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> ...]]]]]]] (Ledgeway 2005: 355).

<sup>13</sup> Throughout the examples in this paper, topicalized constituents will be underlined, informationally focused ones italicized, and contrastively focalized ones capitalized.

<sup>14</sup> This is the position that will be taken here, although the *irrealis* complementizers *mi/mu/ma* have also been argued to sometimes lexicalize a lower position, in the I domain or the V domain, depending on the selecting matrix predicate (Ledgeway 2012, 2013; Groothuis 2019: 24–26).

province: i.e. to introduce both propositional and *irrealis* complement clauses<sup>15</sup>, as well as in *dopo che* ('after that') and more rarely *prima che* ('before that') adverbial clauses<sup>16</sup> in southern Calabrian varieties (Rohlf's 1983: 148; Damonte 2005; De Angelis 2013: 28). These exceptions to the *ca* vs. *mi* alternation, along with the fact that *chi* is also present in particularly conservative phrases with optative value (alongside the respective *irrealis* complementizers) in both Messinese and central-southern Calabrian varieties (Ledgeway 1998)<sup>17</sup>, has prompted De Angelis (2013: 183–186; 2017: 48) to propose this *chi* to be a third complementizer and perhaps a remnant of the original complementation system, rather than the result of recent influence exerted by the Italian finite complementizer *che*<sup>18</sup>.

### 3. USID DUAL COMPLEMENTATION

USID dual complementation has traditionally been considered to be identical to that of the ESIDs. “[D]alla Sicilia fino all’Abruzzo [...] dopo i verbi che esprimono una volontà o un’intenzione, viene usata una particolare congiunzione (*chi, chə, cu, mu o mi*) che non si userebbe dopo i verbi dichiarativi”<sup>19</sup> (Rohlf's 1969: §786–a). According to this interpretation, the main difference between the finite complementation systems of these two dialect groups is the morphology of the *irrealis* complementizer: in the case of USIDs, instead of deriving from MODO or QUOD, it derives from QUID/QUOD and assumes the shape of *chi/che/chə*. Such a state of affairs is visible in Table 2, which in Rohlf's *Grammatica* is presented in conjunction with Table 1 (§2). However, in many varieties (including in some of those listed below), such an alternation is no longer attested. (cf. § 3.2; Ledgeway 2009: 881; for Abruzzese see D’Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010 and D’Alessandro & Di Felice 2015).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. with declarative and epistemic predicates: *pensu chi vegnu* ‘I think I will come’ (Messina, Leone 1995: 68); *ti dicu chi è accussi* ‘I tell you it is so’ (Messina, Leone 1995: 68). Cf. with verbs of volition: *voli chi Mariu leggi u libbru* ‘(s)he wants Mario to read the book’ (Messina, Damonte 2005). Cf. with *dopo che* adverbial clauses: [nefʲjivi ʹdɔpu ki ve ʹnisti ʹtu] ‘I left after you came’ (S. Agata del Bianco [RC], Manzini & Savoia 2005: 464).

<sup>16</sup> In ESIDs, the unmarked situation is for *prima che* ('before that') adverbial clauses to select for the *irrealis* complementizer (*mi/mu/ma*), and for *dopo che* ('after that') to select for the propositional complementizer (*ca*); the tenses of the clauses they introduce are said to be anaphoric and deictic, respectively (De Angelis 2013: 175). Cf. *prima ku se kurka, mandzau* ‘before going to sleep, (s)he ate’; *toppu ka mandzau, se kurkau* ‘after (s)he ate, (s)he went to sleep’ (Salento, Calabrese 1993: 48).

<sup>17</sup> E.g. [kimmɪ aɪ ʹbe:n ɪ!] ‘may you have good fortune!’ (with an ironic connotation) (Messina, De Angelis 2013: 167). Both complementizers *chi* and (*irrealis*) *mi* are recognizable in the **kimmɪ** compound. This is a significant finding as these varieties may employ the *irrealis* complementizer on its own in such contexts, e.g.: *mi ti brucia u fòcu* ‘may the fire burn you’ (Castroreale, Rometta [ME], Rohlf's 1972: 336), *malanòva mi ai* ‘may you have a misfortune’ (Milazzo [ME], Rohlf's 1972: 336).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. also Manzini & Savoia (2005: 499–500) which (additionally addressing complementizers found in infinitive-loss contexts) propose the presence of coexisting dual complementizer systems in dialects which pattern like Arenese (VV).

<sup>19</sup> “From Sicily to Abruzzo [...] after verbs expressing a wish or an intention, a specific complementizer is used (*chi, chə, cu, mu* or *mi*) that is not used after declarative verbs” (translation S.C.).

Table 2

USID dual complementation (adapted from Rohlfs 1969: §786–a)

	penso che verrà 'I think that he will come'	voglio che lui mangi 'I want him to eat'
Northern Calabria	criju ca vèni	vuogliu chi mmangia
Naples	pènsə ca vènə	vògliə chə mmangə
Northern Apulia	pènsə ca vènə	vògghiə chə mmangə
Abruzzo	pènsə ca vènə	vòjjə che mmangə

Subsequent studies on the diachrony of USID complementation have provided a more nuanced understanding of the data offered in Rohlfs' initial formulation; following these, the USID section will be divided into two parts, Early USIDs from the Medieval period (3.1) and Modern USIDs (3.2).

### 3.1. Early USIDs

The claim that central-southern Italian dialects share a single complementation system has been challenged in part by Ledgeway (2003, 2005, 2006), who demonstrates that the distribution of complementizers in fourteenth and fifteenth century texts does not support this view. In particular, the early USID *irrealis* complementizer *che* is found consistently not only with volitional phrases expressing unrealized events – as would be expected if it were indeed an *irrealis* complementizer – but also with declarative matrix verbs (8–9). In these varieties that still conserve the morphological marking of the present subjunctive, it is found not only with embedded clauses in the subjunctive (8), as might be further expected, but it also introduces those in the present indicative (9) (Formentin 1998: 432–3; Ledgeway 2005: 348ff.).

(7) *dice* *alcuni* *ca* *la scabia* *è* *una* *enfe(r)metate* *i(n)*  
 (s)he.says some COMP the mange it.is.INDIC an illness in  
*la cotica*  
 the skin  
 'some say that mange is an illness that affects the skin'

(8) *non dico che 'l c. stia sinça omne fatiga*  
 not I.say COMP the horse it.remain.SBJV without all work  
 'I don't claim that the horse should remain totally unworked'

(9) *se dice ch(e) alcuna volta se fa i(n) lo collo dellu c.*  
 one (s)he.says COMP some time one (s)he.does.INDIC in the neck of.the horse  
 'it is said that sometimes it is done to the horse's neck'  
 (15<sup>th</sup> century prose, Lazio area<sup>20</sup>, Ledgeway 2005: 349)

<sup>20</sup> *Volgarizzamento della 'Mascalcia' di Lorenzo Rusio* (Aurigemma 1998). Example 9: 191.19–20; example 10: 141.15–16; example 11: 190.3–4.

Following the observation that, with few exceptions<sup>21</sup>, *che* is the complementizer invariably found in the presence of – and to the left of – topicalized and focalized constituents in the CP<sup>22</sup>, Ledgeway (2005: 351ff.) proposes that *che* occupies the Force<sup>o</sup> position when the left periphery is activated, independently of verb semantics and mood.

- (10) *si dichi ky chistu cirnigliu sia modu appisu avanti la ecclesia*  
 one (s)he.says COMP this sieve is.SUBJ now hung before the church  
 ‘it is said that this sieve now hangs in front of the church’  
 (14<sup>th</sup> century Sicilian prose<sup>23</sup>, Ledgeway 2005: 350)

On the other hand, when the Topic and Focus fields in the left periphery are inactive, i.e. when fronting is absent, *che* and *ca* are both said to occupy a lower C-related position (viz. Fin<sup>o</sup>), and to alternate according to predicate class (*ca* is selected by declarative/epistemic predicates, *che* by verbs of volition). The higher *che* in Force<sup>o</sup> can be considered a “positional variant” of both lower complementizers *ca* and *che*, one whose selection depends uniquely on the presence of constituents raised to the left periphery (Ledgeway 2005: 376), as can be seen below:

Structure 2. Left periphery activation and C movement in Early USIDs

[ForceP	[TopP/FocP	[FinP <i>ca/che</i>	[IP ... ]]]]
[ForceP <i>che</i>	[TopP/FocP Topic/focus	[FinP ( <i>ca</i> ) <sup>24</sup>	[IP ... ]]]]

These data, in addition to further evidence from Early Salentino’s triple complementizer system<sup>25</sup>, have been used to support the claim that the distribution of complementizers in Early USID varieties is based on both semantic and pragmatic factors. The alternation between the two complementizers realizing the FinP head (viz. *ca* and *che*) depend on the aforementioned semantic/modal considerations, while pragmatic variables (through the activation of the left periphery) drive allomorphic change – to become formally identical to the lower *irrealis* complementizer *che* – and “movement through the left periphery” to the Force<sup>o</sup> position (Ledgeway 2005).

The underlying syntactic structure of the Early USID complementation system would thus be as follows (Ledgeway 2005: 367ff.):

<sup>21</sup> These concern almost exclusively the presence of *ca* to the left of focalized constituents, and not topicalized ones (Ledgeway 2005: 360ff; but cf. also Greco 2011: 51, fn. 11).

<sup>22</sup> On the problematics of interpreting the pragmatic status of preverbal subjects (when directly adjacent to the verb), especially but not exclusively in null subject languages (in particular, whether they occupy the I-space or the C-space), cf. Ledgeway (2005: 356 fn 23) and references therein.

<sup>23</sup> *Libru de lu dialagu de sanctu Gregoriu* (Santangelo 1933). Example 12: 38.17–18.

<sup>24</sup> The FinP head may be filled by a second complementizer (*ca*) in the case of recomplementation (*che*, when used as the second complementizer in such structures, is hypothesized to fill positions higher in the left periphery with respect to *ca*) (Ledgeway 2005: 380-389).

<sup>25</sup> Data from the *Libro di Sidrac* has led scholars to hypothesize that *cu* (< QUOD) and *ca* (< QUIA) alternate in Fin<sup>o</sup> and that *che* (< QUID) instead occupies the Force<sup>o</sup> position: [ForceP *che* [TopP [FocP [FinP *ca/cu* [IP ... ]]]]]] (Ledgeway 2005: 367ff.; De Angelis 2013: 144–6).

## Structure 3. Early USID Complementation

[ForceP *che* [TopP [FocP [FinP *ca/che* [IP ...]]]]]

## 3.2 Modern USIDs

Although some dialects preserve a productive alternation between complementizers (cf. Abruzzese, Verbicarese, various varieties spoken in Southern Lazio and Northern Campania<sup>26</sup>), it has been observed that most Modern USIDs now present a sole lexeme (most frequently *ca*) to introduce all complement clauses (Ledgeway 2009: 881; De Angelis 2013: 171–174). For reasons of space, this section will focus on this more common type, while making allusions to the exceptions when indispensable to the analysis.

That in such varieties one complementizer is selected by all predicates (including in varieties presented by Rohlfs as having two complementizers, such as Neapolitano) has led to the conclusion that the propositional complementizer *ca* (or *che*) has been generalized to cover all modal functions (it is used both with the present indicative and the imperfect subjunctive) and that the distinction between the two complementizers found in Early USIDs has been neutralized (Rohlfs 1983: 152–154; Leone 1995: 66 fn 157; Ledgeway 2009, 2016; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 40).

- (11) [m anə 'ðittə **ka** 'viənəðə 'krajə]  
 me.DAT=they.have tell.PPLE COMP (s)he.comes tomorrow  
 'they told me that (s)he will come tomorrow'  
 (Terranova Pollino [PZ], Manzini & Savoia 2005: 460)
- (12) vu'ɛrə **ka** və'nɛrəðə  
 I.like.COND COMP (s)he.came.SBJV  
 'I would like for him/her to come'  
 (Terranova Pollino [PZ], Ledgeway 2016: 1019)

While this is true from a morphological perspective, Ledgeway (2009: 14–16) demonstrates, using data from Cosentino (13–16), that a syntactic alternation persists in Modern USIDs, and that this may be better termed a case of relexicalization, and not generalization. “[T]he loss of an overt morphological alternation in the complementizer system cannot *a priori* be assumed to imply a shift from a dual to a single complementizer system” (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 40).

As can be seen below, the complementizer precedes clitic left-dislocated topics and contrastively focused constituents in propositional complements (13–14), but this is ungrammatical with *irrealis* clauses (15–16) (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 42–3). These can only be “saved” through right dislocation and focus *in situ* (Ledgeway 2009: 15). This semantically conditioned structural alternation (like ESID complementizer shape and position, cf. §2), is argued to be another way of expressing the modality of the clause,

<sup>26</sup> For Abruzzese, cf. D’Alessandro & Ledgeway (2010), D’Alessandro & Di Felice (2015); for Verbicarese, cf. Groothuis (2019: 12). For Southern Lazio and Northern Campanian varieties (at least 13 have been documented with dual complementizer systems), cf. Colasanti (2018a; 2018b: 52–60). Colasanti (2018b: 51–53) also cites 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century texts demonstrating that the Southern Lazio dialect of Ferentino has presented a triple complementizer system.

especially when the morpholexical alternation between complementizers is lost (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 46).

- (13) a dittu **ca** 'e mulingiane unn' 'e vo  
 (s)he.has say.PPLE COMP the eggplants NEG=them.ACC = (s)he.wants  
 cchiù  
 anymore  
 '(s)he said that s(he) doesn't want any more eggplants'
- (14) a dittu **ca** CICCIU sgarra (nun Micheluzzu)  
 (s)he.has say.PPLE COMP Francesco errs (not Michele)  
 '(s)he said that Francesco is mistaken (not Michele)'
- (15) \*vulissa **ca** 'u canciellu 'u cunzassaru  
 I.like.COND COMP the gate it.ACC= they.fix.IMPF.SBJV  
 'I would like for them to fix the fence'
- (16) \*vulia **ca** NA BELLA SAGNA priperassa (nun nu  
 I.want.IMPF COMP a nice lasagna (s)he.prepares.IMPF.SBJV (not a  
 purpettune)  
 meatloaf)  
 'I wanted him/her to prepare a nice lasagna (not meatloaf)'  
 (Cosentino (CS), Ledgeway 2009: 14–5)

Thus, the proposed complementation structure put forward by the authors (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014: 44) is:

#### Structure 4. Modern USID Split Complementation<sup>27</sup>

[<sub>ForceP</sub> *ca* [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> *ca* [<sub>IP</sub> ...]]]]]

Furthermore, as in the case of ESIDs, traces of the complementizer *chi/che/chə* are found in those Modern USIDs that generalize *ca*; they are selected for especially in *prima che* ('before that') and *dopo che* ('after that') adverbial clauses (De Angelis 2013: 162ff., 172ff.)<sup>28</sup>.

#### 4. DUAL COMPLEMENTATION IN THE DIALECT OF THE EOLIAN ISLANDS

The following examples in Eoliano were collected by the author during fieldwork on the islands of Stromboli and Salina<sup>29</sup>. Though only one of the two islands is listed for each example, it should be noted that the choice of complementizer was uniform across the speakers on both islands, for each sentence. Examples (21), (22), (26) and (27) each present

<sup>27</sup> This structure does not apply to those Modern USIDs still showing dual complementation mentioned at the beginning of this section (these in turn present structures which may differ from one another, cf. Colasanti 2018b: 17-20; Groothuis 2019: 59, 109).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Terranovese (PZ), where the complementizer *chə* is used with both 'before that' [addʒə jəs'sutə 'primə kə bbə'niəðə] ('I left before he arrived') and 'after that' clauses [addʒə jəs'sutə 'ðəppə kə ttu ajə vənutə] ('I left after you came') (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 460).

<sup>29</sup> Salina is the second largest island and has three municipalities: Santa Marina, Malfa (which Pollara is a part of), and Leni. All six of the other islands fall under the municipality of Lipari, the largest of the islands.

one exception, in which one out of 15 or more speakers across both islands (not necessarily the same individual) used a complementizer different from the one shown in the example (i.e. the speaker used *ca* where *chə* was employed by all the other speakers, or (s)he used *chə* where the others selected *ca*).

What emerges at first glance in Eoliano is a morpholexical alternation between *ca* and *chə* licensed by the semantics of the main clause predicate (*ca* with declarative/epistemic predicates, *chə* with verbs expressing unrealized events), apparently similar to this alternation found in ESIDs.

- (17) u fratə mia mə difə **ca** sugnu bbrava  
 the brother mine me.DAT= he.says COMP I.am good  
 ‘my brother says I am a good person’  
 (Salina-Pollara)
- (18) difunu **ca** faf- a megghju granita di tutt-a Sifilia  
 they.say COMP (s)he.makes the best granita of all the Sicily  
 ‘they say that (s)he makes the best granita in all of Sicily’  
 (Salina-Santa Marina)
- (19) tu pjensə **ca** nni vènun- a pijjar- ô pwostu?  
 you you.think COMP us.ACC= they.come to get.INF at=the harbor?  
 ‘you think they will come to pick us up at the harbor?’  
 (Salina-Malfa)
- (20) criju **ca** morù  
 I.believe COMP (s)he.died  
 ‘I think that (s)he died’ (Stromboli)
- (21) vwo **chə** vvaju jo?  
 you.want COMP I.go I?  
 ‘do you want me to go?’ (Stromboli)
- (22) volə **chə** ll-awtʃə l-ajütənə  
 (s)he.wants COMP the others him=they.help  
 ‘he wants the others to help him’ (Stromboli)
- (23) a nonna volə **chə** i’o a vaj- a tttovo  
 the grandma she.wants COMP I her.ACC= I.go to I.visit  
 ‘Grandma wants me to visit’ (Salina-Santa Marina)

Contrary to the situation found in Early USIDs, fronting Topics/Foci to the left periphery does not provoke changes in the shape of the complementizer used with declarative/epistemic verbs. The presence of *ca* is invariable, and it systematically appears to the left of clitic left-dislocated topics (26–27) and informational and contrastive foci (24–25): *ca* may be accordingly said to lexicalize the ForceP head<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> I make the assumption that these fronted Topics/Foci target the left periphery in the CP rather than the lower left periphery at the VP-edge (Belletti 2004) because they precede the inflected verb, which in Romance is typically raised to the I domain (cf. Schifano 2018 for a typology of Romance V-to-I movement).

- (24) pjensu **ca** *dduman-* arriva Ggwidu  
 I.think COMP tomorrow he.arrives Guido  
 ‘I think Guido arrives tomorrow’ (Salina-Pollara)
- (25) pensu **ca** ODDʒƏ Ddʒuvannə nəffju c-a varca no  
 I.think COMP today Giovanni he.left with=the boat NEG  
 ajeri  
 yesterday  
 ‘I think Giovanni went out with the boat today, not yesterday’  
 (Stromboli)
- (26) mə dissə **co libbru** u ccatta Vĩŋjenzu  
 me.DAT (s)he.said COMP=the book it.ACC= he.buys Vincenzo  
 ‘he told me that Vincenzo would buy the book’ (Stromboli)
- (27) saffju **ca** ddu tərrinu Gaetanu u vennù  
 I.know COMP that land Gaetano it.ACC= he.sold  
 ‘I know that Gaetano sold that land’ (Stromboli)

The presence of fronted constituents in the CP does not appear to alter the shape of the complementizer, or its syntax, for verbs of volition either.

- (28) v<sup>w</sup>ogghju (**\*u libbru**) **chə/c-** u libbru u catta Marju  
 I.want the book COMP/COMP=the book it.ACC he.buys Mario  
 ‘I want Mario to buy the book’ (Stromboli & Salina)
- (29) v<sup>w</sup>ogghju (**\*DDOMANI**) **chə** DDOMANI arriva Maria  
 I.want tomorrow COMP tomorrow she.arrives Maria  
 no oddʒə  
 NEG today  
 ‘I want for Maria to arrive tomorrow, not today’ (Stromboli)

It is noteworthy, considering the contrasting data from the Modern USID of Cosenza (13-16), that in the case of *volirə* ‘to want’, the fronting of topics and foci to the CP of the embedded clause results in structures considered to be entirely grammatical by speakers. Furthermore, even the *irrealis* complementizer *chə* – invariant in shape – occupies the position to the left of pragmatically salient, raised elements. Consequently, *chə* may also occupy Force<sup>o</sup>.

As *both* the propositional complementizer *ca* and the *irrealis* complementizer *chə* consistently appear to the left of dislocated constituents, we may conclude that both – though alternating based on predicate class – lexicalize Force<sup>o</sup>, like the Italian finite complementizer *che*. The proposed underlying syntactic structure of Eoliano complement clauses is the following:

Structure 5. Eoliano Dual Complementation  
 [<sub>ForceP</sub> *ca/chə* [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> [IP ...]]]]]

Following the observations on adverbial *prima che* (‘before that’) and *dopo che* (‘after that’) clauses in other southern varieties, it is accordingly observed that with such clause types Eoliano employs *chə*. This conforms to the pattern found in many Modern

USIDs, whose corresponding temporal adverbial clauses may represent the only context (along with complements of *è meglio che* ‘it’s better that’) that licenses the use of the complementizer *chə* instead of *ca* (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 477ss; De Angelis 2013: 170–174). Both differ in this respect from ESIDs, in which *prima che* generally selects for the *irrealis* complementizer *mi/mu/cu* (and *dopo che* selects for the propositional complementizer *ca*).

- (30)    nəʃʃimu c-a    varca    prima    **chə**    ffaʃə    jwornu  
          we.leavewith=the boat    before    COMP    it.makes day  
          ‘we go out with the boat before daybreak’    (Stromboli & Salina)
- (31)    dopo    **chə**    ppartù    ʃistammə    cchjù    tʃʃrankwillə  
          after    COMP    (s)he.left we.stayed    more    calm  
          ‘after (s)he left we felt calmer’    (Stromboli)

## 5. DISCUSSION

In support of Fanciullo’s hypothesis that the dialects of the individual islands fail to show diatopic variation, it should firstly be remarked that the Salina and Stromboli examples do not present differences in the C system. Based on the data presented in this paper, we may accordingly continue referring to Eoliano as a unitary linguistic variety, rather than as composed of different dialects. This being said, the fact that Eoliano manifests a productive use of two complementizers is in itself a significant and original finding, if we remember that most Modern USIDs (and western Sicilian ESIDs<sup>31</sup>) now present only one, with in some cases only residual traces of a second complementizer.

On the other hand, most ESIDs and Early USIDs do present dual complementation. Between these two systems, the Eoliano complementizer shapes align more with those found in Early USIDs (and with those modern varieties that still preserve such an alternation), as the *irrealis* complementizer is *chə* rather than a reflex of MODO. Thus, on this point, despite its geographical position – and despite its classification as an ESID/a Sicilian dialect – i) Eoliano appears to pattern more readily with USIDs than with ESIDs, and ii) from this perspective, Eoliano, which preserves a dual complementizer system now lost in many Modern USIDs, is a morphosyntactically conservative variety.

The morpholexical alternation between the two complementizers, in contrast, is licensed by the same factor found in ESIDs and in part in Early USIDs, namely the semantics of the matrix verb. But it is only the complementizer shape, and not its syntax, which seems to be involved in this semantically conditioned alternation: unlike ESIDs and most Modern USIDs, both the propositional and *irrealis* complementizer occupy the same – leftward – position *vis-à-vis* constituents fronted to the CP. And significantly, unlike Early USIDs, the activation of the left periphery does *not* appear to influence either the shape or the syntax of the complementizer. Thus, in the case of Eoliano, instead of each lexicalizing a distinct C-head (i.e., Fin<sup>o</sup> and Force<sup>o</sup>) – or manifesting a complementizer allomorph in a separate functional projection – they both occupy the same position, e.g. Force<sup>o</sup>:

<sup>31</sup> In Western Sicily (ESIDs) the predominant complementizer shape is *chi* (< QUID/QUOD) (Paesano 2012).

Table 3. SID complementation structures compared

ESIDs:	[ <sub>ForceP</sub> CA	[ <sub>TopP</sub> [ <sub>FocP</sub> [ <sub>FinP</sub> MI	[IP ...]]]]
Early USIDs:	[ <sub>ForceP</sub> CHE	[ <sub>TopP</sub> [ <sub>FocP</sub> [ <sub>FinP</sub> CA/CHE	[IP ...]]]]
Modern USIDs:	[ <sub>ForceP</sub> CA	[ <sub>TopP</sub> [ <sub>FocP</sub> [ <sub>FinP</sub> CA	[IP ...]]]]
Eoliano:	[ <sub>ForceP</sub> CA/CHE	[ <sub>TopP</sub> [ <sub>FocP</sub> [ <sub>FinP</sub>	[IP ...]]]]

If we continue to assume a split-CP, Eoliano appears structurally unique among the varieties examined in: i) not hosting a complementizer in  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , and ii) not presenting syntactic alternation or movement (i.e., there are no conditions, semantic or pragmatic, that license the lexicalization [as in Modern USIDs], or movement to a second C-head [as in Early USIDs]). It should be noted that this underlying structure is to be found elsewhere in SIDs, and should be further investigated: Groothuis (2019: 12, 59, 109) has pointed out that the Modern USID of Verbicarese, which does not behave like Cosentino, presents a structure that coincides with what is proposed here for Eoliano.

While it is plausible that both *ca* and *chə* invariably occupy the  $\text{Force}^\circ$  position, the data also supports the conclusion that, when the left periphery is inactive, the complementizer system is in effect a syncretic, rather than a split one. What this could entail is the existence of a single composite projection in which both  $\text{ForceP}$  and  $\text{FinP}$  features are realized (Giorgi & Pianesi 1997; Ledgeway 2009: 19). When there are no fronted Topics/Foci present (and their respective heads are inactive, as in Structure 6), each complementizer, when selected for by its respective predicate, would lexicalize the features (normally scattered) bundled and realized in this single head:

Structure 6. A syncretic C-system  
 $[\text{CP}_{\text{Force/FinP}} \text{ca/chə} [\text{TopP} [\text{FocP} [\text{IP}]]]]$

While it is not viable to empirically demonstrate the syncretic nature of this functional head, it may be argued that this view is supported by the fact that the complementizers both lexicalize the same position (viz.  $\text{Force}^\circ$ ) when the left periphery is activated. The CP instead collapses when there are no fronted topics/foci, bringing  $\text{FinP}$  features to be realized in the same functional projection as  $\text{ForceP}$  (e.g.  $\text{Force/FinP}$ ). The complementizers continue to lexicalize a single position, but when the left periphery is inactive, they realize both  $\text{ForceP}$  and  $\text{FinP}$  features.

What is now unquestionable is that Eoliano's CP – whether split or partially syncretic – is specific to this dialect, and does not replicate those typical of either macro-group of southern Italian dialects (viz. USIDs or ESIDs), with the probable exception of Verbicarese. It is particularly important to underline that, along with aspects of its infinitival complementation (1–2), the structure of Eoliano's C-system (and the shape of its *irrealis* complementizer) distinguishes it significantly from Messinese and ESIDs in general, with which it has been classified (cf. §1). Contextualizing it more precisely within the complex Modern USID complementation typology and within the diachrony of SID C-systems can contribute towards a better understanding of the origins of Eoliano (the varieties it initially derived from and their specific contributions to the resulting linguistic system, as per Fanciullo (1995)).

## REFERENCES

- Andriani, L., K. Groothuis, G. Silvestri, 2020, "Pathways of grammaticalisation in Italo-Romance", in A. Ledgeway, I. Roberts (eds), *Probus*.
- Aurigemma, L. (ed.), 1998, *La 'Mascalcia' di Lorenzo Rusio nel volgarizzamento del codice Anglicano V.3.14*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Bartoli, M., 1943, *Lineamenti di linguistica spaziale*, Milan, Le lingue estere.
- Belletti, A., 2004, "Aspects of the low IP area. In The structure of CP and IP", in L. Rizzi (ed), 16–51.
- Benincà, P., C. Poletto, 2004, "Topic, focus, and V2. Defining the CP sublayers", in L. Rizzi (ed.), 52–75.
- Bertoni, G., 1905, "Intorno alle questioni sulla lingua della lirica italiana", *Studi Medievali*, 1, 580–593.
- Bertoni, G., 1916, *Italia dialettale*, Milan, Hoepli.
- Calabrese, A., 1993, "The Sentential Complementation of Salentino: A Study of a Language without Infinitival Clauses", in A. Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Turin, Rosenberg & Sellier, 28–98.
- Colasanti, V., 2018a, "La doppia serie di complementatori nei dialetti del Lazio meridionale: un approccio microparametrico", *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 82, 65–91.
- Colasanti, V., 2018b, "Romance Morphosyntactic Microvariation in Complementizer and Auxiliary systems", Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Colasanti, V., G. Silvestri, 2018, "Matrix complementizers in Italo-Romance", in S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway, E. Remberger (eds), *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 155–183.
- Coray, H., 1930, "Bodenbestellung, ländliche Geräte, Ölbereitung, Weinbau und Fischerei aufden liparesischen Inseln", *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen*, 3 (2–3), 149–231 & 3 (4), 305–391.
- Cruschina, S., A. Ledgeway, 2016, "The structure of the clause", in A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), 556–574.
- D'Alessandro, R., C. Di Felice, 2015, "The diachrony of Abruzzese complementation", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 60, 129–145.
- D'Alessandro, R., A. Ledgeway, 2010, "At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese Complementation", *Lingua*, 120, 2040–2060.
- Damonte, F., 2005, "La diffusione della particella mi in alcune varietà messinesi: problemi di metodo", in G. Marcato (ed), *Dialetti in città* (Conference proceedings, Sappada/Plodn, 30 June - 4 July 2004), Padua, Unipress, 237–242.
- Damonte, F., 2006, "Complementatori e complementi congiuntivi in alcuni dialetti sardi", in A. Padovan, N. Penello (eds), *Atti della Giornata di Lavoro dell'ASIt sui dialetti sardi 2005* (Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIt 6), Padua, Unipress, 71–95.
- Damonte, F., 2009, "La particella mu nei dialetti calabresi meridionali", in D. Pescarini (ed), *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria* (Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIt 9), Padua, Unipress, 101–117.
- De Angelis, A., 2013, *Strategie di complementazione frasale nell'estremo Meridione italiano*, Messina, SGB.
- De Angelis, A., 2016, "Origini formali e funzionali della particella (m)i, (m)u, ma nell'area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale", in P. Del Puente (ed.), *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne* (Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba., Potenza/Castelmezzano/Lagopesole, 6–8 novembre 2014), Potenza, Il Segno Arti Grafiche, 75–94.
- De Angelis, A., 2017, "Microvariazione, diacronia e interferenza: due case-studies dall'Italia meridionale estrema", *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 102, 1, 40–69.
- Fanciullo, F., 1983, *Dialetto e cultura materiale alle isole Eolie*, Palermo, Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

- Fanciullo, F., 1995, "Sulla posizione dialettale delle Eolie", in S. Todesco (ed), *Atlante dei beni etno-antropologici eoliani*, Messina, EDAS, 101–114.
- Formentin, V. (ed), 1998, Loise De Rosa, *Ricordi*, Rome, Salerno Editore.
- Ganfi, V., 2018, "Il complementatore mi: subordinazione e insubordinazione in siciliano nord Orientale", in A. Chilà, A. De Angelis (eds), *Capitoli di morfosintassi delle varietà romanze d'Italia: teoria e dati empirici*, Palermo, Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, 199–215.
- Giorgi, A., F. Pianesi, 1997, *Tense and Aspect. From Semantics to Morphosyntax*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Greco, P., 2011, "La subordinazione complete a verbo finito nel Libro de la destructione de Troya: tra sintassi e stilistica", *Vox Romanica*, 70, 47–62.
- Groothuis, K., 2019, *Reflexes of Finiteness in Romance*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Groothuis, K., forthcoming, "The downward grammaticalisation of irrealis subordinators in Romanian, Salentino and Southern Calabrese", in A. Nicolae, A. Dragomirescu (eds), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2017. Selected papers from "Going Romance" 31*, Bucharest, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ledgeway, A., M. Maiden (eds), 2016, *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, A., A. Lombardi, 2014, "The Development of the Southern Subjunctive: Morphological Loss and Syntactic Gain", in P. Benincà, A. Ledgeway, N. Vincent (eds), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 25–47.
- Ledgeway, A., 1998, "Variation in the Romance Infinitive: The Case of the Southern Calabrian Inflected Infinitive", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 96, 1–61.
- Ledgeway, A., 2003, "Il sistema completo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori", *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia*, 27, 89–147.
- Ledgeway, A., 2005, "Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of Southern Italy", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 103, 3, 339–396.
- Ledgeway, A., 2006, "The Dual Complementiser System in Southern Italy: Spirito greco, materia romanza?", in: A. Lepschy, A. Tosi (eds), *Rethinking Languages in Contact: The Case of Italian*, Oxford, Legenda, 112–126.
- Ledgeway, A., 2009, "Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino", in D. Pescarini (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria* (Quaderni di lavoro ASIt 9), Padua, Unipress, 3–24.
- Ledgeway, A., 2012, "Contatto e mutamento: complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento", *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*, 41, 459–480.
- Ledgeway, A., 2013, "Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy", in M. Janse, B. Joseph, A. Ralli, M. Bağrıaçık (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects*, University of Patras, 184–228.
- Ledgeway, A., 2016, "Clausal complementation", in A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), 1013–1028.
- Leone, A., 1995, *Profilo di Sintassi Siciliana*, Palermo, Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani.
- Loporcaro, M., 2013 [2009], *Profilo linguistico dei dialetti italiani*, Rome-Bari, Laterza.
- Manzini, M., L. Savoia, 2005, *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, vol. I, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Paesano, N., 2012, *La doppia serie di complementatori ca e chi nel siciliano contemporaneo*, Doctoral dissertation, Università degli studi di Torino.
- Pellegrini, G. B., 1997, *Carta dei dialetti d'Italia* (PDI 0), Pisa, Pacini.
- Rizzi, L., 1997, "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht/Boston/London, Kluwer, 281–337.
- Rizzi, L., 2004, *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, Oxford University Press.
- Rohlf, G., 1933, *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*, Halle (Saale), Niemeyer.
- Rohlf, G., 1969, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. III, Turin, Einaudi.

- Rohlf, G., 1972, “La perdita dell’infinito nelle lingue balcaniche e nell’Italia meridionale”, in G. Rohlf (ed), *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d’Italia*, Florence, Sansoni, 318–332.
- Rohlf, G., 1983, “Distinzione di due congiunzioni in dialetti d’Italia (nel senso del latino *ut e quod o quia*)”, in P. Benincà (ed.), *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, vol. I, Pisa, Pacini, 147–154.
- Ruffino, G., 1977, *Il dialetto delle Pelagie e le inchieste dell’Atlante Linguistico Mediterraneo in Sicilia*, Palermo, Biblioteca del Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- Ruffino, G., 1992, “Migrazioni insulari e riflessi linguistici. Il caso di Ustica”, in G. Ruffino (ed.), *Studi linguistici e filologici offerti a Girolamo Caracausi*, Palermo, Centro degli studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, 387–393.
- Santangelo, S., 1933 (ed.), *Libru de lu Dialagu de Sanctu Gregoriu*, Palermo, Boccone del Povero.
- Schifano, N., 2018, *Verb movement in Romance. A comparative study*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

