Complementisers in language contact.
The influence of Italian *che* on South Slavic and Albanian in Molise and beyond

Abstract: This paper deals with complementisers introducing object clauses, mainly restricted to the complements of *verba dicendi*. Other clause types and their connectors are added in so far as they are formally connected with the complementisers by means of polysemy or pleonasm in at least one of the languages in contact. As this research is about minority varieties in Italy, or “micro-languages” as we call them, Standard Italian and local Romance dialects serve as dominant or model languages in the contact-induced changes observed in the replica languages. The introduction presents an overview of the actual and historical situation of Italo-Albanian and of the corresponding information on the Slavic micro-languages in Italy.

As for the role of complementisers in language contact, section 2 is dedicated to the interplay of the Albanian conjunctions *se* and *që*, both in the Balkan-Albanian Standard and in Italo-Albanian, including their opposition to complementation by means of the subjunctive. Section 3 deals with complementation in two Slavic micro-languages, Molise Slavic in southern and Resian in north-eastern Italy. In doing so, Standard Croatian (or rather the whole range of the Serbo-Croatian continuum) and Standard Slovene serve as points of comparison for a development without direct influence of Italian. Complementation in the Italian model language is discussed as a source for pattern and matter borrowing in both Italo-Albanian and Slavic. In Section 4 the Romance influence in all described alloglottic varieties is compared. The results of our study are presented in chapter 5, including an outlook for further research in other micro-languages in Italy that could confirm or relativize them in terms of grammatical developments in situations of total language contact with the same donor language.
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1 Introduction

Italy on the whole is very rich in non-Romance varieties of different language families. There are several Germanic micro-languages in the north, Slavic varieties in northern and central Italy, as well as Greek and Albanian varieties in the south. In the following, we will focus on Slavic and Albanian micro-languages, in particular, Resian in the north-eastern Region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Molise Slavic in the central Region of Molise (centro-sud), and Italo-Albanian. As for the latter, only the Albanian varieties of Molise and Calabria will be considered. See Figure 1 for the overall distribution of Slavic and Albanian in Italy.
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**Figure 1:** The geographic distribution of Slavic and Albanian varieties in Italy.

The direct contrast between Albanian and Slavic in Molise with the same Italian dialect as the dominant contact variety is especially interesting, while Calabro-Albanian and Resian will serve as “triangulation” points of comparison. The minority languages of Italy addressed in the following have been in contact situations for centuries and have now entered a stage of “total” (or “absolute”) language contact. This means that all the speakers of these varieties are fully bilingual with
Italian as their only “foreign” Dachsprache\(^1\) (umbrella language). As a result of the historical and present influence of the dominant languages and varieties, many contact-induced changes have manifested themselves in these micro-languages on all linguistic levels and may be considered the main reason for their development into Abstand languages within their respective language families.

It is in such situations that the concept of a common diasystem or diagrammar of the two (or more) languages in question becomes evident. The concept of “diagrammar” is a theoretical model based on the hypothesis that multilingual speakers do not strictly separate the grammars of their two or more languages but combine them in the most economical way possible; see Breu (2011: 440) and Breu (2019b, 2020). It could be argued that the grammars of the individual languages in contact are synchronically derived from their diagrammar, i.e. a kind of common deep structure, by means of language-specific rules. The fewer the rules are, the more economical the management of the languages. Therefore, the reduction of such rules by means of a more and more comprehensive diagrammar is the overall “purpose” or direction of language change in total contact situations.

The reduction of rules is mainly the result of pattern borrowing,\(^2\) in the sense of copying the internal structure by means of syntactic and semantic calques based on the model of the dominant language. It is mainly grammar that is deeply affected by means of calquing. But it is well known that pattern borrowing plays its part in the lexicon, too, in addition to matter borrowing being the main method of adaptation to the dominant language in this field.

### 1.1 Actual and historical situation of Italo-Albanian

Italo-Albanian, or Arbëresh, Arbërisht, shares similar contact conditions with Molise Slavic, as both of them are spoken by minorities in southern Italy. Nevertheless, there are considerable differences with respect to the numbers of speakers and to the territories inhabited. While Molise Slavs live in a small compact area, see below 1.2, there are almost fifty Italo-Albanian villages, spread out across several regions from Molise via Campania, Basilicata, Apulia, and Calabria

---

1 For the terminology on the sociolinguistic characteristics of micro-varieties used in this chapter, see Kloss (1978 [1952]; 1967) and especially the discussion of the terms “Dachsprache” and “fremdes Dach” in Muljačić (1989).

2 Pattern (PAT) borrowing as the mechanism of copying only the structures of a model language (traditionally: Strukturentlehnung) is understood as the opposite of matter (MAT) borrowing (Materialentlehnung), referring to the integration of forms or morphemes of the donor language in question. For these terms and their usage in contact linguistics see, for example, Sakel (2007).
down to Sicily, with a higher concentration, however, in the North Calabrian province of Cosenza (Breu 1991). In Molise alone, there are four Arbëresh villages, Montecilfone, Campomarino, Portocannone and Ururi, of which Montecilfone is the most isolated one. Language fidelity of the younger generations has strongly declined in the last decades, especially in Campomarino, having given up its original Arbrisht variety almost completely.

Albanian immigration to Italy was a process manifesting itself in several waves from the 15th up to the 18th century and including also additional migration inside Italy. Linguistic evidence like the shift of intervocalic $n$ to $r$ (the Tosk “rhotacism”) and the lack of an infinitive point to southern Albania and Greece with their Tosk dialect as the original homelands of the Italo-Albanians.3

The absence of an infinitive in Tosk and other characteristics like the formation of the future with do ‘to want’ are typical for the Balkan languages. While Italo-Albanian generally agrees with Tosk dialects in these differentiating criteria, there are also contentious points like the formation of the future with kam ‘to have’, resembling in this respect the Geg future, where kam however combines with the infinitive, whereas in Italo-Albanian it combines with the subjunctive like do in Tosk: kam me bâ (Geg), do tê bëj (Tosk), ka(m) t bëj (Italo-Albanian) ‘I will make’. For this reason, some linguists claim the Italo-Albanian future to be a mixture of both dialects. On the other hand the Italo-Albanian future could also be claimed a result of Romance influence; for discussions see Altimari (2005) and Breu (2011: 156–158).

Like in the case of the other minorities in Italy, their actual number of speakers can only be estimated, with figures running from some tens of thousands up to one hundred thousand. Due to the extension of the Italo-Albanian territories, many Italian dialects have played a role in the contact-induced development of the Italo-Albanian varieties, but just as in the case of the varieties of the Slavic minorities, Standard Italian is nowadays the main source of foreign influences.

3 The two Albanian main dialects (or dialect groups) are Geg in the north and Tosk in the south with the river Shkumbin in central Albania separating them. Today’s Albanian standard language shows mainly Tosk characteristics. Geg, traditionally spoken also outside Albania proper in Kosova and western Macedonia, is more conservative, for example in keeping the original intervocalic -n-, becoming -r- in Tosk, and the original nasal vowels, denasalized in Tosk, e.g. bâna vs. bëra ‘I made’ aor.1sg. The Geg infinitive is formed by adding the particle me to a special form of the past participle, for example me bâ ‘to make’.
1.2 Actual and historical situation of the Slavic micro-languages in Italy

Molise Slavic is still spoken in the coastal hinterland of the Province of Campobasso, about 35 kilometres away from the Adriatic Sea, in the southern Italian Region of Molise. Nowadays, this Slavic-speaking area, having been larger in the past, is restricted to the territory of three bordering municipalities with the villages of Acquaviva Collecroce, San Felice del Molise, and Montemitro in their centres. There are only about one thousand persons left who actively use Molise Slavic or are at least able to understand it, out of an overall number of less than two thousand inhabitants of these villages.4

Language knowledge and behaviour differs from one village to another, with the smallest village, Montemitro, being most conservative with respect to both the influence of language contact and language usage. In San Felice only very few older people still use their Slavic variety, while Acquaviva, historically considered the cultural centre of the Molise Slavs, is situated in the middle between these two extremes. In this paper, all examples are taken from the Acquaviva dialect.5

From a genealogical point of view, Molise Slavic belongs to the Štokavian-Ikavian dialect group of Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (Serbo-Croatian) with examples like mblika ‘milk’, different from the Croatian Jekavian standard mlijeko and the Serbian Ekavian standard mleko, and likewise lit ‘summer’, contrary to Croatian ljeto and Serbian leto. This and other linguistic characteristics, as for example the absence of the ending -ā in the genitive plural of nouns, show that, in addition to determining the moment in time in which the separation of the main body of Štokavian speakers occurred, the ancestors of the Molise Slavs probably emigrated to Italy from the Herzegovinian Neretva valley in the 16th century (Rešetar 1911: 78–89).

After the immigration, their South Slavic variety first came under the influence of the Romance dialect of Molise (Molisan). After Italy’s unification in 1861, Standard Italian acquired its role as an additional donor language. As for grammar, most contact-induced changes in Molise Slavic seem to go back to the first centuries after the Slavic settlement in Molise, as they can best be explained from dialectal models. Italian (together with its local southern varieties) has

4 For a comparison of the demographic development of Molise Slavic and Molise Albanian in the last two centuries, see Breu (2018).
5 For an overview of the differences between the individual Molise Slavic dialects on all linguistic levels see Breu (2017: 16–72). In the present paper only a phonological differentiation has to be mentioned, namely “akanye”, the pronunciation of unstressed short e and o as a, which has an effect on the form of the borrowed complementiser; see below. Akanye is found in Acquaviva and San Felice, while it is absent in Montemitro.
always been the only umbrella language for Molise Slavic, while Slavic standard varieties, for example Standard Croatian, have never played any substantial role in everyday life in the Molise Slavic villages.

Resian is still spoken in a few little villages with four main dialects. In contrast to Molise Slavic, it belongs to the Slovene *phylum* with Standard Slovene as its nearest relative among the Slavic standard languages. But just like Molise Slavic, Resian is a micro-language with a “foreign roof”, as Standard Italian and to a far lesser extent Friulian are its only umbrella languages (*Dachsprachen*). Standard Slovene has never played a substantial role in its history. In spite of its geographical position close to Slovenia, due to which it cannot figure among the linguistic enclaves in the proper sense, high mountains have practically prevented direct contact between Resia and the Slovene dialects beyond the border since the very immigration of the ancestors of modern Resians, which took place about a thousand years ago. Besides the Romance varieties, (Austrian) German seems to have had some contact influence on Resian, too.

## 2 Albanian complementisers in language contact

In Albanian both complementisers and the subjunctive have a role in complementation, though with clearly different functions. This is true for Standard Albanian as well as for Italo-Albanian. Furthermore we will be claiming in the following that there is a functional difference between the single complementisers, too.

### 2.1 Complementisers and subjunctive in Standard Albanian

Standard Albanian has two concurring complementisers introducing object (and subject) complements, *se* and *që* ‘that’. Though grammars do not hint at any substantial difference in usage, it seems that *se* shows factuality (1) including strong

---

6 The classical description of the Resian dialect goes back to Baudouin de Courtenay (1895). For a modern description of the Resian dialect of San Giorgio see Steenwijk (1992). As for language contact, works like Pila (2017) on contact-induced change in the verb system could be mentioned. On the whole, very little has been said about Resian syntax. For a comparison of Resian and Molise Slavic in some parts of their grammars see, for example, Benacchio (2009) and Breu and Pila (2020).

7 For Albanian complementation in the context of the Balkan *Sprachbund* see Joseph (2016).

8 Actually, authors seem rather unsure in this respect. For example, Prifti (1971: 260) states that “*Lidhëzat “se” dhe “që” duket se në disa raste mund të përdoren njëra në vend të tjetrës pa
epistemic support, while që expresses a dubitative or distancing connotation (2) based on weak or even negative epistemic support. Both complementisers are followed by finite verbs in the indicative. On the other hand, intentionality and other non-realized situations, briefly termed ‘non-factual’ in the following, are the domain of the subjunctive clauses, introduced by the pure (analytic) subjunctive without an additional conjunction (Buchholz and Fiedler 1987: 514); but see pleonastic që below. Note that the Albanian subjunctive is formed in a complex analytic way, by means of the subjunctive particle të. This particle then combines with subjunctive verb forms, different from the indicative ones in the second and third singular of the present tense and in all present tense forms of the auxiliaries kam ‘have’ and jam ‘be’ with the exception of the 1st and 2nd person plural. Examples are (3a) with the present subjunctive vijë ‘come’, different from the corresponding indicative vjen, and (3b), containing a verb form without a difference between indicative and subjunctive, the imperfect sillë ‘bring’. This means that in the latter case the subjunctive particle të alone expresses the subjunctive, here reduced to t’, due to the following word-initial vowel. As Standard Albanian has no infinitive, infinitive objects of the type he told her to come in English, are, of course, excluded in this language, or rather, they are rendered by means of the subjunctive construction.

[It seems that the conjunctions se and që may be used one instead of the other without a difference in meaning ... ]. But then the examples he gives, in which që (with the indicative) according to him is not interchangeable with se, are by no means categorized. They only have in common that që is in front position of subject clauses, but this does not seem to be a decisive criterion. Buchholz and Fiedler (1987: 509–512), in their description of subject clauses, only indirectly hint at a possible lack of interchangeability of që (with the indicative) in not nominating se as equally possible with certain verbs meaning ‘to happen, to occur’ like rastis, qëllon. Further investigation is needed in this field outside of our research of the complementisers in object complements. What is really clear is that që is not interchangeable with se when combined with the subjunctive; see below.

9 This results from a detailed analysis of complement clauses in Ismail Kadare’s novel Koncert në fund të dimrit [The concert at the end of the winter] and a number of other examples from the literature and from oral speech. But, for example, the comprehensive grammar of Buchholz and Fiedler (1987: 513–514) does not claim such a contrast. Its authors just state that with verba dicendi in statements about real facts se is used more frequently than që. Çabej (2002: 264) writes rather vaguely that që in object sentences in certain cases alternates with se. Joseph (2016: 269) simply states: “the indicative complementizers që and se are used, essentially interchangeably, with both factive and nonfactive complements”.

10 Clauses coding non-realized situations either do not contain any proposition (e.g., those depending on desiderative or directive predicates), or the proposition(s) may be suspended, for example in conditional clauses, whose truth-values cannot be tested.
In negative complement clauses *nuk* ‘not’ follows the complementiser combining to *që nuk* (4a) and *se nuk* (4b) respectively. When, however, the subjunctive is negated, instead of *nuk* the negative particle *mos* has to be inserted between the subjunctive particle and the finite verb as in example (4c).

(1) *Disa banorë thanë se kanë frikë*

> some inhabitant:NOM.PL say:AOR.3SG COMP have:PRS.3PL fear:ACC.SG
> se mund të dënohen.

> ‘Some inhabitants said *that* they are afraid *that* they could be punished.’

(2) *Mos më thuaj që ke frikë!*

> NEG 1SG.DAT say:IMP.SG COMP have:PRS.2SG fear:ACC.SG

> ‘Don’t tell me *that* you (allegedly) are afraid.’

(3a) *I thashë të vijë me mua.*

> 3SG.DAT say:AOR.1SG PTL come:PRS.SUBJ.3SG with 1SG.ACC

> ‘I told her *that* she should come with me.’

(3b) *I tha stjuaredës t’i sille një kafe.*

> 3SG.DAT say:AOR.3SG stewardess:def.dat.sg.f PTL 3SG.DAT bring:IPRF.3SG INDF coffee:ACC.SG

> ‘He told the stewardess *that* she should bring him a coffee.’

In negative complement clauses *nuk* ‘not’ follows the complementiser combining to *që nuk* (4a) and *se nuk* (4b) respectively. When, however, the subjunctive is negated, instead of *nuk* the negative particle *mos* has to be inserted between the subjunctive particle and the finite verb as in example (4c).

(4a) *Kuptohej menjëherë që nuk kërkonte asnjë material.*

> understand:IPRF.PASS.3SG immediately COMP NEG seek:IPRF.3SG no matter

> ‘One understood immediately *that* he (as it seems) did not look for any matter.’

(4b) *Një oficer tankist thoshte se nuk zbatonte urdhrin.*

> INF officer tank.driver sa:.IPRF.3SG COMP NEG execute:IPRF.3SG order:def.acc.sg.m

> ‘A tank officer said *that* he did not execute the order.’
Both complementisers may be used pleonastically, for example që in combination with the subjunctive particle të in clauses coding non-realized situations, as in (5a), being absolutely equivalent to example (3a) above. The complementiser se is fairly frequent as a pleonastic element in embedded WH-questions, for example, by initiating a local object clause together with the interrogative pronoun ku ‘where’, see (5b). In example (5c) it combines with the conjunction si ‘how’ in an object clause as part of an interrogative sentence, initiated by the question particle a, (5d) is an example for a pleonastic combination of se with the conjunction kur ‘when’, in (5e) se combines with ç’ ‘what’, and in (5f) with kush ‘who’.¹¹

11 The wh-elements ku, si, kur, ç’, kush connecting the indirect interrogative clause with the main clause, accompanied in the indirect object clauses (5b–f) by se, are homonymous with the corresponding interrogative pronouns, meaning ‘where’, ‘how’, ‘when’, ‘what’, and ‘who’.
This nom.sg.f love:nom.sg.f
‘He had asked himself [that] when this love was possibly born in himself.’

(5e) Ai donte të merrte vesh se ç’
3sg.m.nom want:iprf.3sg PTL take:iprf.3sg ear comp what
murmuritej nën tokë.
murmur.iprf.pass.3sg under earth
‘He wanted to understand [that] what was being murmured in the underground.’

(5f) Silva deshi t-a pyeste
S. want:aor.3sg PTL-3sg.acc ask:iprf.3sg
se kush ishte ai.
COMP who be:iprf.3sg 3sg.m.nom
‘Silva wanted to ask [that] who he was.’

Embedded clauses containing yes-no questions are introduced by the complementiser nëse ‘if, whether’ in (6a); they are never doubled by se.\(^{12}\) Alternatively, the interrogative particle a is used as a complementiser in such clauses, too. Contrary to nëse it appears also as a neutral question particle in interrogative (main) clauses, see (5c). In indirect interrogative clauses it allows for a pleonastic se, as in (6b). In negative indirect interrogative clauses the complementiser changes to mos (6c).

(6a) Kramsi e pyeti nëse kishte dëgjuar
K. 3sg.acc ask:aor.3sg COMP have:iprf.3sg hear:ptcp
gjë për vizitën.
thing for visit:def.acc.sg.f
‘Kramsi asked him if he had heard something about the visit.’

\(^{12}\) This is probably due to the fact that nëse itself is already a combination of the conditional conjunction në ‘if’ with the complementiser se, though in a word order different from se in its above-mentioned pleonastic usage. But note that a formal opposition similar to that between në and nëse also exists between the interrogative pronoun pse ‘why’ and the causal conjunction sepse ‘because’, here with se, indeed, preceding pse. There are some further peculiarities as pse is also a variant of sepse as a causal conjunction, whereas nëse is a frequent variant of në in conditional clauses.
With certain verbs the difference between an object clause, introduced by the complementiser se, and an object formed by means of the subjunctive may result in different lexical meanings of the verb. An example is the verb mendoja, showing its basic meaning ‘think’ in case of strong epistemic support, as in example (7a), but expressing ‘intend’, thus a non-realized (non-factual) situation, as in the object clause in (7b):13

(7a) Ai mendonte se ishte vërtet
3sg.nom.m think:iprf.3sg comp be:iprf.3sg really
një figurë tragjike.
indf figure:nom.sg.f tragic:f
‘He thought that he really was a tragic figure.’

(7b) Silva po mendonte të thoshte diçka gazmore.
Silva ptl think:iprf.3sg ptl say:iprf.3sg something joyful:f
‘Silva was intending to say something joyful.’

2.2 Complementisers and subjunctive in Italo-Albanian

Italo-Albanian does not show any differentiation corresponding to the Standard-Albanian division of the complementisers se and që.14 On the other hand, Italo-

---

13 See, for example Buchholz and Fiedler (1987: 514). By means of the particle po, added to finite forms of the imperfect as in (7b) or the present, Standard Albanian forms the progressive aspect periphrasis, here po mendonte ‘was intending’.
14 Italo-Albanian examples here and in the following have been collected in fieldwork on the spot, all of them checked again in recent times. No relevant differences with respect to age, gender and other sociolinguistic criteria have been noticed. The same is true for the Molise-Slavic examples below.
Albanian differs dialectally with respect to the only remaining declarative complementiser. So, in the Calabro-Albanian variety of Frascineto Albanian se has been preserved (8a), whereas in the Molise Albanian variety of Montecilfone it has been replaced by the loanword ke (8b), which corresponds to Standard Italian che (and its local variants).

(8a) Nusja thot se ka shor,
    bride:DEF.NOM.SG.F say:PRS.3SG COMP have:PRS.3SG see:PRS.SUBJ.3SG
    ka t burthonj gjithsej.
    have:PRS.3SG PTL show:PRS.SUBJ.3SG all
    ‘The bride says that she has to see, has to show it all.’ (Calabria)

(8b) Thonjën gjith ke Munxhufuni ka
    say:PRS.3PL all COMP Montecilfone:DEF.NOM have:PRS.3SG
    bukre gra
    beautiful.F woman.ACC.PL.F
    ‘All say that Montecilfone has beautiful women.’ (Molise)

The possibility of expressing non-factuality or intentionality by means of the subjunctive continues to exist also in Italo-Albanian, see example (9) from Frascineto, with the reduced subjunctive particle t.15

(9) I thash t vinj me mua.
    DAT.SG say:AOR.3SG PTL come:PRS.SUBJ.3SG with 1SG.ACC
    ‘I told him that he should come with me.’ (Calabria)

In negative sentences the situation in both Italo-Albanian dialects in question resembles Standard Albanian in that the indicative negation particles nëng (Frascineto) and ngë (Montecilfone) are inserted into the complementation clause, introduced by the complementisers se (Frascineto) and ke (Montecilfone), resulting in (8a’) Nusja thot se nëng ka shor ... and (8b’) Thonjën gjith ke Munxhufuni ngë ka bukre gra. In an object clause expressing non-factuality (intentionality) both

15 In Italo-Albanian the common Albanian subjunctive particle të is sometimes omitted, see ka (të) shor in example (8a), or loses its final vowel even before consonants, as in thash t vinj in example (9). Often ka të ‘has to’, expressing deontic modality and also the de-obligative future, merges to a particle kat, being used in combination with the subjunctive either restricted to the singular alone or even in all forms of the present tense. In the imperfect the particle kisht < kish + të is used in such cases, for example, to express the future in the past; see Breu (1994: 366–369) for more details on verbal periphrases in Calabro-Albanian.
dialects insert the negation particle mos between the subjunctive particle and the finite verb, giving, for example, in Frascineto (9') *I thash t mos vinj me mua.*

Special cases are verbs or constructions expressing fear. While in affirmative complements the normal complementiser is used, cp. *se* in the Calabro-Albanian example (10a), it may be omitted before the optional negative particle mos, see (10b), which means that mos itself may serve as a negative complementiser.

(10a) *Trëmbša se m prit me*

fear:IPRF.PASS.1SG COMP 1SG.DAT cut:PRS.3SG with gërshëren

scissors:DEF.ACC.SG.F

‘I feared that he would cut me with the scissors.’

(10b) *Kimi trëmbësir puru mos bënjën ndonjë dëm.*

have:PRS.1PL fear also COMP.NEG make:PRS.3PL some damage

‘We are also afraid that they [don’t] cause some damage.’

In Calabria, just like in Standard Albanian, the complementiser *se* is added pleonastically to the introducing *wh*-element of embedded interrogative clauses as in (11a–b).

(11a) *Do t shofsh se si tundenj u këmben?*

want:PRS.2SG PTL see:PRS.SBJV.2SG COMP how move:PRS.1SG 1SG.NOM leg:DET.ACC.SG.F

‘Do you want to see [that] how I move my leg?’

(11b) *Shomi se ç bëri!*

see:PRS.1PL COMP what make:AOR.3SG

‘Let us see [that] what he has done!’

In Molise Albanian this pleonastic method has been lost, as a consequence of the replacement of the complementiser *se* by the loanword *ke*, following its Italian source *che* in not being used in such cases. On the other hand, *ke*, in following Italian models, is used as part of compound conjunctions or adverbials, for example in the borrowings *vistu-ke* ‘considering that’ ← It. *visto che*, *datu-ke* ‘as’ ← It. *dato che*, *par-ke* ‘seemingly’ ← It. *pare che*, *dhopu-ke* ‘after, when’ ← It. *dopo*
che and in calqued hybrids like the synonyms vetēm-ke and mēse-ke\textsuperscript{16} ‘only that’, corresponding to Italian solo che. Such cases find their parallels in Molise Slavic; see 3.2 below.

\section*{2.3 Italian che as a source for pattern and matter borrowing}

Italian che and its equivalents in the local dialects (Rohlfs 1969: 188–189) are highly polysemic in having quite a lot of different functions, from that of an interrogative pronoun ‘what’, over the aforementioned function as a complementiser, down to its functions as a relativiser and as a conjunction introducing causal and other subordinate clauses. Figure 2 is meant to illustrate some parts of this polysemy.

\begin{center}
\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
\caption{The polysemy of Italian che.}
\end{figure}
\end{center}

Italian or Molisan che (cha) serves both as the source form for matter borrowing and as a model for the adaptation to its polysemic semantic structure. For an overview of forms and functions with respect to the complementisers in the Albanian varieties, compared with the polyfunctional Italian che, see the upper part of Table 1. Among other things, Standard Albanian in the left column could reflect the original complexity of what was later to become Italo-Albanian at the time of the immigration of Albanians to Italy.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{The Albanian varieties between internal development and Romance influence.}
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\hline
 & Albanian & ARB Calabria & ARB Molise & Italian  \\
\hline
COMP (factual) & se & se & ke & che  \\
COMP (+ connotation) & qē & qē & &  \\
REL pronoun ‘what’ & \(\varsigma\) & \(\varsigma\) & \(\varsigma\) & che  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{16} Note, by the way, that Molise-Albanian mēse ‘only’ could have preserved the original complementiser se as a constituent of its compound form. A similar case of this type is Albanian and Italo-Albanian pse ‘because’ < *pēr se ‘for that’.
If \( që \) really existed in the immigration dialects (of which we, unfortunately, do not have any written records),\(^{17}\) the aforementioned absence of Albanian \( që \) as a complementiser in the Italo-Albanian varieties might be interpreted as a result of language contact. By replacing \( që \) with the unmarked \( se \) in Frascineto (Calabria), \( se \) has become as polyfunctional as its Italian equivalent \( che \) in the sphere of complementisers. This would be a case of pattern borrowing by semantic calquing. As becomes obvious from the information in the two rightmost columns, the same goal is reached in Montecilfone (Molise), by borrowing the Italian polyfunctional complementiser \( che \) itself (matter borrowing).

On the other hand, the lower part of Table 1 shows that the relativiser and the interrogative pronoun behave differently in the two Arbritsh dialects. It is worth noting that also in this case we have a merger based on the Italian polysemy of \( che \) as its model, but here Italo-Albanian takes \( ç(ë) \) ‘what’\(^{18}\) as the base form for calquing this polysemy.\(^{19}\) As a consequence, the large-scale polysemy of the dominant model \( che \) corresponds to two different polysemic entities in the replica systems, or in other words, language contact led to a bifurcation of the overall polysemy of Italian \( che \) with the complementiser and other conjunctions, on the one hand, and the relativiser and the interrogative pronoun, on the other.

As for the role of Italian \( che \) and Italo-Albanian \( se \) and \( ke \) as causal conjunctions, see section 4 below. Furthermore, they serve as conjunctions in consecutive, final and comparative clauses and as free connectors with an only vague logical connection between individual clauses as in the Calabro-Albanian example (12a).

\(^{17}\) The oldest Italo-Albanian text is \textit{Mbsuame e Krështerë} by Lekë Matrënga from 1592. It indeed already has \( çë \) ‘what’ as a relative marker, and \( se \) ‘that’ as a complementiser, while \( që \) is missing. But it is from Sicily. So it cannot necessarily be claimed the predecessor of the Calabrian and Molisan varieties in the present paper. In addition, it already shows other Italian influences, such that the adaptations in the field of complementisers and relativisers, described above, could have happened prior to the publication of this catechism. Anyway, in Gjon Buzuku’s \textit{Meshari}, the oldest Albanian book from 1555, \( që \) (though in its Geg form \( qi \)) is well documented in both functions it has preserved in modern Standard Albanian. The formal connection between \( që \), \( ç(ë) \), with an intermediate form \( qish \), and \( se \) is a very complicated etymological problem. They all seem to have been derived from the same root \(*kvi-\) ‘what’, though partially from different case forms and with a lot of analogy involved; see, for example, Çabej (2002: 264–265) and Matzinger (2006: 112, 143, 158).

\(^{18}\) In today’s Standard Albanian, \( ç' \) is often expanded to \( çka \), by adding the existential \( ka \) ‘there is’ to it.

\(^{19}\) See Breu (2019a) for \( që \) as a relative marker in Italo-Albanian. While the general statement by Turano (2011: 104) concerning the absence of \( që \) in the different Calabro-Albanian dialect of San Nicola dell’Alto in the Crotone district is confirmed by the data of the two dialects dealt with in this paper, we cannot agree on her assumption of its phonological development to \( ç \). At least in our dialects, a direct phonetic development of the relative pronoun \( që > ç \) is excluded, and \( ç \) also in this case clearly corresponds to \( ç \) ‘what’.
See also (12b) for a sentence, in which Calabro-Albanian se appears in a construction that from its very formation is a comparative clause, but which could also be interpreted as a temporal clause with më par se, literally ‘more first than’, as a compound conjunction meaning ‘before’.

(12a) Vete fjë se nani më shkon.
go:prs.1sg sleep:prs.1sg comp now 1sg.dat pass:prs.3sg
‘I am going to sleep **as/because/and** then (the pain) will pass.’

(12b) Rijem më par se të vet fjëjem.
stay:iprf.1pl ptl.cmp first comp ptl go:ptl sleep:iprf.1pl
‘We stayed there **before** [than] going to sleep.’

3 Slavic complementisers in language contact

According to what was said in the introduction, we will concentrate on the situation in Molise Slavic with Resian as a triangulation point for a comparison with Italo-Albanian. Though these two Slavic micro-languages have different standard languages as their narrowest correlates in synchronic and diachronic respect, it is nevertheless useful for the theory of language contact to show parallelisms and contrasting developments in the field of their complementisers. In both cases we will take the respective standard language as a starting point, not pretending, however, that they necessarily preserved the historical situations preceding language contact in the minority languages.

3.1 Complementisers in Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (BCS)

Traditionally, two more or less synonymous factual complementisers, not distinguishing between strong epistemic support and factive (i.e. presupposed) propositions, existed in the Serbo-Croatian dialect continuum, da and što, but with a strong predominance of da especially in the western parts. In modern Standard Croatian da is the only all-embracing complementiser; see example (13a). But even in the eastern parts of the continuum with verba dicendi almost exclusively da is used.20 On the other hand, što is frequently used even in Croatian as

---

20 This does, however, not exclude što as the general factual complementiser in eastern peripheral dialects or linguistic enclaves. One of them is Gallipoli Serbian, in which š(t)o frequently
a variant of *da* in constructions, expressing the emotional attitude of the speaker towards the given event, as in example (13b).21

(13a) *Rekao sam* da znam ovu  
say:pfv.ptcp.sg.m aux.prs.1sg comp know:prs.1sg this:acc.sg.f ženu.  
woman:acc.sg.f  
‘I said that I knew this woman.’

(13b) *Radujemo se, da ~ što si došao.*  
be.glad:prs.1pl refl comp aux.2sg come:pfv.ptcp.sg.m  
‘We are happy that you have come.’

Complementisers concurrent with *da* in Croatian (and elsewhere) are *kako* ‘how’ and, more rarely in the standard, *gdje* ‘where’; see examples (14a–b) from Raguž (1997: 421).22

(14a) *Rekao je da/kako to njemu*  
say:pfv.ptcp.sg.m aux.3sg comp this:n 3sg.m.dat ne bi odgovaralo.  
NEG cond.ptl correspond:ipfv.ptcp.sg.n  
‘He said that this would not have pleased him.’

replaces *da* in this function (Ivić 1994: 393). For a distribution of *da* in Serbo-Croatian dialects, including older times, see Zima (1887: 132–134). Grković-Major (this volume) deals with the complex development of complementisers in Serbian and the gradual penetration of *da* into the sphere of *što*, especially in the western territories. Standard Serbian is classified in this respect as being normalised on the basis of a conservative dialect. The rise of *da* as a complementiser in the western part of the Balkans is assumed to be due to Romance influence, which, however, is in sharp contrast to its contact-induced decline in Molise Slavic, see below.

21 See Raguž (1997: 414). The same variation is true for the Bosnian Standard (Jahić, Halilović, and Palić et al. 2000: 424). In this case *da ~ što* are not pure declarative complementisers, but possibly have a causal function or connotation; see Rječnik (1959–1962: 826–827). Such clauses, often governed by verbal complexes of the type *drago mi je, da ~ što ...* ‘I like it that ... ’, *žao mi je, da ~ što ...* ‘I am sorry that ... ’ are not object complements anyway, which does, of course, not exclude *da* and *što* from functioning as complementisers. In Serbian *što* seems even obligatory in these contexts, judging from Stevanović (1979: 891–892), who cites such examples only in his causal section, though with some reserve about this classification, and without any reference to a variation with *da*.

22 Raguž (1997: 421) states that with some verbs like *slušati* ‘listen’ (but not *ćuti* ‘hear’) or *gledati* ‘observe’ (but not *vidjeti* ‘see’) *da* is even excluded. But they obviously do not require a factive complement, as they refer to ongoing processes.
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(14b) Vidio je da/kako/(gdje) dolaze pred see:ptcp.sg.m aux.3sg comp come:pfv.prs.3sg before banku.
bank:acc.sg.f
‘He saw that he was arriving in front of the bank.’

In non-factual sentences the standard complementiser is again da, requiring the verb in the indicative and – as far as telic verbs are concerned – in the perfective aspect (15a). This means that – contrary to Albanian – complements are not differentiated according to their degree of epistemic support nor with respect to the distinction between factual and non-factual.23 If the main verb is in the imperative, the particle neka may serve as a variant of the complementiser da in its non-factual reading (15b); see Raguž (1997: 315).

(15a) Rekao mu je da odmah say:pfv.ptcp.m 3sg.m.dat aux.prs.3sg comp at.once come:pfv.prs.3sg
‘He told him that he should come immediately.’

(15b) Reci mu da ~ neka dode! say:pfv.imp.sg 3sg.m.dat comp come:pfv.prs.3sg
‘Tell him to come!’

In addition to its function as a complementiser, da serves as a conjunction initiating several types of subordinate clauses, too, for example final, optative, conditional and consecutive clauses, partially combined with the bi-conditional of the verb. We cannot go into any detail here; see for example Raguž (1997: 300–301, 427–438) and the comprehensive description of the functions of da in Rječnik (1884–1886: 163–214).

In Standard Croatian free relative clauses are initiated by the relativiser što, formally identical with the interrogative pronoun što ‘what’, used in interrogative and embedded WH-questions (Raguž 1997: 397–401). Embedded yes-no questions, however, are linked to the main clause by the complex complementiser da li ‘if’ as in (16).24

---

23 In contrast to Albanian, negation does not have any influence on the choice of the complementiser either. In both cases ne ‘not’ is inserted before the verb in the subordinate clause.
24 The form da is also part of other complex connectors like premda ‘though’ (< prem da).
(16) Ne znam da li je došao.
   neg know:prs.1sg if aux.3sg come:pfv.ptcp.sg.m
   ‘I don’t know if he has come.’

3.2 Complementisers in Molise Slavic

The traditional complementiser *da* has completely lost this function in Molise Slavic, and so has *štto*. Here the all-embracing complementiser is *ke ~ ka*,\(^{25}\) borrowed from Italian.\(^{26}\) It is insensitive to the degree of epistemic support. There is, however, a difference in the verb form combined with it in the complement clause.\(^{27}\) On the one hand, factivity and strong epistemic support require an indicative form corresponding to the verb in the main clause in terms of the Romance *consectutio temporum* as in (17). But on the other hand, in adapting to the differentiation between factual and intentional (non-factual), expressed in Italian by *che* + indicative vs. subjunctive, a special intentional construction has developed. It is rendered by *ke ~ ka* and a deontic modal construction, also functioning as a de-obligative future (future of necessity, NEC), with the clitic marker *jimat* ‘have, must’ + infinitive, see example (18). It corresponds exactly to the southern-Italian colloquial construction formed by *che* and the modal complex with inflected *dovere* ‘must’ + infinitive.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{25}\) This is also true for complement clauses with a causal connotation, governed by expressions or verbs conveying the emotional attitude of the speaker towards the given event, for which in Croatian both *da* and *štto*, are possible.

\(^{26}\) Both variants *ke* and *ka* go back to Italian *che* and/or dialectal *cha/che* (Giammarco 1968: 514–515) as the basic integration form in Molise Slavic, which directly corresponds to *ke* as the only form used in the conservative dialect of Montemitro. Due to the phonological process of akanye, however, frequently changing unstressed short *e*, *o* to *a*, in the dialects of Acquaviva and San Felice, the normal form is *ka*. But some conservative speakers still use *ke* as a variant even in these two villages. In view of this distribution, Rešetar’s (1911: 347) hypothesis of *ka* as the basic form with *ke* as an unstressed variety is problematic and even contradicts his own description of the relation between stressed and unstressed vowels (Rešetar 1911: 347).

\(^{27}\) Just like in Croatian and in contrast to Albanian, negation does not influence the choice of the complementiser. The negative particle normally is *ne* in both cases. With some verbs a special negative form exists, again identical in both cases, cp. *nenadaša* ‘he did not know’ in (17) with its positive equivalent *znadaša* ‘he knew’. In (18) the negative equivalent to *maš* ‘you must’ would be *nimaš* ‘you must not’, like in the recorded sentence: *Ja sa ti rekla ke nimaša po utra tijalu!* ‘I told you that you should not go into the pot!’.

\(^{28}\) The same is true for the local Molisan dialect, also replacing the subjunctive by a modal construction with *avé* ‘to have, must’; see Piccoli (2005: 172–173). In principle, a similar construction is possible in Italo-Albanian, too, here in form of the aforementioned future with *kam* ‘to have,
(17) \(\text{Je reka ka on nenadaša}\)
\[\text{AUX.3SG say:PFV.PTCP.SG.M COMP 3SG.M.NOM NEG.know:IPRF.3SG nišča.}\]

nothing

‘He said that he did not know anything.’

(18) \(\text{Sa ti rekla ka maš hi}\)
\[\text{AUX.1SG 2SG.DAT say:PFV.PTCP.SG.F COMP must:PRS.2SG 3PL.ACC štrajit.}\]

remove:PFV.INF

‘I told you to that you should remove them.’

Just like in Italian, and without an equivalent in Standard Croatian, the intentional function is synonymously expressed also by an infinitival clause, introduced by the conjunction za ‘for’ as in (19). Its Italian equivalent is the infinitival complement preceded by the preposition di ‘of’, for example in the Italian translation of (19): *Ha detto loro di scendere*. In Molise Albanian such a construction is obviously impossible, due to the absence of an infinitive in its verbal system.

(19) \(\text{Je njimi reka za sa skinit dol.}\)
\[\text{AUX.3SG 3PL.DAT say:PFV.PTCP.SG.M for REFL descend:PFV.INF down}\]

‘He told them to descend [down].’

The infinitival construction in Molise Slavic is a syntactic calque from Italian, with the preposition di being replaced by Slavic za. The formation of such constructions introduced by the preposition za is a typical result of Romance influence, generally claimed by Ivč (1958: 126) as “dem slavischen Sprachsystem vollkommen fremd” [completely alien to the Slavic language system].

Ivič (1958: 126) generally claims constructions of za + infinitive as “dem slavischen Sprachsystem vollkommen fremd” [completely alien to the Slavic language system].
in a subordinate clause as in (18) would also be possible, here: (19′) *Je njimi reka ka maju sa skinit dol* ‘He told them that they should descend’.

This double solution corresponds to a similar variation in Standard Italian between the infinitive and the subjunctive solution, whereas in the local Molisan dialect the infinitive seems obligatory (Piccoli 2005: 172). On the other hand, in a factual example like (17) the infinitive construction is excluded in Molise Slavic, in spite of the referential identity of the subjects of the main and the subordinate clause, permitting it in Italian and obligatorily requiring it in the local Molisan dialect; cp. the Italian equivalents of (17): *Ha detto che non sapeva niente.* ~ *Ha detto di non sapere.*

This means that Molise Slavic, when compared to the Romance varieties, shows a third possibility in allowing for variation in the case of non-factual, just like Italian and in contrast to Molisan, and in requiring obligatorily the explicit complement clause in the case of factuality, contrary to Italian and even more to Molisan, where only the infinitive construction is possible.

As for the (marginal) complementisers *kako* and *gdje* in Standard Croatian, they do not have an equivalent in Molise Slavic as the corresponding interrogative pronouns, *kaka* ‘how’ and *di* ‘where’, basically do not show this function. If this is due to a contact-induced loss or to a later development of the complementising function of *kako* and *gdje* in Serbo-Croatian remains an open question.

In contrast to Molise Albanian *ke*, likewise borrowed from Italian *che*, but restricted to the realm of complementisers, Molise Slavic *ke* ~ *ka* have adopted the relativizing function of *che*, too. But they did not replace the interrogative pronoun *što* ‘what’, neither in questions nor in free relative / embedded interrogative clauses; see (Breu 2019a).

As mentioned above, the Italo-Albanian complementisers corresponding to Italian *che* have additional functions in other types of subordinate clauses. In the case of Molise Slavic we could mention, among other things, their usage as conjunctions in consecutive and final clauses as in (20a) and (20b) respectively (Piccoli 2005: 173–174). Example (20b) is ambiguous, as the subordinate clause might also be interpreted as a causal clause in the sense of ‘because the wheat has to grow’. Apart from this, *ka* ~ *ke* also link main and subordinate clauses without any specific logical connection as in (20c), and they also serve as a conjunction in comparative clauses (20d).30 For *che* introducing causal clauses see section 4 below.

---

30 All these cases are parallel to the usage of *cha/che* in dialectal Molisan. See for example the following comparative construction from the neighbouring dialect of Palata (thanks to Domenica Catino): *[ˈmɛʎə ˈtardə kə ˈmajə]* ‘better late than never’.
Complementisers in language contact

(20a) *Je* norko *daždila* **ka**

AUX.3SG so.much rain:PTCP.SG.N COMP

su *sa* polagal sekolike *njive.*

AUX.3PL REFL flood:PFV.PTCP.PL all:Nom.PL field:Nom.PL

‘It has rained so much *that* all fields have been flooded.’

(20b) *Neka daždi,* **ka** ma rest *žita.*

PTL rain:INF COMP must:PRS.3SG grow:INF wheat

‘May it rain, so *that* the wheat will grow.’

(20c) *Štrega,* *kaka je* pola **ka** maša

witch how AUX.3SG go:PFV.PTCP.SG.F COMP must:IPRF.3SG

si *ga* po, je *rivala*

REFL.DAT 3SG.N.GEN go:PFV.INF AUX.3SG arrive:PFV.PTCP.SG.F

di vrata.

where door:Nom.PL

‘The witch, when she went *as/when/because* she had to leave, arrived at the door.’ (= The which, when she set out to leave, arrived at the door.)

(20d) *Jim veča ja* **ka** on,

have:PRS.1SG more 1SG.NOM COMP 3SG.M.NOM

na *gošta* veče.

one:ACC.SG.M year:ACC.SG.M more

‘I have more *than* he, one year more.’

Italian *che*, apart from being a complementiser on its own, is also part of many compound conjunctions or adverbs like *finché*, *fintantoché* ‘until’, *dopo che* ‘after, when’, *senza che* ‘without’, *purché* ‘if only’ or *prima che* ‘before’, *cosicché* ‘(so) that’. They have either been borrowed in Molise Slavic, e.g. *fin-ka*, *fina-tand-ka*, *dòp-ka*, *sendza-ka*, *pur-ka*, or they form calqued hybrid forms with the borrowed *ka* as a component like *prije-ka* ‘before’, *naka-ka* ‘(so) that’.32 This is also true in those cases, in which *che* in Italian is optional (pleonastic) or rare, like *mentre ~ mentre che* ‘during, when’, appearing as *mendr ~ mendr-ka*. Sometimes the source is clearly dialectal, e.g. in *tramjend ~ tramjend-ka* ‘during, when’ and *kvaš-ka* ‘as if’ from local Romance. In contrast to Italian, in Molise Slavic *ke ~ ka*

31 See section 2.2 above for similar cases in Molise Albanian.

32 A special form of this kind, dealt with below in section 4, is *aje-ka* ‘because’, corresponding to Italian *perché.*
is clearly preferred in such cases, and it even shows up, where *che* is unusual in Italian as in *sikom-ka* ‘as’, corresponding to Italian *siccome*, and *pen-ka* ‘hardly’, corresponding to *appena*. But there is no pleonastic *ka* with the conjunctions in embedded interrogative clauses, neither in total ones, formed with the borrowed conjunction *si* ‘if, whether’, as for example in (21) below, nor in partial ones, with conjunctions like *di* ‘where’, *kaka* ‘how’ or *štto* ‘what’. So, there are no equivalents to Albanian pleonastic *se* ‘that’ in the above examples in (5) and their Calabro-Albanian equivalents like *se ku* ‘where’, *se si* ‘how’ and *se č* ‘what’ in (11). In lacking such pleonasms, Molise Slavic has its parallel in Molise Albanian, likewise having borrowed Italian *che*; see 2.2 above.

Even verbs may combine with their complementiser in forming a kind of compound adverb, e.g. *par-ka* ‘seemingly’ ← It. *pare che* ‘it seems that’. Furthermore, we find cases of meaning extension of newly formed compounds, especially with respect to *naka-ka* ‘(so) that’, which has acquired the additional concessive meaning ‘though’, instead of borrowing or calquing Italian *benché* and in spite of the existence of the semantically near compound conjunction *pur-si* ‘even if, though’, calqued from Italian *anche se* or rather borrowed from its local equivalent *pura sa*.

On the other hand, in both Molise varieties combinations of the borrowed complementiser with interrogative pronouns in indirect interrogative clauses are absent. For example, Molise Slavic *di-ka* and Molise Albanian *ku-ke* are excluded, just like combinations of the type *dove-che* instead of *dove* ‘where’ in Italian and contrary to the inherited pleonastic formations of this type in Calabro-Albanian, here *se ku ~ ku* ‘where’; see 2.2 above.

In embedded yes-no questions, Molise Slavic is again quite different from Croatian in not using *da li*, completely unknown in the micro-language, as a complementiser, but rather the loanword *si* ‘if’ as in (21).33

(21) *Sa ja nenadam *si pa mahu now 1SG.NOM NEG.know:PRS.1SG if then must:IPRF.3PL
*platit parekju*.
pay:PFV.INF plane:ACC.SG.F
‘Now, I don’t know if they had to pay the plane afterwards.’

The conjunction *da*, in Molise Slavic most probably functioning traditionally as a complementiser just like in Croatian, has been reduced to its optative function;

33 The complementiser *si* is borrowed from local *sa/si*, but corresponds functionally also to Standard-Italian *se*, in both its functions, as a complementiser ‘if, whether’ and as the conjunction ‘if’, introducing conditional clauses.
see examples (22a–b). It is often combined with the *bi*-conditional, but in subordinate clauses like (22c) the present is also possible (Piccoli 2005: 173–174). In this case its function approaches that of the complementiser *ka* in non-factual (intentional) complements, though the optative meaning of the subordinate clause is expressed more directly.

(22a) «*Da bi* *ti kalala sajata teb s njom!*» *sa ju rekla ja.*

‘«The lightning may fall on you together with her!» I said to her.’

(22b) *Bog da bi ma pomoga nonda di grem!*

‘God may help me there, where I go!’

(22c) *Moli boga, da bi ga pomoga.*

‘He prays to God that he should help him.’

Interestingly, even in Italian optative constructions *che* is used, for example in the Italian equivalent of (22a), “*Che ti cali la saetta a te insieme a lei*, *le dissi*, while *ke ~ ka* are excluded in Molise Slavic. Like in the aforementioned preservation of the interrogative pronoun, this is another case of the Slavic minority language not respecting the polysemy of the Italian model *che*. Here an explanation for this differentiating development may be found in the optative construction itself (*da* + conditional), of which *da* is an integral part that cannot be replaced so easily by a loanword as is the case with isolated conjunctions. Cases like the clearly less frequent variant of (22c) with the indicative after *da* could then have been kept due to their parallel usage with the conditional type.

There is also a reason for *što* ‘what’ being preserved as an interrogative pronoun in Molise Slavic, in contrast to the polysemic structure of Italian *che*. Actually, in colloquial Italian *che* as an interrogative pronoun has been almost completely replaced by *cosa*, originally meaning ‘matter’, e.g. Ital. *cosa vuoi?* ‘what do you want?’, corresponding to Molise Slavic *što hoš*. So, at least in col-
loquial Italian, there was no obligatory polysemic model including ‘what’ that should have been calqued or borrowed in Molise Slavic.\textsuperscript{34}

Summing up what has been said about the three minority varieties in southern Italy, the polysemy of Italian \textit{che} doubtlessly had a role in rearranging the system of complementisers and pronouns. But the borderlines between the different developments based on this polysemy are not congruent. The most important difference seems to be the merger of the interrogative pronoun with the relativiser in both Italo-Albanian varieties, while in Molise Slavic they remained separated, as the traditional interrogative pronoun \textit{što} ‘what’ did not expand its functions to becoming a relativiser, or may have even lost it since immigration times. Furthermore, Albanian traditional \textit{që}, functioning as a complementiser and as a relativiser, different from ç ‘what’, was replaced in both functions by the latter, which in this way became highly polysemic and resembles in this sense very much Italian \textit{che}. On the whole, both micro-languages in contact follow different strategies of pattern borrowing, based both on the semantic structure of Italian \textit{che}, but differing in the specific part of its polysemy they take as a model. So its full-range polysemy is copied, but either with the exception of the interrogative pronoun (Molise Slavic)\textsuperscript{35} or including the interrogative pronoun, but with the exception of the complementiser (Italo-Albanian).

As for matter borrowing in the sphere of the complementiser, the isogloss runs across the Italo-Albanian varieties with Calabro-Albanian being conservative, whereas in Molise both the Slavic and the Albanian micro-language borrowed Italian \textit{che}, though to a different extent with respect to its grammatical functions. It is the relative marker that makes the difference, as Molise Slavic \textit{ke} (\textit{~ ka}) also functions as a relativiser, whereas Molise Albanian \textit{ke} does not. Why, contrary to Molise Slavic, the relativiser shares the same form with the interrogative pronoun in Italo-Albanian as a whole, seems to be an open question, if we do not claim this to continue a situation from historical stages of Albanian. In other words, a highly polysemic structure as in Italian \textit{che} may be divided into

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See Breu (2019a) for a similar argumentation in connection with not borrowing \textit{che} as a relative pronoun in free relative clauses. As shown in this paper, there are, however, certain case forms of \textit{što}, with the instrumental \textit{kime} in the first place, playing a role in the realm of relativisers, at least for some speakers. But in the subject and the direct-object position of attributive relative clauses \textit{što} is completely excluded as a relative marker. It could be added that at least some Molisan dialects have kept a special interrogative pronoun \textit{ched}, also different from the complementiser and the relativiser (Giammarco 1968: 517).
\item Actually, Molise Slavic is a special case here, as not only part of the semantic structure of \textit{che} is borrowed, but also the form \textit{che} itself.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
different partial models for the adaptation of the replica languages, dependent on language-specific characteristics.

### 3.3 Complementisers in Standard Slovene

The overall declarative complementiser in Slovene is *da* (23a–b), just like in Croatian, but in non-factual complements we normally find the particle *naj* as a complementiser (23c), optionally preceded by *da*.\(^{36}\) We will not go into further details here.

\begin{verbatim}
(23a) Rekla je, *da* pride.
    say:PFV.PTCP.SG.F AUX.3SG COMP come:PFV.PRS.3SG
    ‘She said that she will come.’

(23b) Rekel je, da je imela velike probleme.
    say:PFV.PTCG.SG.M AUX.3SG COMP AUX.3SG have:PTCP.SG.F
    big:ACC.PL problem:ACC.PL
    ‘He said that she had had big problems.’

(23c) Učitelj mu je reklo, *(da) naj* odide.
    teacher 3SG.M.DAT AUX.3SG say:PFV.PTCP.SG.M COMP
    leave:PFV.PRS.3SG
    ‘His teacher told him that he should leave.’
\end{verbatim}

### 3.4 Complementisers in Resian

Starting out from the rather similar situation in their respective standard language as a point of comparison, Resian seems to be less influenced by Italian *che* and its local variants than Molise Slavic. As a matter of fact, the examples in (24) and (25) show that Resian has preserved its traditional complementiser *da*.\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{36}\) See Sonnenhauser (this volume) for the role and historical development of the element *naj* and Toporišič (1984: 372–374, 530) for the range of functions of *da* in Slovene.

\(^{37}\) Examples (24a–b) and (25) are taken from the texts of Baudouin de Courtenay (1895: 175, 12, 5), cited with his own orthography, whereas examples (26a–b) are from recent field research. I am grateful to Malinka Pila for letting me have them.
Example (24a) contains a factual complement clause, and so does (24b), showing furthermore that da is often used to introduce direct speech.

(24a) Swá ráklá, dá mi hréwa po
AUX.1DU say:PFV.PTCP.DU.M COMP 1PL.NOM go:PRS.1DU on
pótě zá jítět jískat judícřh.
way:SG.DAT for go:INF seek:INF reason:SG.ACC
‘We [two] said that we were going our way [to go] to look for the common sense.’

(24b) E rékal úk, da «kán38 vi grěta?»
AUX.3SG say:PFV.PTCP.SG.M wolf COMP whither 2PL.NOM go:PRS.2DU
‘The wolf said [that]: «Where are you [two] going to?»’

The complement clause in example (25) is non-factual. Here da, abbreviated to d due to the initial a- of the next word, is combined with the imperative. Ježovnik (2015) claims this construction to be a syntactic loan from the Romance subjunctive.

As the Romance subjunctive and the da + imperative construction, having as their common basis a volitional or optative meaning, might be claimed non-transparent enough from a structural point of view for calquing, inherited patterns should, however, also be considered. See for example Dvořák (2005) on the syntax of Slovene imperatives, including those with the complementiser da preceding them. But in any case, the functional correspondence between the Italian and the Resian construction in the sense of Ježovnik’s (2015) interpretation cannot be denied and certainly figures as a parallelism in the common diagram of bilingual Resians, even if the construction of da + imperative as such exists also in Standard Slovene (and beyond).

(25) An̨ je prusìl, d aŋ ga dej spát to núћ.
3SG.M.NOM AUX.3SG ask:PTCP.SG.M COMP 3SG.M.NOM 3SG.M.ACC
give:IMP.SG sleep:INF DEM.DIST.ACC.SG.F night:SG.ACC
‘He asked that he should let him sleep that night.’

38 In Baudouin de Courtenay’s (1895: 12) original text, kan vi is amalgamated to kami, which he separated then in footnote *).
As the variation between the two examples in (26) shows, Resian, just like Molise Slavic, disposes also of a prepositional construction for expressing non-factivity, formed by za + infinitive and corresponding to Italian di + infinitive; cp. (26a) with the synonymous combination of da + imperative in (26b).

\[(26a)\]  
\[\text{Si ti rakla za prít.}\]  
\[\text{AUX.1SG 2SG.DAT say:PFV.PTCP.SG.F for come:PFV.INF}\]  
\[\text{‘I told you to come.’}\]

\[(26b)\]  
\[\text{Si ti rakla da ti pridi.}\]  
\[\text{AUX.1SG 2SG.DAT PTCP.SG.F COMP 2SG.NOM come:PFV.IMP.SG}\]  
\[\text{‘I told you that you should come.’}\]

Apart from its function as a complementiser in declarative subordinate clauses, da has a lot of other functions, including its usage as a conjunction in consecutive and final clauses (Steenwijk 1992: 176), which seem to be traditional, too. Nevertheless they are supported by the polyfunctionality of Italian che.

Resian also has complex conjunctions reminding the Molise Slavic pleonastic formations with the complementiser ke ~ ka as the second element. But the hybrid formations in question, like (in Baudouin de Courtenay’s notation) apena k ‘hardly’, siccome ko ‘as’, dopo ka ‘after, when’ or (Steenwijk 1992: 178–179) fín ki ‘until’, sebén ki ‘though’, do not have a borrowed equivalent of the Italian complementiser che as their second component, but rather genuine Slavic elements from the sphere of the interrogative pronouns ko(j), ka(j) ‘what’ and the relativiser ki; see below. Another hybrid type is formed with the help of the traditional complementiser da, for example čnča da ‘without’, with the first element borrowed from Italian senza ‘without’.

Let us now proceed immediately to a general comparative overview of the extent of Romance influence on the Albanian and Slavic varieties dealt with in this paper. Note, however, that the upper half of Table 2 in the following section 4 may serve as a summary of what has been said above about complementisers, relativisers, and the interrogative pronoun ‘what’ in the Slavic micro-languages, thus allowing for a direct comparison with the situation in the Albanian varieties in Table 1.
4 A comparison of the Romance influence in the sphere of complementisers

What we call the “sphere of complementisers” is defined by the whole range of phenomena connected by means of the functions of the polysemic element *che* in Italian in Figure 2 above, i.e. complementation, relative markers, the interrogative pronoun ‘what’ and causal conjunctions. The summarising Table 2, showing the overall Romance influence on Resian and Molise Slavic in these fields, is divided into three parts. Solid arrows symbolise matter borrowing, with borrowed elements in bold type, while interrupted arrows refer to pattern borrowing (calquing).

**Table 2:** Molise Slavic and Resian between internal development and Romance influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resian</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Molise Slavic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMP (factual)</strong></td>
<td>da</td>
<td>che</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMP (non-factual)</strong></td>
<td>da</td>
<td>che</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>infinitival construction</strong></td>
<td>za</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REL pronoun ‘what’</strong></td>
<td><strong>ke</strong></td>
<td>che</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAUSE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ke</strong></td>
<td>che</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ki, ka(j)</strong></td>
<td>che</td>
<td>što</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>par-da</strong></td>
<td>****---</td>
<td><strong>aje-ka</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pokaj-ka</strong></td>
<td><strong>perché</strong></td>
<td><strong>zašto-ka</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>perké</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pr-ke</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the uppermost part of this overview, in Resian the traditional complementiser *da*, existing also in Standard Slovene, has preserved its functions as the basic complementiser in declarative sentences, whereas Molise Slavic, in contrast to Standard Croatian, has replaced it by (*ke ~ ka* borrowed from Italian *che*). But both micro-languages show Italian influence in developing an infinitival construction with the preposition *za* in non-factual sentences, calquing Italian *di* + infinitive.

Including the information about Italo-Albanian and the contact-induced constructions for expressing non-factuality in the Slavic micro-languages, Table 3 sums up the complementisers in the four minority varieties dealt with in this paper. For

---

39 For the sake of better legibility only the forms of the akanye-dialect of Acquaviva have been listed here. In Montemitorio we would, of course, have *ke* instead of *ka*. 


the sake of simplicity Italian *che* was omitted here, with both matter and pattern borrowings set off in bold.

**Table 3:** A comparison of the complementisers in the Albanian and Slavic varieties in Italy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARB Calabria</th>
<th>ARB Molise</th>
<th>Molise Slavic</th>
<th>Resian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMP (factual)</strong></td>
<td><em>se</em></td>
<td><em>ke</em></td>
<td><em>ka</em></td>
<td><em>da</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMP (non-factual)</strong></td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td><em>ka + NEC</em></td>
<td><em>da + IMP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INF (non-factual)</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opposition between factual and non-factual (intentional) complements, kept in Italo-Albanian by means of the use of the subjunctive in the latter function, but originally missing in the Slavic varieties, was introduced into Molise Slavic by means of the adaptation to the local dialectal model of using the de-obligative future (NEC). In Resian the Romance subjunctive has been calqued by an imperative construction (IMP). Due to the lack of an infinitive in their systems, the Italo-Albanian varieties could not develop an infinitival construction similar to Slavic *za* + infinitive, calqued from the Italian *di*-complement.

The second part of Table 2 above refers to the relativisers and the interrogative pronouns, both homonymously expressed by *che* in Standard Italian. Molise Slavic borrowed *che* here only in its function as a relativiser, while it kept its traditional interrogative pronoun *što* ‘what’. In Resian, in spite of their formal similarity to Italian *che*, the relativisers *ka*, *ki* seem to be of Slavic origin, with *ki* serving as a relative marker in Standard Slovene, too.

The relativiser *ka* most probably goes back to a meaning extension of its traditional interrogative pronoun, whose full form is *kaj*, corresponding to *kaj* ‘what’ in Standard Slovene, but (now) rare in Resian. Here the variant *koj*, with its short form *ko*, is preferred. Originally ‘what’ was expressed in Slovene by *ka*, but has been preserved as such only in Venetian Slovene and in Resian. Today’s standard form *kaj*, evidenced already in the 16th century, goes back to *ka* + asseverative particle *j* (Bezlaj 1982: 9 s.v. *káj*). In the 16th century *kaj* – but not *ka* – was also used

---

40 Note that in Resian, contrary to *ka* in Molise Slavic, going back to *ke* (akanye), the very form *ka* could hardly be explained phonetically from an Italian source *che*. Note that *ka* is not used as a complementiser in Resian, in contrast to the Slovene *Prekmurje* dialect, where an existing opposition between *ka* and *da* even collapsed in favour of *ka*; see Greenberg (this volume). This reminds to some extent the Molise Slavic situation, at least, with respect to the withdrawal of *da*, whereas here *ke* ~ *ka* has been borrowed and contrasts with the interrogative pronoun *što* ‘what’, in its turn corresponding to *ka* ‘what’ in *Prekmurje* Slovene.
as a relative marker besides $kar < ka-re < *ka-že$. In modern Resian $kaj$ is mostly restricted to the meaning of ‘something’.\footnote{As this paper is not specifically addressed to etymological questions of Resian, we will not elaborate here on the difficult question if $ka(j)$ and $ko(j)$ go back to different sources, with the latter being connected to Slovene $ko$ ‘if, because, when’ etc., or, less probably, if $ko(j)$ is only a phonetic variant of $ka(j)$. In any case, Baudouin de Courtenay (1895: 399) explicitly explains $koj$ in a footnote as “kaj”. For our comparison it is important that the loanword $ke$ is not used as an interrogative pronoun and that there are also genuine-Slavic forms, by means of which relativisers and interrogative pronouns may be kept apart, e.g. $ki$: $koj$, besides the polysemic form $ka$. The problem becomes still more intricate as a consequence of the fact that the individual Resian dialects are not homogeneous in this field, as for example $ka$ as an interrogative pronoun seems to be restricted to the dialect of Stolvizza (besides $koj$), while the others only have $koj$ ~ $ko$. Furthermore, $ka$ as a relative pronoun is restricted to the dialects of Gniva and Oseacco, while in the San Giorgio and Stolvizza dialects in this function $ki$ is used; see \url{http://abaoaqu.maldura.unipd.it:8081/resianica/dictionaryForm.do} (Resian online dictionary, accessed 18 July 2021). This means, above all, that a syncretism of the interrogative ‘what’ and the relativiser exists only from a cross-dialectal point of view, whereas they are kept apart in the single dialects by having their individual contrasting couples out of the overall set of $k$-forms, which all go back to different derivations (gender, cases) of the same Proto-Slavic root *$k$–; see Bezlaj (1982: 30) for $ki$, (1982, 49–50) for $ko$, (1982: 7) for $ka$, and (1982: 9) for $kaj$. Resolving the puzzle of the formally and functionally overcrossing $k$-forms in Resian would require a special research on this topic.}

There are also cases of a relative marker $ke$, fewer in number and probably borrowed from Italian $che$; see the abbreviated example (27) with $ke$ besides the genuine (originally relative) Slavic $ki$, both functioning here as causal conjunctions.\footnote{They are mostly marked by means of italics in Baudouin de Courtenay (1895), his way of referring explicitly to borrowings. But there are also cases of $ke$ without italics. It remains unclear, if the author considered them as variants of the basic forms $ki$, $ka$, just like the more reduced forms $k$, $kь$, or if they simply escaped him.}

(27) \begin{tabular}{llllll}
Já & bon & mážal & têt... & $ki$ & já \\
1SG.NOM & AUX.1SG & must:PTCP.SG.M & go:INF & because & 1SG.NOM \\
man & têt & kár & je & dín, & $ké$ & to \\
must:PRS.1SG & go:INF & when:REL & be:PRS.3SG & day & because & 3SG.N \\
jœ́ & na & húda & pôt... & \\
be:PRS.3SG & INDF.F & bad:F & way & \\
\end{tabular}

‘I will have to go... because I must go as long as it is day, because this is a bad way...’
Complementisers in language contact

however, it most probably is a result of language contact. The polysemy of Resian *ka* as a relativiser and as an interrogative pronoun could well be due to a partial adaptation to the semantic structure of Italian *che*, too, as at least Standard Slovene does not use *ka(j)* as a relativiser.

As mentioned above, the full form *kaj* was historically used as a relative pronoun in written Slovene, but we do not know if this was also possible in Resian, before Romance varieties started to influence it. In any case, claiming a Romance model for the extension of its meaning (functions) remains just a hypothesis. If it is confirmed, Resian could be a parallel case to the Italo-Albanian meaning expansion of ç ‘what’ to a relative marker. In any case, these two micro-languages differ from Molise Slavic, where the loanword *ke ~ ka* is used as a complementiser as well as a relative marker, whereas *što* functions only as the interrogative pronoun meaning ‘what’. Compared with Standard Croatian, Molise Slavic *što* has even lost its once existing polysemy, comprising the function of a relativiser.43

Overall, it is worth noting that all variants of the micro-languages dealt with in this paper are strictly conservative with respect to the form of the interrogative pronoun in not borrowing it from the dominant varieties. On the other hand, only Molise Slavic (and partially Resian) has borrowed *che* as a relativiser. This situation is contrary to that of *che* as a complementiser, borrowed in the whole Molise area (but not in Resian and Calabro-Albanian), irrespective of the language family the micro-language in question belongs to. In other words, what we have is an implicational hierarchy for MAT borrowing in the given field: complementiser (particle) < relativiser (particle) < (interrogative) pronoun, with “<” symbolising ‘before’.

The third part of Table 2 refers to causal conjunctions, one of which is again *che* in (mostly dialectal or colloquial) Italian, besides the more specific conjunction *perché* ‘because’ (Standard Slovene *ker*, Standard Croatian *jer*). The situation is still more varied here than in the other fields. To begin with, both Slavic micro-languages borrowed Italian *che*; for Resian see example (28a) from Baudouin de Courtenay (1895: 6). Furthermore, in Resian the use of the relativisers *ki* and *ka(j)* with the function of causal conjunctions could again be cases of

---

43 This must not be mixed up with the interrogative pronoun *što*, introducing in Molise Slavic, among other things, free relative clauses, see above, an additional function of Resian *koj* ‘what’, too. In such cases, Resian *koj* may be preceded by the pleonastic complementiser *da* as in An he veđaet ... *da kój prodáš twój ođá* ‘He wants to know, what your father sells.’ (Baudouin de Courtenay 1895: 87). The same optional usage of the complementiser *da* occurs with other interrogative pronouns in indirect interrogative clauses like *da káku* ‘how’, *da zakój* ‘why’ (Steenwijk 1992: 176). This usage, unknown to Molise Slavic, corresponds to the pleonastic complementiser *se* in Albanian of the type *se ç* ‘what’, *se sì* ‘how’ like in the Calabro-Albanian examples in (11).
pattern borrowing on the model of Italian *che*; see example (28b) with causal *kaj* from Baudouin de Courtenay (1895: 7).

(28a) *To he bit téško za jítít nútár...,*
     *it will:3SG be hard to go inside*
     *ke tana wráteh sta dwá leóna.*
     *COMP at door:LOC.PL be:PRS.2DU two lion:DU.NOM*
     ‘It will be hard to go in..., *because* at the door there are two lions.’

(28b) *An ni mœ́šœ béčou̯ nikár,*
     *3SG.M neg have:IPRF.3SG money:GEN.PL nothing*
     *káj am bíl búžac.*
     *what 3SG.M be:PTCP.SG.M poor*
     ‘He had no money at all, *because* he was poor.’

Molise Slavic, however, contrary also to Standard Croatian, does not use *što* ‘what’ as a causal conjunction, not even in constructions expressing the emotional attitude of the speaker towards the given event, in which Croatian *što* varies with the complementiser *da*, see section 3.1. The only traditional causal conjunction is *aje*, nowadays almost always combined with *che*, thus forming the hybrid compound conjunction *aje-ka* ‘because’ as in (29a), replaceable by the borrowed causal conjunction *pëke* ← Ital. *perché*.44 The simple form *aje* is restricted to its function as an interrogative pronoun meaning ‘why’, i.e. as a synonym of the traditional pronoun *zašto*.

Note that *zašto* ‘why’ is the only traditional form of the interrogative pronoun in Molise Slavic, still used in both dialects considered as a variant of the forms *aje*, *jer*, which in their turn had been the traditional causal conjunctions; cf. Croatian *jer* ‘because’. So, language contact has induced several subsequent restructurings in this field, based on the form and the polysemy of Italian *perché* ‘why, because’. Starting from the original opposition between *zašto* ‘why’ and *jer* ‘because’, in a first step *jer* (and its local phonetic variants) also acquired the interrogative function of *zašto*, thus becoming its variant in the meaning ‘why’, while *zašto* in its turn, by the opposite development, based again on the polysemic model of *perché*, expanded to the meaning ‘because’. In a further step, calquing of the internal structure of *perché* with the complementiser *che* as its component led to the compositional hybrid forms *aje-ka* and *zašto-ka*. Finally, the polysemic form *perché → pëke* itself was borrowed.

44 The Molise-Slavic forms in Table 2 are again those of the Acquaviva dialect. In Montemitro, with its basic form *ke*, the hybrid forms are *jer-ke, er-ke, ajer-ke* ‘because’.
In addition, a parallel hybrid form zašto-ka has been formed, consisting of the interrogative pronoun and the complementiser ka, a (possible but rather rare) variant of aje-ka in (29a). Another variant is the loanword ka itself in its causal meaning (29b).

(29a) Nisma mogl spat, aje-ka bihu fandazma.
    neg.aux.1pl can:ptcp.pl sleep because be:iprf.3pl ghost:nom.pl
    ‘We could not sleep, because there were ghosts.’

(29b) Biša rajana pur s menom ka ja
    be:iprf.3sg furious:sg.f also with 1sg.ins comp 1sg.nom
    sa smijahu.
    refl laugh:iprf.1sg
    ‘She was annoyed at me, too, because I was laughing.’

Based on the hybrid conjunctions, Molise Slavic has developed a system different from Italian with its ambiguity of perché as an interrogative pronoun and as a causal conjunction, by using hybrid (pleonastic) forms with the added complementiser che in the latter case, thus giving rise to the oppositions aje: aje-ka and zašto: zašto-ka = ‘why’: ‘because’; see the direct opposition in the little dialogue (29c). When in such cases the direct borrowings pëke and ka are used, the ambiguity between ‘why’ and ‘because’ remains the same as in Italian.

(29c) «Ja ne moram jiskodit!» – «Aje?»
    1sg.nom neg can:prs.1sg get.out:pfv.inf why
    – «Aje-ka su škare odekaj!»
    because be:prs.3pl scissors here
    “I can’t get out!” – “Why?” – “Because there are scissors here!”

As for Resian, it also forms a hybrid conjunction, but in a clearly different way. The basis is again Italian perché, which, however, is decomposed into its components per ‘for’ + che ‘what’, with the polyfunctional che interpreted in terms of its function as a complementiser. The result is the hybrid calque par-da as in (30), composed of the borrowed element par ← per and the traditional complementiser da, replacing Italian che. In the examples we have come across up to now, like (30) from Baudouin de Courtenay (1895: 115), par-da is used only as a final conjunction, one of the functions of Italian perché besides its causal one; see also Steenwijk (1992: 177).
In Resian there are also pleonastic forms with the meaning ‘because’. In Baudouin de Courtenay’s (1895) texts we find, for example, *pokaj-ka*, based on the traditional form *pokaj* ‘why’, combined with the pleonastic *ka* (interrogative and/or relativising). On the other hand, there is also *pokaj-da* ‘why’, with the complementiser *da* added to the basic form *pokaj*.45 Finally, there is also the conjunction *perké* ‘because’ (Steenwijk 1982: 181), borrowed directly from Italian *perché*.

Calabro-Albanian *se*, apart from still being used as a complementiser, also functions as a variant of the causal conjunction *pse*; see the subordinate causal clause in (31a).46 As this double usage of *se* is known also from Standard Albanian, this parallel to Italian *che* seems to be original, without any need to explain it by means of language contact. But, of course, language contact may have contributed to keeping this polysemy after the emigration to Italy. As for Molise Albanian, it goes parallel with Molise Slavic in using the borrowed complementiser *ke* additionally as a causal conjunction (31b).47

(31a)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>vën</th>
<th>gjith</th>
<th>esposto,</th>
<th>se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and put:PRS.3PL</td>
<td>all exposed</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>shohen</td>
<td>gjindjat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have:PRS.3PL</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>see:PRS.3PL</td>
<td>people:DEF.NOM.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘And they expose it all, **because** the people have to see it.’

---

45 See, for example, the question with *pocai da* and the corresponding answer, introduced by *pocai ca* in the dialogue in paragraph 1424 of the Resian Catechism (Baudouin de Courtenay 1895: 459).

46 Interestingly enough, Albanian in Greece (Arvanitika) went the opposite way, by using now *pse* ‘because’ (< *për se* ‘for that’) as a variant of the traditional complementiser *se*. On the other hand, there is also a pleonastic formation *se oti*, at least among male speakers, combining *se* with the Greek complementiser *óti* (Sasse 1991: 394–395).

47 In Italo-Albanian, not considered in Table 2, we have not found up to now a parallel hybrid form of *pse* ‘because’ combined with *ke* of the type *pse-ke*, which could only have developed in Molise, as only here the complementiser *ke* itself has been borrowed. This is contrary to the aforementioned parallelisms in the domain of compound and pleonastic conjunctions with the element *ke* both in Molise Slavic and Molise Albanian.
(31b) Ka vemi Këmvash ke ka fërromi. (Molise)
have:PTL go:PRS.IPL C. COMP have:PTL sign:PRS.IPL
‘We have to go to Campobasso, because we have to sign (the contract).’

Calabro-Albanian has also borrowed Italian perché ‘because’, which serves as a variant of genuine Albanian pse, see example (32). In Molise Albanian normally only pse is used, while perché is restricted to sequences of code-switching from Italian. In this respect, it resembles the conservative Montemitro variant of Molise Slavic.

(32) Nëng m e nxuar jatroj,
not 1SG.DAT 3SG.ACC remove:AOR.3SG doctor:DEF.NOM.SG.M
perke u hrisja. (Calabria)
because 1SG.NOM cry:IPRF.1SG
‘The doctor did not remove it (= the plaster) from me, because I was crying.’

There are quite a lot of further influences based on Italian che as a model for the structural reorganisation of the minority languages, which cannot be dealt with in this paper. But one of them should be mentioned, as it could lead to the grammaticalisation of a newly developed form in terms of a ‘reportive evidential’. It is based on the local Italian impersonal form dice (che) ‘it is said (that), ‘allegedly’, literally ‘says (that)’, and appears in both alloglottic micro-languages of Molise; see examples (33a–b). Note that this happened by means of matter borrowing in Molise Slavic, while Molise Albanian shows pattern borrowing, resulting in a hybrid form, as the borrowed complementiser ke is added to the traditional Albanian verb Thom ‘say’ in its 3rd person singular present.

(33a) Dič-ka sa čujaša gruba. (Molise Slavic)
REP REFL feel:IPRF.3SG bad
‘He allegedly felt bad.’

(33b) Thote-ke errurën solde. (Molise Albanian)
REP arrive:AOR.3PL money:PL
‘It is said that money has arrived.’
5 Summary and conclusion

In concluding, we will emphasise some central results of the contact-induced developments of the complementisers in Italo-Albanian and Italo-Slavic minority languages, due to the influence of the highly polysemic Italian *che* and its equivalents in the local Romance varieties. The polysemy of *che* was the reason for including other parts of syntax in this paper, especially relative and causal clauses with their respective introducing elements.

In all contact areas we find matter and pattern borrowings, though in a different distribution. In Molise, the central region of our investigation, *che* was borrowed directly in the Slavic and the Albanian varieties, but only in Molise Slavic do the borrowed variants *ke* ~ *ka* serve as both a complementiser and a relativiser, while in Molise Albanian borrowed *ke* is restricted to the complementising function. The Slovene-based Resian micro-language in north-eastern Italy and also Calabro-Albanian preserved their original complementisers *da* and *se* respectively, not borrowing *che* at all in this function. In contrast, they adapted to the polysemy of Italian *che* as a model for semantic calquing. So, in Calabro-Albanian *se* replaced also the original alternative complementiser *që*, and in Resian the traditional interrogative pronoun *ka* expanded its functions to that of a relativiser. The latter development is found also in both Albanian varieties (with respect to ç ‘what’), but not in Molise Slavic, which preserved the interrogative pronoun *što* different from the borrowed relativisers *ke* ~ *ka*. As a consequence, Molise Slavic and Molise Albanian, though equally borrowing *che* as a complementiser, remain different with respect to its homonymy with the relativiser, present only in Slavic.

Again based on the characteristics of Italian *che*, causal conjunctions changed in different ways in the single contact areas: in this case both Slavic micro-languages borrowed *che*, while both Italo-Albanian varieties kept their original conjunction *pse*. The Italian alternative causal conjunction *perché*, having *che* as one of its constituents, led to several hybrid formations in Molise Slavic, which added *ke* ~ *ka* to the original conjunction *jer* (> *aje*) ‘because’ and to the original interrogative pronoun *zašto* ‘why’, thus restoring the original opposition between the conjunction (now with *che*) and the pronoun (without *che*), alien to Italian, on the basis of a preceding merger of both, due to the polysemy of Italian *perché* ‘why, because’.

Besides fully borrowing Italian *perché*, Resian replaced *che* as a component of *perché* by its traditional complementiser *da*, which led to the hybrid form *par-da*. Italo-Albanian as a whole did not form hybrid causal conjunctions, and only Calabro-Albanian borrowed *perché* as a variant of the traditional causal conjunction *pse*, while Molise Albanian did not. But even Molise Slavic does not behave homogeneously in this respect, as only the dialect of Acquaviva borrowed...
perché (<i>pëke</i>) as a free variant of <i>ka</i>, <i>aie-ka</i>, <i>zašto-ka</i>, while it is rather rare in the more conservative variety of Montemitro.

Apart from the restored opposition between the interrogative pronouns meaning ‘why’ and the causal conjunctions extended with the complementiser, another opposition has developed in Molise Slavic, differentiating factual and non-factual (intentional) statements. This was achieved by means of introducing a new type of complement clauses on the model of local Romance varieties, more precisely by combining its de-obligative future with the complementiser to express non-factuality (intentionality). While the differentiation between ‘why’ and ‘because’ is contrary to the Italian polysemy of <i>perché</i> ‘why, because’, the non-factual solution clearly copies the Romance differentiation.

Resian developed a contact-induced construction for non-factual (intentional) sentences, too, by combining the complementiser with the imperative, thus calquing the Romance combination of the complementiser with the subjunctive. What is more, both Slavic micro-languages have adopted the Italian (standard and dialectal) possibility of using an infinitival construction in case of referential identity between the main and the subordinated clause in non-factual sentences. This was achieved by means of the preposition <i>za</i> preceding the infinitive, i.e. by a construction clearly alien to the traditional Slavic grammatical structures.

On the whole, the model of the dominant varieties often overrides inherited structures in the alloglottic minority languages by copying the polysemy of <i>che</i> or even by borrowing it as a lexical element. But every single contact situation shows individual results based on the overall possibilities given by the Romance models. Sometimes the “genealogic” factor plays a role, especially the impossibility of adopting infinitive constructions in Italo-Albanian due to the lack of an infinitive. So, the inherited Albanian hypotactic construction with the pure subjunctive in non-factual (intentional) sentences remained absolutely untouched.

There are also some implications and restrictions with respect to the borrowed grammatical elements in the investigated varieties. So, if the relativiser is borrowed, then the complementiser is borrowed, too, but not the other way round. The interrogative pronoun is still more stable than the relativiser, as it is never borrowed. The complementiser can only become homonymous with the interrogative pronoun, if the functions of the latter are extended, not the other way round. In Slavic the interrogative pronoun and the complementiser remain different, but they merge in Albanian (though possibly already prior to the immigration). When the borrowed complementiser is used pleonastically in the source language, it is used in the same way in the replica languages and with the same restrictions, for example, by excluding the combination of <i>che</i> with interrogative pronouns in indirect interrogative sentences, contrary to the combination
with adverbs serving as conjunctions. If the complementiser was not borrowed, however, there are no such restrictions, as show Resian da koj and Albanian se ç with their traditional complementisers pleonastically preceding the interrogative pronoun ‘what’.

Comparing our results with contact-induced change in other minority languages in Italy could confirm or relativize them in terms of grammatical developments in situations of total language contact with the same donor language (and its local varieties). For example, the German-based Cimbrian variety of Luserna in Northern Italy, and the Greek-based varieties in Southern Italy corroborate our findings about the borrowability of Italian *che*, as Salentinian Griko (Rohlfs 1977: 98, 204) borrowed *ka* from its local Romance neighbours both as a complementiser and a relativiser, while Cimbrian (Tyroller 2003: 234–236) borrowed *ke* only as a complementiser. This reflects the situation in Molise Slavic and in Molise Albanian respectively as well as the implicative order claimed above. On the other hand, the Calabro-Greek variety seems to be as conservative in this respect as Calabro-Albanian in not borrowing *che* at all (Rohlfs 1977: 97–98, 204). In future research, similar comparisons could be made with respect to the other contact-induced developments in this paper, and the role of the “genealogic” background of the individual micro-languages in the sense of their traditional structure could be analysed in more detail.

The alloglottic varieties in Italy are only one facet of an overall spectrum of linguistic enclaves, but fine-grained knowledge about the behaviour of their complementisers and the like could, hopefully, be an important contribution to a general theory of contact-induced grammatical change in situations of total language contact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations and glosses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 In spite of its formal similarity to *che*, deriving from Latin *quid* and *quod* ‘what’, the form *ca* ([ka], serving as a complementiser and a relativiser in the local Romance dialects, goes back to Latin *quia* ‘because’ (Rohlfs 1968: 195–196; 1969: 188–189). Actually, *ca* is also found in Molisan dialects (Giammarco 1968: 354), but the borrowed form *ke* in Molise Slavic and Molise Albanian clearly refers to the alternate complementiser *cha/che* as their source. In any case, these local differences are irrelevant for the process of borrowing in the minority languages itself.
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