

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces*.

Edited by Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway and Eva-Maria Remberger.

© 2019. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Matrix complementizers in Italo-Romance

Valentina Colasanti and Giuseppina Silvestri

University of Cambridge

Based on uncharted evidence from Italo-Romance, we describe and discuss three types of matrix clauses, i.e. jussives, concessives and optatives, which reveal a certain degree of consistency but also display different patterns of microvariation. We show how such clauses may be introduced by complementizers, whose insertion is strictly dependent on the utterance of speech-act material at the outset of the sentence. The variation in the overt realization of the complementizers and the utterance of initial interjections conveys different pragmatic information. We finally interpret the morpho-syntactic behaviour of jussive, concessive and optative matrix clauses through the interplay of three semantico-syntactic variables, i.e. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality.

Keywords: matrix clauses, left periphery, speech act, complementizers, Italo-Romance

1. Introduction

In Romance, complementizers convey a number of functions, other than the core role of subordinators (Evans 2007: 367, 2009; see also Ledgeway 2000, 2005; Reis 2006; Truckenbrodt 2006; Heycock 2006; Franco 2009; Cable 2007; Hill 2012; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2014 a.o.). Namely, like in other languages of the world, in Romance too complementizers (e.g. *if*) can introduce in subordinate clauses, i.e. apparent subordinates that display the distribution of main clauses. A typical case of in subordination is represented by free-standing conditional predicates like the following in (1):

- (1) *Se solo potessi tornare indietro nel tempo...* (standard Italian)
if only could.1SG return back in.the time
'If I only could turn back time...'

Recent studies show that, especially in Ibero-Romance and in Italo-Romance, complementizers may introduce other types of non-embedded matrix clauses. Crucially,

the morphological makeup of the complementizer reveals the semantico-pragmatic type of the clause (cf. Etxepare 2008; Cruschina 2012; Demonte and Fernández Soriano 2014; Haegeman and Hill 2014; Hill 2012; Villa-García 2015; Corr 2017, a.o.). As for Italo-Romance, it has been noticed that in modern varieties the selection of a specific type of complementizer may depend on certain information with respect to the semantico-pragmatic meaning of the whole sentence. For instance, in modern Abruzzese the examples in (2) represent a minimal pair where the contrast in the pragmatic interpretation is conveyed by the selection of the complementizer (D'Alessandro and Di Felice 2015: 130; cf. Roberts 2004): the sentence introduced by *ca* expresses a reassuring meaning, whereas *chi* is selected to convey a warning stance (Prins 2014: 4).

- (2) a. Ca nin chischə!
that not fall.2SG
'You won't fall!'
[Interpretation: 'Don't worry. It is the case that you will not fall.']
b. Chi nin chischə!
that not fall.2SG
'You might fall!'
[Interpretation: 'Watch out! It is the case that you might fall.']
(modern Abruzzese, D'Alessandro and Di Felice 2015: 2)

In this contribution we will discuss a selection of Italo-Romance matrix clauses introduced by the complementizers *CA* and *CHI* (and allomorphic forms thereof).¹ In particular, we will describe the morpho-syntactic behaviour of three types of matrix clauses: jussives, concessives and optatives.

2. Complementizers in matrix clauses in southern Italian dialects

We will provide a description of new data from extreme and upper southern Italian dialects (henceforth ESIDs and USIDs, respectively). We will discuss different patterns of complementizer selection in non-embedded contexts which, in turn, correlate with the modality of the whole utterance and the morphological exponence of the verb complex. The relevant data come from three USIDs, i.e. Teramo, Santa Maria Capua Vetere (Caserta) and Santa Maria del Cedro (Cosenza), and two ESIDs, i.e. Melito di Porto Salvo (Reggio Calabria; henceforth Melito) and Vernole (Lecce). All utterances have been elicited through face-to-face interviews to native speakers conducted by the authors. The selection of these Italo-Romance varieties witnesses the different distribution of complementizer forms between USIDs and

1. CA and CHI are the outcomes of Latin QUIA and QUID, respectively (Rohlf 1969: §786a).

ESIDs (see Ledgeway 2016: 1018ff and references therein). In particular, in all the matrix clause types described below (cf. §§2.1–2.3) the USIDs may employ either CA or CHI.² As exemplified in (3) for the variety of Santa Maria del Cedro, in embedded contexts CA introduces declarative (realis) complements (3a) and CHI volitional (irrealis) complements (3b):

- (3) a. Rita dicia ca non chiova.
 Rita says CA not rains
 ‘Rita says that it is not raining.’
 b. Rita vulera chə stèrəsə afòra.
 Rita want.3SG.COND CHI stay.2SG.COND outside
 ‘Rita would like for you to stay outside.’ (Santa Maria del Cedro)

By contrast, in the ESIDs the matrix clauses taken into consideration below (cf. §§2.1–2.3) are introduced only by complementizer forms (i.e. MI/CU)³ which usually introduce embedded volitional (irrealis) complements. In particular, while in the dialect of Melito the complementizer MI introduces volitional (irrealis) complements (4a), in the dialect of Vernole the same irrealis complements are introduced by the complementizer CU (4b):

- (4) a. Mariu volia mi canta.
 Mario wanted MI sings
 ‘Mario wanted/would like to sing.’ (Melito)
 b. Lu Mariu ulia cu canta.⁴
 the Mario wanted CU sings
 ‘Mario wanted/would like to sing.’ (Vernole)

2. However, we acknowledge within USIDs a great wealth of microvariation concerning complementizer selection, see Ledgeway (2000, 2009, 2012); Manzini and Savoia (2005: vol. 1, Chapter 3); Colasanti (2015, 2017, 2018) *inter alia*.

3. MI and the allomorphs (m)i, (m)u and ma attested in central and southern Calabria derive from Latin MODO, whereas CU is the outcome of Latin QUOD (for further etymological details and different proposals see Roberts and Roussou 2003: 88ff; De Angelis 2017: 77). We will discuss in detail the *status* of MI and CU in §3.1.

4. In Vernole, as in several dialects of Salento, CU triggers *Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico* (RF, phonosyntactic doubling; (i)). More specifically, when CU is a subordinator (ia), it may remain unpronounced in some cases (ib). However, the RF occurs anyway and signals the presence of a phonologically and syntactically active CU (Rohlf 1969: 105; Ledgeway 2015):

- (i) a. Lu Mariu ole cu [kk]anta
 the Mario wants CU sings
 b. Lu Mariu ole [kk]anta
 the Mario wants sings (Vernole)

Consistently with the distribution of complementizers among the ESIDs, in the dialect of Melito and Vernole declarative subordinate clauses are introduced by CA (cf. 4):

- (5) a. Mariu dici ca no chiovi.
 Mariu says CA not rains
 ‘Mario says that it is not raining.’ (Melito)
- b. Lu Mariu tice ca nu chiòe.
 the Mariu says CA not rains
 ‘Mario says that it is not raining.’ (Vernole)

The syntactic function of MI-clauses has been object of a number of studies (Calabrese 1993; Loporcaro 1995; Ledgeway 1998, 2007, 2012, 2015; Roberts and Roussou 2003: 88ff; Damonte 2005, 2009, 2011; De Angelis 2014, 2017). It has been shown that in the present day ESIDs, other than the function of complementizers, such elements are irrealis mood markers. Following Ledgeway (1998, 2007, 2013), MODO-forms have been reanalysed from complementizers to non-finite markers. For the purpose of this contribution, based on our first-hand data on matrix clauses in USIDs and ESIDs, we observe that the distributional properties of MI and CU validate the hypothesis (Ledgeway 1998, 2007, 2013) that MI and CU show a different distribution with respect of the complementizers found in the USIDs (cf. (3) with (4) and (5)). Hence, the distinct nature of MI and CU becomes evident both in embedded and non-embedded contexts (see §3.1 for more details).

2.1 Jussive clauses

The first type of clause which we call ‘jussive’ is related to the expression of command or exhortation. In order for the speakers to spontaneously produce the target-utterances of jussive type, we provided the description of a likely context situation. The discourse context given to the speakers was about some guy, Mario, who does not really want to go somewhere. Yet, the speaker demands that he goes and expresses the coercive stance to the hearer. The resulting utterances are the followings:

- (6) a. (Ca) (Mario) vənissə (Mario)!
 CA Mario come.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ Mario
 ‘Mario had better come!’ (Teramo)
- b. (Ca) (Màriə) facessə u bravə (Màriə)!
 CA Mario do.3SG.PST.SUBJ the good Mario
 ‘Mario had better behave!’ (Santa Maria Capua Vetere)
- c. (Ca) (Màriə) vənissa (Màriə)!
 CA Mario come.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ Mario
 ‘Mario had better come!’ (Santa Maria del Cedro)

- d. (Mariu) *(mi) (*Mariu) veni (Mariu)!
 Mario MI come.3SG Mario
 'Mario had better come!' (Melito)
- e. (Lu Mariu) *(cu) (*lu Mariu) begna (lu Mariu)!
 the Mariu CU come.3SG.PRS.SUBJ the Mario
 'Mario had better come!' (Vernole)

In the varieties of Teramo (6a), Santa Maria Capua Vetere (6b) and Santa Maria del Cedro (6c) the speakers may select the complementizer *CA* in jussive clauses. The subject of the clause (i.e. *Mario/Màriə*) may linearly occur in pre- or postverbal position (6a–c). In the varieties of Melito (6d) and Vernole (6e), by contrast, *MI* and *CU* have to be obligatorily selected. Moreover, the subject (i.e. (*lu*) *Mariu*) may linearly occur in pre- or postverbal position but never between *MI/CU* and the verb (cf. 6a–c with 6d, e). Specifically, *mi veni* (6a, 7a) and *cu begna* (6b, 7b) form an unbreakable unity in that no constituents, such as the subject (*lu*) *Mariu*, can intervene between them.

More specifically, we tested if the declarative complementizer *CA* found in our ESID varieties (cf. 5) and the optative matrix complementizer *CHI*⁵ can co-occur with *MI/CU* (7). The result is that the jussive clauses below are ungrammatical:

- (7) a. (*Chi/ *Ca) *(Mi) veni Mariu!
 CHI CA MI come.3SG Mario
 'Mario had better come!' (Melito)
- b. (*Ci/ *Ca) *(Cu) begna moi lu Mariu!
 CHI CA CU come.3SG.PRS.SUBJ now the Mario
 'Mario had better come now!' (Vernole)

As we can see in (8), speakers of USIDs often utter these clauses with an initial monosyllabic non-lexical interjection, typically *Oh!*.⁶ Whenever the interjection is realized, the complementizer *CA* in the USIDs is mandatorily uttered too.⁷ Also, in jussives a prosodic pause occurs between the initial interjection and the beginning of propositional clause, revealing that the prosodic continuum of the utterance can

5. Other than *CA* and *MI/CU* the ESIDs discussed here avail themselves of *CHI* which in the varieties of Melito and Vernole occurs only in matrix clauses of the optative type (§2.3; see also De Angelis 2017: 142ff.).

6. The graphical realization of the interjection is merely conventional. The non-lexical interjections that the speakers may use are more frequently monosyllabic and often correspond to a vocalic segment which can be lengthened for expressive purposes, e.g. *Oh!* corresponds to [o:(~)].

7. This co-occurrence finds striking parallels in Emilian and Venetan dialects, as well as standard Italian, where lexical interjections require the realization of the complementizer (cf. Munaro this volume).

be broken before CA. In particular, this prosodic space between the interjection (i.e. *Oh!*) and the complementizer (i.e. CA) can host other speech-act elements, such as vocatives (i.e. *Combà!* / *Guagliù!*).⁸ Moreover, as we highlight in the examples (8b) and (8c) below, the utterance of a speech-act element, i.e. either the interjection or the vocative, makes the realization of CA obligatory in the USIDs.

- (8) a. Oh! Combà! *(Ca) vənissə Mariə!
 INTJ VOC CA come.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ Mario
 ‘Hey! Pal! Mario had better come!’ (Teramo)
- b. Oh! Guagliù! *(Ca) (Màriə) facessə u bravə (Màriə)!
 INTJ VOC CA Mario do.3SG.PST.SUBJ the good Mario
 ‘Hey! Guys! Mario had better behave!’ (Santa Maria Capua Vetere)
- c. Oh! Guagliù! *(Ca) (Màriə) vənissə (Màriə)!
 INTJ VOC CA Mario come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
 ‘Hey! Guys! Mario had better come!’ (Santa Maria del Cedro)

From a pre-theoretical perspective, the complementizer CA in (8) seems to mark the boundary between the speech-act field, placed at the leftmost area of the whole utterance, and the propositional clause structure (Ross 1970). Prosody consistently signals such configuration, as a pause (#) is realized between the two parts. A neat prosodic division within the same act of speech production arises. The utterance (8b) shows the prosodic organization in (9):

- (9) [_{speech-act} Oh! (#) Guagliù! ... # [_{propositional} *(Ca) (Màriə) facesse u brave (Màriə)]]⁹

The speech-act area is further potentially endlessly expandable with the insertion of other speech-act elements, such as interjections (i.e. *Oh!/Ja!*), and vocatives (i.e. *Guagliù!*):

- (10) Oh! Ja! Guagliù! Ja!... *(Ca) facessə u bravə (Màriə)!
 INTJ INTJ VOC INTJ CA do.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ the good Mario
 ‘Hey! Come on! Guys! Come on!... Mario had better behave!’

To conclude, the main properties of jussives concern the optionality of CA in the USIDs and the obligatory presence of MI/CU in the ESIDs. Concerning the complementizer CA, we pointed out that it must be realized whenever the speaker utters

8. The pragmatic purpose of this type of vocatives is for the speaker to catch the hearer’s attention.

9. The speech-act elements used in jussives and concessives can also be uttered in isolation, as their semantico-pragmatic stance is conveyed even if they are not integrated in the prosodic contour of a propositional clause.

Some common properties can be singled out. The position of the subject is consistently postverbal across all varieties. Also, the verb expresses ‘irrealis’ mood through the synthetic subjunctive morphology in the USIDs (i.e. *vānessā/vānissa*; 11a–c). In the ESIDs the ‘irrealis’ mood can be realized with the synthetic present subjunctive, as in the variety of Vernole (i.e. *begna*; 12b), or analytically with the complex ‘MI+verb’, as in Melito (i.e. *mi veni*; 12a). The different status of the ESIDs with respect to the distribution of the complementizers is also confirmed against the concessive clauses in that no complementizer can be inserted before ‘MI+verb’.

It is worth considering the response of native speakers to the request of uttering some speech-act elements before the concessive clause. It turns out that interjections and vocatives are uttered in a separate prosodic space, which is not integrated within the prosodic domain of the clause. The speaker can utter (12a) and (12b) consecutively, as two parts of the same sentence. Yet, the two utterances are prosodically autonomous, since an intonational break occurs.

- (12) a. Eh sì! Guagliù!...
 INTJ yes guys
 'Alright, guys!'
 b. (Ca) (*Màriə) vənessə Măriə.
 CA COME.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
 'Mario, may come.' (Santa Maria Capua Vetere)

More specifically, (12a) can convey the concessive stance through intonation only and independently from the utterance of the concessive predicate (12b). Such prosodic division and pragmatic interpretation is further corroborated by the distribution of CA. Namely, uttering the speech act elements (12a) right before the propositional part of the sentence (12b) does not make the realization of CA obligatory.

2.3 Optative clauses

We now sketch the third type of matrix clauses that in both the USIDs and the ESIDs of our database display a structural internal consistent behaviour, i.e. optatives with a negative stance (viz. curses). The context provided to our informants during data elicitation was a situation whereby the speaker is extremely upset about the hearer's behaviour to the point of imprecating curses on him/her. Speakers resorted to the inventory of curses available in each variety which prove to be highly formulaic in terms of lexical content.

In all the varieties of our database, the complementizers CHI/CA are optionally inserted (13).

- (13) a. (Chə/ *Ca) tə pozzənə accidə!
 CHI CA YOU.OBJ CAN.3PL.PRS.SUBJ kill.INF
 'May they kill you!' (Teramo)
- b. (*Chə/ Ca) tə putessərə accidə!
 CHI CA YOU.OBJ can.3PL.IMPF.SUBJ kill.INF
 'May they kill you!' (Santa Maria Capua Vetere)
- c. (Chə/ *Ca) tə pəgghjissa nu lampə!
 CHI CA YOU.OBJ take.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ a lightning
 'May lightning strike you!' (Santa Maria del Cedro)
- d. (Chi/ *Ca) *(mi) ti mangianu i cani!¹⁰
 CHI CA MI YOU.OBJ eat.3SG the dogs
 'May dogs devour you!' (Melito)
- e. (Ci/ *Ca) *(cu) mueri!¹¹
 CHI CA CU die.2SG.PRS.IND
 'May you die!' (Vernole)

As a remark on the variation concerning the complementizer selected, we notice that all varieties employ CHI,¹² with the exception of the upper southern variety of Santa Maria Capua Vetere which may insert the complementizer CA (13b). From a pragmatic point of view, the speakers were strikingly consistent in providing the interpretation of the clause introduced by CHI/CA. Namely, the insertion of the complementizer corresponds to a stronger stance of the curse, mirroring a deeper involvement of the speaker. Further revealing properties of optatives become evident when the utterances in (13) are realized with an initial interjection which makes the pragmatic stance even more salient. Again, the utterance of the initial interjection makes the realization of CHI or CA mandatory (14).

- (14) a. Ih *(chə) tə pozzənə accidə!
 INTJ CHI YOU.OBJ can.3PL.PRS.SUBJ kill.INF
 'May they kill you!' (Teramo)

10. In the dialect of Melito CHI and MI coalesce and form an unbreakable element, phonetically resulting in [ˈkɪmmi]. Allomorphic variants (*chimma*, *chimmu*) are attested in several Calabrian varieties and introduce optative matrix clauses (Rohlf 1972: 335–336; Ledgeway 1998; De Angelis 2017).

11. As pointed out in fn. 5, CU may remain unpronounced. Yet, in Vernole CU cannot be deleted in optative clauses introduced by CHI.

12. In some other northern Calabrian varieties (Cosenza), which in the past an opposition between CA and CHI, nowadays CA is the only complementizer used and CHI is only employed in restricted contexts such as optatives (Ledgeway 2009: 9).

- b. Ih *(ca) tə putessərə accidə!
 INTJ CA you.OBJ can.3PL.IMP.F.SUBJ kill.INF
 'May they kill you!' (Santa Maria Capua Vetere)
- c. Ih *(chi) mi ti mangianu i cani!
 INTJ CHI MI you.OBJ eat.3SG the dogs
 'May the dogs devour you!' (Melito)

The prosodic contour of the utterance reveals that the interjection and the complementizer form an unbreakable speech unit, as no further element, such as a vocative, i.e. *Mari* (15a) and *Pè* (15b) can intervene.

- (15) a. Ih (*Mari) chə tə pəgghjissa nu lampə!
 INTJ VOC CHI you.OBJ take.3SG.IMP.F.SUBJ a lightening
 'May lightning strike you!' (Santa Maria del Cedro)
- b. Ih (*Pè) chi mi ti mangianu i cani!
 INTJ VOC CHI MI you.OBJ eat.3SG the dogs
 'May the dogs devour you!' (Melito)

One can argue that the interjection and the complementizer form one prosodic unit. Evidence to support this claim comes from the elliptical use of the optative that speakers resort to in order to censor themselves and mitigate the invective. In this case, what is uttered is the unit 'INTJ+COMP' only (16a), necessarily followed by MI/CU in the ESIDs (16b, c).

- (16) a. Ih-chə...! (Santa Maria del Cedro)
 INTJ+COMP
- b. Ih chi-mi ...! (Melito)
 INTJ+COMP+MI
- c. Ih ci cu ...! (Vernole)
 INTJ+COMP+CU

The utterances in (16) display prosodic and pragmatic autonomy. To conclude, optatives, as jussives and concessives, provide a complex picture based on the different degrees of pragmatic stance conveyed by the presence or the absence of the complementizer. In either event, the morphological mood expresses the irrealis modality of the sentence. In the unmarked word order of the clause the subject is placed in postverbal position. Finally, whereas for jussives and concessives all USIDs select CA, for optatives they may employ CHI (13a, c).

3. Microvariation in matrix clauses

The empirical evidence described above (§2) from the USIDs and the ESIDs reveals a certain degree of consistency in the behaviour of jussive, concessive and optative matrix clauses with respect to different factors of internal variation. Namely, the optional overt realization of the complementizers *CHI/CA*, the utterance of initial interjections and the differences in the interpretive outcomes based on these elements result in recurrent patterns. In particular, we noticed that, when the speakers utter some speech-act related material, such as interjections or vocatives, the realization of the complementizer is obligatory. As for the selection of different complementizer forms, the most interesting case concerns optatives. Whereas in jussives and concessives USIDs make optional use of *CA*, in optatives *CHI* may be selected. Moreover, the realization of the interjection and the complementizer in optatives show a peculiar co-occurrence, as the two elements prosodically weld together. Given this evidence, we will account for the complementizer selection as a fact related to a specific pragmatic stance of the utterance. The realization of the complementizer and the pragmatic value of the utterance set, in turn, a specific modality of the whole clause. Therefore, we will provide an interpretation for the correlation between the presence of complementizer, the modality of the sentence and the verb mood morphology in jussive, concessive and optative matrix clauses (§§4–5).

3.1 The status of *MI* and *CU*

Among the dialects we described in the previous section (cf. §2), the extreme southern varieties of Melito and Vernole set apart, due to a number of properties contrasting with the USIDs. We observed that jussives and concessives in USIDs are optionally introduced by *CA*. In ESIDs jussives and concessives are obligatorily headed by *MI/CU* and no complementizer can be simultaneously realized, not even when the propositional clause is preceded by speech-act elements. One might wonder what the common behaviour of *MI/CU* in matrix clauses could reveal of their syntactic status of subordinators. It has been shown that in the syntax of subordination of the present-day ESIDs of southern Calabria *MI* functions as an infinitival marker (Ledgeway 1998, 2007, 2013) rather than a complementizer. One piece of syntactic evidence for such conclusion comes from the ordering of *MI* with respect to other clausal elements, such as the preverbal negator (Ledgeway 2007: 345ff.). In the ESIDs of southern Calabria the reflexes of *MŌDO* invariably follow the

preverbal negator *non*. The same ordering occurs in jussive (17a)¹³ and concessive (17b) matrix clauses:

- (17) a. (*mi) Non mi parra troppu Petru!
 not MI speak.3SG too.much Pietro
 ‘Pietro had better stop speaking!’
 b. (*mi) Non mi canta allura Petru, si no voli!
 not MI sing.3SG then Pietro if not want.3SG
 ‘Pietro may not sing, if he does not want to!’ (Melito)

In contrast, in the ESID variety of Salento (i.e. Vernole) *cu* precedes the preverbal negator *nu* in both jussives (18a) and concessives (18b):

- (18) a. Cu nu (*cu) begna moi Petru!
 CU not come.3SG.PRS.SUBJ now Pietro
 ‘Pietro had better not come now!’
 b. Cu nu (*cu) begna chiùe Petru, si nu bole!
 CU not come.3SG.PRS.SUBJ anymore Pietro if not wants
 ‘Pietro may not come anymore, if he does not want to!’ (Vernole)

In the dialects of Melito (13d) and Vernole (13e) the optative clauses may be introduced by the complementizer *chi* (cf. 13d and 13e, respectively; §2.3). We observed that the same complementizer obligatorily precedes *mi/cu* when interjections and vocatives are realized at the outset of the utterance (cf. 14c; §2.3). Whenever a negator is inserted in the structure, the two varieties result in different configurations. More specifically, in the dialect of Melito the negator follows *chi* and, predictably, precedes *mi*, giving rise to the sequence *CHI > NEG > MI* (19a; cf. 17a, b). Such sequence is ruled out in the variety of Vernole, as the negator follows *cu* which, in turn, follows *chi* (*CHI > CU > NEG*) (19b; cf. 18a, b):

- (19) a. Chi nu mi (*nu) ti faci jornu!
 CHI not MI you.DAT= makes day
 ‘May tomorrow never come for you!’ (Melito)
 b. Ci (*no) cu nu pozza mai ire bene!
 CHI CU not can.2SG.PRS.SUBJ never go.INF well
 ‘May you never live well!’ (Vernole)

The different placement of negator in all the three types of matrix clauses corroborates the different syntactic position and function of the heads *mi* and *cu*. More specifically, *cu* occupies a structural higher position than *mi*. This would mirror

13. For a detailed account of the morphosyntax of negative imperatives in the varieties of the extreme south of Calabria see Ledgeway et al. (2016).

the syntactic status MI and CU when functioning as subordinators. As shown in previous works, CU and MI occupy the head of two different syntactic fields of subordinate clauses, i.e. CP and TP, respectively. Namely, following Ledgeway's (1998, 2007, 2013) analysis based on Rizzi's (1997) rich structure of the CP, CU would occupy the lower head of Fin(iteness) P(hrase), whereas MI is a mere infinitival marker to be mapped in the TP field.

3.2 The role of intonation

We showed extensively that the utterance of a non-lexical monosyllabic interjection at the outset of the matrix clause requires the spell-out of CA/CHI (§§2.1–2.3), which would be otherwise optional. Also, we observed that, whenever some speech-act elements are realized, a different prosodic configuration distinguishes jussives and concessives from optatives. While in the former a prosodic pause occurs between the interjection and the complementizer, so that other speech-act related material (i.e. vocatives) can be inserted, in optatives the interjection and the complex 'CHI+MI/CU' coalesce. It follows that the outset of such matrix clauses hosts the most prosodically salient elements of the utterance. However, whereas in jussives and concessives the interjections and the vocatives can be analysed as a sequence of independent exclamations, in optatives the same speech-related elements fully integrate in the prosodic configuration of the propositional clause. Therefore, an optative clause introduced by interjections qualifies as a fitting case of exclamative prosody. As shown by Sorianello (2010, 2011) for standard and regional Italian, the syntactic elements which head an exclamation bear the highest tonal pitch, whereas the rest of the utterance displays a lower frequential level. The resulting prosodic contour of the whole utterance is of a descending type (D'Eugenio 1976; Avesani and Vayra 2005; Grice et al. 2005). Even though we do not provide here the results of an instrumental analysis of the intonation of matrix clauses,¹⁴ we argue that optatives present a descending prosodic contour as the highest tonal pitch falls on the initial elements of the utterance, i.e. 'INTJ+CHI(+MI/CU)', which plausibly belong to the same tonal unit (Gussenhoven 1984: Chapter 6; Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990; Truckenbrodt 2012). The prosody of jussives and concessives too can be accounted for in terms of exclamative type. Yet, they display an overall different prosodic configuration with respect to optatives. Given that the speech-act elements preceding jussives and concessives can be prosodically isolated by means of pauses, they are able to bear their own tonal configuration. The prosodic contour

14. The present work is part of a more extended study on the matrix clauses and speech act across standard and non-standard Romance varieties (Colasanti and Silvestri in progress).

of the rest of the utterances shows a pattern in which, arguably, the highest tonal pitch falls on the verb. However, jussives are further distinguished from concessives through a different sequence of high and low tones.

Such prosodic properties, i.e. the high tonal contour of the utterance outset as well as the intonation status of the syntactic heads of the matrix clauses (see 16), are to be accounted as by-products of different structural configurations. We assume that syntax determines prosody, thus we shall interpret the prosody of interjections and syntactic heads as necessarily mediated by syntactic functions (Heim 2017). What the prosody of such matrix clauses indisputably reveals is the strict interplay between the CP (and TP) field and the non-propositional, speech-act related field that exists beyond the last projection of the CP. Furthermore, the utterance and the distribution of the interjections reveals that such clauses cannot be embedded (20a-c).

- (20) a. *Dicə ca oh guagliù (ca) vənissa Màriə!
say.1SG CA INTJ guys CA come.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ Mario
b. *Dicə ca oh (ca) stissədə accurtə Màriə!
say.1SG CA INTJ CA stay.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ careful Mario
c. *Dicə ca ih (chə) tə pəgghjissa nu lampə.
say.1SG CA INTJ CHI you.OBJ take.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ a lightning
(Santa Maria del Cedro)

The embedding of jussives (20a), concessives (20b) and optatives (20c) introduced by the interjections is impossible. Hence, it seems that the speech-act elements do not display an unconstrained distribution. Namely, interjections and vocatives (*Oh! Mari!* in 21a) can occur at the beginning of the matrix clauses and cannot be realized at the outset of the subordinates (cf. *ca no chiova chiù* in 21):

- (21) Oh! Mari! Mə para ca (*oh!) (*Mari!) no chiova chjù.
 INTJ VOC me.DAT= seems CA not rains anymore
 ‘Hey! Mary! It seems that it stopped raining.’ (Santa Maria del Cedro)

Therefore, we argue that in non-embedded jussives, concessives and optatives the interjections occupy a structural higher non-propositional area. If spelt out, they interact with the syntactic lower structure and trigger the spell-out of the CP and TP heads.

In the next sections we provide a sketch of a unified structural interpretation for jussives, concessives and optatives. We will show how the interactions of three semantico-syntactic variables ultimately map the microvariation within the domain of matrix clauses.

Given the possibility of a rich articulate CP¹⁵ we assume that the higher position Force may be activated and involved in the expression of speech-act related information. Specifically, the higher area of the CP seems to be involved in mapping speech-act material which we assume is lexicalized outside of the CP.¹⁶ Therefore, we label such structural field as ‘BEYOND-FORCE’.

We consequently assume that a relation holds between the utterance of interjections (and vocatives) BEYOND-FORCE and the realization of the position Force in the CP in the matrix clauses of our database. In particular, we will show that in some cases what is crucial for the structural account of prosodically and pragmatically marked matrix clauses is the area above Force. In matrix clauses the activation of Force is strictly related to one of the three variables, i.e. Mood, which encodes features within the TP through the verb morphological exponence (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997:205 a.o.).¹⁶

Finally, all variables play a role in expressing the sentence modality which identifies the clause type at the semantico-pragmatic level.¹⁷ ‘Modality’ ultimately defines a composite semantico-syntactic setting through the necessary combination of specific factors, such as the utterance of interjections (and vocatives) BEYOND-FORCE, the presence of the complementizer within the CP and the verb morphology (‘Mood’). By way of illustration, compare the clauses in (24) where neither complementizer nor speech-act material are uttered at all. Verb morphology only is sufficient to disambiguate the clause modality:

- (24) a. Ti pigghia nu lampə. [declarative]
 you.OBJ take.3SG.PRS.IND a lightning
 'A lightning strikes you (because you are nearby a tree during a storm).'
- b. Ti pəgghiera nu lampə. [counterfactual]
 you.OBJ take.3SG.PRS.COND a lightning
 'A lightening could strike you (if you were nearby a tree during a storm).'

15. We claim here that this structure undergoes the phenomenon of truncation (Rizzi 1997, 2001). In short, we witness a reduction of a given structure at the lower layer that blocks the projection of higher functional categories. Hence, in our perspective the presence of a split-CP is possible but not always necessary in the varieties investigated in this paper.

16. See §5.

In this paper we will not present a formalization of the variable *BEYOND-FORCE* and its syntactic structure. We acknowledge the presence of a great wealth of literature concerning the syntacticization of the conversational domain (cf. Speas and Tenny 2003; Sigurdsson 2004; Bianchi 2006; Baker 2008; Giorgi 2010; Cruschina 2012; Miyagawa 2012; Haegeman and Hill 2014; Haegeman 2014; Wiltschko and Heim 2016; Hinterhölzl and Munaro 2015; Corr 2017, a.o.). However, for a formalization of ‘*BEYOND-FORCE*’ adopting Martina Wiltschko’s neo-performative approach (2016, in progress) see Colasanti and Silvestri (in progress).

17. For a definition of modality see Palmer (1986) and Bybee and Fleischman (1995).

- c. Ti pəgghissa nu lampə! [optative]
 you.OBJ take.3SG.IMPF.SUBJ a lightening
 'May lightning strike you!' (Santa Maria del Cedro)

Therefore, it goes without saying that the three variables we build our interpretation on are tangled to each other and act concurrently. Therefore, modality in the matrix clauses is mapped through the setting of interjections (and vocatives) BEYOND-FORCE, the position Force in the CP and Mood, namely by the lexicalization of CP material and the indicative versus the subjunctive opposition within the TP (cf. Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014).

Furthermore, as we observed before, whenever some speech-act particles are realized at the outset of the utterance of all three types of matrix clauses, a different prosodic division emerges (see §3.2).

In the next section (§5) a unified interpretation of jussives, concessives and optatives will be put forward. We will show how the interactions of the three variables ultimately gives us the key to interpret the microvariation across the domain of matrix clauses in Italo-Romance.

5. Interpreting jussives, concessives and optatives

With the definition of the three variables in mind, i.e. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality, we will proceed with the interpretation of the matrix clauses we described in this paper (viz. jussives, concessives and optatives). Moreover, it is worthwhile noticing that while the three variables are all necessary to interpret matrix jussives, concessives and optatives in Italo-Romance, these are not always at work simultaneously, as it will be clear below (§§5.1–5.4).

5.1 Jussive clauses

As shown in §2.1 above, three generalizations can be made concerning the morpho-syntactic behaviour of jussive clauses in the southern Italian varieties: (a) in all the varieties investigated in this paper the selection of the matrix complementizer appears to be optional.¹⁸ However, when an interjection (or a vocative) is present, the realization of the complementizer is obligatory; (b) the subject of the clause may linearly occur in preverbal or postverbal position; (c) the morphological mood present in jussive clauses is always an irrealis subjunctive.

18. We do not consider MI in the varieties of the extreme south of Calabria to be a complementizer (see §3.1).

As we can see in example (25) below, if there is no speech-act material beyond the higher position Force in the split-CP and the complementizer *CA* does not lexicalize any positions in the CP, the sentence has a weak jussive stance (25a).¹⁹ As we can see in (25b), if the complementizer *CA* lexicalizes the lower position Fin in the split-CP, the stance of the sentence is strong. However, if we have an interjection beyond Force (viz. *Oh*), then the complementizer *CA* in the higher position Force cannot be dropped (25c). In the sentence in (25b), we assume that the complementizer *CA* lexicalizes the lower position in the CP Fin and carries an [irrealis] feature which has to be checked with the verb *vinissədə* in the TP (that is endowed as well an [irrealis] feature). However, in the example in (25c) *CA* lexicalizes the higher position Force and carries a [speech] feature,²⁰ which has to be checked with the interjection *Oh* BEYOND-FORCE.²¹

- (25) a. [ForceP Force [TopP (Màriə) [FinP Fin [TP vinissədə_[irrealis]]]]]]
Mario come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
‘Mario would come!’ [weak jussive]
- b. [ForceP Force [TopP (Màriə) [FinP ca_[irrealis]]]]
Mario CA
[TP vinissədə_[irrealis] (Màriə)]]]
come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
‘Mario had better come’ [strong jussive]
- c. Oh_[speech] [ForceP* (ca_[speech]) [TopP (Màriə) [FinP Fin
INTRJ CA Mario
[TP vinissədə_[irrealis] (Màriə)]]]]]
come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
‘Mario had better come!’ [very strong jussive]
(Santa Maria del Cedro)

By reinterpreting jussive clauses through the three variables described above (§4), we can see that all the three variables *can* be in action at the same time. Specifically, if speech-act material occupy the layer outside the CP (viz. BEYOND-FORCE), the

19. In particular, our informants pointed out that the speaker is less involved towards what is being said when *ca* is dropped. Hence, the 'jussivity' can be 'weak', 'strong' and 'very strong' according to our informants' judgements.

20. We are considering the [speech] feature BEYOND-FORCE as an *edge*-feature (see Munaro 2010, this volume).

21. For the specific of feature checking and other syntactic mechanisms in action, especially concerning the structural relationship(s) between the CP and the ‘conversational domain’ above it (viz. BEYOND-FORCE) see Colasanti and Silvestri (in progress).

force of the sentence is shared between BEYOND-FORCE (viz. interjection *Oh!*) and the complementizer *CA* in Force.

Moreover, in all sentences the subjunctive mood expresses an [irrealis] feature. Hence, it seems that the irrealis modality of the sentence can be expressed only overtly or overtly and covertly at the same time. In particular, modality marking can be shared between the complementizer in Fin and the subjunctive verb in the TP (cf. 25b) or can be only expressed by verbal morphology (cf. 25a). More generally, depending on the interaction of the three variables (viz. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality), a matrix jussive can convey a different stance (i.e. weak, strong and very strong jussive stance).

To conclude, in matrix jussive clauses the three variables can be in action at the same time and the following interactions between BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality are possible (Table 1):

Table 1. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality in jussive matrix clauses.

Sentence-type	BEYOND-FORCE	Mood	Modality	Examples
Weak jussive	×	✓	✓	(25a)
Strong jussive	×	✓	✓	(25b)
Very strong jussive	✓	✓	✓	(25c)

As we can see in Table 1, the variable BEYOND-FORCE plays a role only when a speech-act layer beyond the CP is activated, i.e. when speech-act material such as interjections and vocatives are present. As we can notice in the examples (25a) and (25b) for Santa Maria del Cedro, the stance of the sentence can be only weak and strong if the variable BEYOND-FORCE is not playing any role. At the same time, the other two variables, i.e. Mood and Modality are always active in all jussives. However, when all the variables are active at the same time, the sentence has a very strong jussive stance (25c).

5.2 Concessive clauses

As shown in §2.2, three generalization can be put forward concerning the morpho-syntactic behaviour of concessive clauses in the southern Italian varieties: (a) in concessive matrix clauses it is not possible to have interjections BEYOND-FORCE; (b) the subject is always postverbal; and, (c) the morphological mood is always an irrealis subjunctive.

As we can see in (26) for the variety of Santa Maria del Cedro, if in concessives the complementizer *CA* does not lexicalize any positions in the CP, the clause is a weak matrix concessive (26a). However, if the complementizer *CA* lexicalizes the

lower position Fin in the split-CP, the sentence has a stronger stance. As in all the sentences in (26) the morphological mood is always an irrealis subjunctive, we assume that in the case of matrix concessives the complementizer CA can only lexicalize the lower position Fin in the split-CP as its [irrealis] feature has to be checked with the verb *vinissəda* in the TP, which is endowed with the same feature. Hence, as revealed by the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (26b), it seems that, at least in concessive matrix clauses, the complementizer cannot lexicalize the higher position in the CP, i.e. Force, and thus cannot carry a [speech] feature, as we have seen above for jussive clauses (cf. 25).

- (26) a. [_{ForceP} Force ... [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} (*Màriə)
Mario
vinissədə_[irrealis] (Màriə)]]]
come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
'Mario may come.'
[weak concessive]
- b. [_{ForceP} Force ... [_{FinP} ca_[irrealis] [_{TP} (*Màriə)
CA Mario
vinissədə_[irrealis] (Màriə)]]]
come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
'Mario may come!'
[strong concessive]
- c. *Oh_[speech] [_{ForceP} ca_[speech] [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} (*Màriə)
INTRJ CA Mario
vinissədə_[irrealis] (Màriə)]]]
come.3SG.PST.SUBJ Mario
'Mario may come!'
[very strong concessive]
(Santa Maria del Cedro)

By providing an interpretation of concessive clauses through the three variables described above (§4), we can notice that in matrix clauses the three variables do not have to be active at the same time. In particular, the speech-act material cannot occupy the layer outside the CP (viz. BEYOND-FORCE). Therefore, we have to assume that the force of the sentence cannot be modified through the interaction between BEYOND-FORCE (viz. interjection *Oh!*) and the complementizer *CA* in Force. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (26c). Moreover, in all sentences the subjunctive mood carries an [irrealis] feature. Hence, it seems that the irrealis modality of the sentence can be expressed either overtly only or overtly and covertly at the same time. In particular, in matrix concessives the modality of the whole sentence can be shared between the complementizer in *Fin* and the subjunctive verb in the TP (cf. 26b) or can be only expressed by verbal morphology (cf. 26a).

On the basis of the interaction of BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality, a matrix concessive sentence can have a different stance, i.e. weak and strong, but never very strong concessive stance.

To conclude, in matrix concessive clauses it is impossible to have all the three variables in action at the same time. Only the following interactions between BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality are given (Table 2):

Table 2. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality in concessive matrix clauses.

Sentence-type	BEYOND-FORCE	Mood	Modality	Examples
Weak concessive	x	✓	✓	(26a)
Strong concessive	x	✓	✓	(26b)
*Very strong concessive	x	x	x	(26c)

As we can see in Table 2, in concessives the variable BEYOND-FORCE does not play any role, at least overtly.²² However, both variables Mood and Modality are always at play since the mood in the TP is always a morphological subjunctive and the modality of the sentence is always irrealis. As we have shown for jussives (cf. §5.1), the complementizer *CA* in concessive matrix clauses can be optional. The only difference between (26a) and (26b) above is the force of the sentence (i.e. weak or strong). It follows that the presence of the complementizer *CA* can have an influence on the force of the sentence. Moreover, it is impossible to have very strong concessives, since the speech-act field above the CP (i.e. BEYOND-FORCE) cannot be activated in concessive matrix clauses.

5.3 Optative clauses

As shown in §2.3, optative clauses display similarities with jussives clauses (cf. §2.1, §5.1) rather than with concessive clauses (cf. §2.2, §5.2). Specifically, three generalizations can be put forward concerning the morpho-syntactic behaviour of optatives: (a) in all the varieties of our database the selection of the matrix complementizer appears to be optional. However, when an interjection (or a vocative) is present, the realization of the complementizer is obligatory; (b) the subject of the clause may linearly occur in preverbal or postverbal position; and, (c) the morphological mood present in jussive clauses is always an irrealis subjunctive.

22. Following a comment of an anonymous reviewer, we want to specify that there is always an activation of the speech-act field in every embedded-clause we took into consideration in this paper. However, in the case of concessives the structure is just silent.

As we can see in example (27a) below, when there is no speech-act material beyond the higher position Force and the complementizer CHI does not lexicalize any positions in the CP the sentence is a weak optative. However, when the complementizer CHI lexicalizes the lower position in the CP (i.e. Fin), it carries a [irrealis] feature, which has to be checked with the irrealis subjunctive verb *ruppissädä* in the TP. The sentence results in a strong optative (27b). An optative matrix clause has a stronger optative stance when an interjection, i.e. *Ih*, is present beyond Force and the complementizer CHI lexicalizes the higher position in the split-CP, Force, and carries a [speech] feature which has to be checked with the interjection *Ih* lying beyond Force (27c).

- (27) a. [_{ForceP} Force ... [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} si ruppissədə_[irrealis] nu vrəzzə]]]
CL break.3SG.PST.SUBJ an arm
'May he break his arm!' [weak optative]
- b. [_{ForceP} Force ... [_{FinP} chə_[irrealis] [_{TP} si ruppissədə_[irrealis]
CHI CL break.3SG.PST.SUBJ
nu vrəzzə]]]
an arm
'May he brak his arm!' [strong optative]
- c. Ih_[speech] [_{ForceP} *(chə_[speech]) [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} si ruppissədə_[irrealis]
INTJ CHI CL break.3SG.PST.SUBJ
nu vrəzzə]]]
an arm
'May he break his arm!' [very strong optative]
(Santa Maria del Cedro)

All the three variables involved in the interpretation of jussives *may* be in action at the same time in optatives as well. In particular, the activation of the layer above the CP, namely BEYOND-FORCE, is possible and plays a role in conveying the force of the sentence together with the complementizer in Force (cf. 27c).

In all the optative sentences in (27) the subjunctive mood carries an [irrealis] feature, so that the irrealis modality of the sentence can be expressed either overtly only or overtly and covertly at the same time. In particular, the whole modality of the sentence shared between the complementizer in Fin and the subjunctive verb in the TP (cf. 27b) or can be only expressed by verb morphology (cf. 27a). More generally, depending on the interaction of BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality a matrix jussive sentence can have a different stance, i.e. weak, strong and very strong jussive stance.

To conclude, in matrix optative clauses the three variables can be in action at the same time but also the following interactions between them are possible (Table 3):

Table 3. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality in optative matrix clauses.

Sentence-type	BEYOND-FORCE	Mood	Modality	Examples
Weak optative	x	✓	✓	(27a)
Strong optative	x	✓	✓	(27b)
Very strong optative	✓	✓	✓	(27c)

As we can see in Table 3, the variable BEYOND-FORCE plays a role only when a speech-act layer beyond the CP is activated,²³ i.e. an interjection is uttered. The sentence results in a weak or strong stance when the variable BEYOND-FORCE is not at work. At the same time, the other two variables, i.e. Mood and Modality, are always in action. Finally, if all the variables are simultaneously activated (27c), the sentence has a very strong optative stance.

5.4 Three variables for a unified interpretation

The interpretation of jussives, concessives and optatives through three variables, i.e. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality, allows us to put forward certain generalizations concerning the morpho-syntactic behaviour of matrix clauses in Italo-Romance. Specifically, not in all matrix clauses the variable BEYOND-FORCE is relevant, as only in jussives and optatives we observe the activation of the speech-act layer. While the variable BEYOND-FORCE is not playing any role at all in concessives (cf. §5.2), it may be active in optatives (cf. §5.3) and jussives (cf. §5.1). Furthermore, we showed that the variables Mood and Modality affect all matrix clauses. This might suggest that modality is a primitive phenomenon to be expressed in the language. In curse optatives the irrealis subjunctive mood is the only morphological option. More generally, this is linked to the fact that the modality of the sentence can be expressed either overtly only or overtly and covertly at the same time. In particular, the expression of the modality of the whole sentence can be shared between the complementizer in FinP and the subjunctive verb in the TP or it can be only expressed by verbal morphology. In all the matrix clauses of our database Modality plays a key role in any case. Namely, all sentences refer to an irrealis discourse context, i.e. a situation referring not to a scenario actually existing at the time of the utterance. What is more relevant in jussives and optatives is that the strongest stance of the sentence can be expressed employing specific means, i.e. utterance of interjections, realized with high pitch intonation, and presence of complementizers.

23. See fn. 22.

6. Conclusions

In this contribution we assessed and described new empirical evidence concerning three types of matrix clauses in southern Italian dialects, i.e. jussives, concessives and optatives. Our description highlights that the optional presence of the complementizer contributes to define the pragmatic function of the sentence. We also proved that peculiar patterns arise by realizing interjections right at the outset of the utterance. The speech-act material requires the spell-out of CHI/CA. In order to accommodate these microvariation facts within a maximally unifying interpretive account, we singled out three semantico-syntactic variables, i.e. BEYOND-FORCE, Mood and Modality, and their interactions at the structural level.

As a general point, we argue that the parameters of variation related to the speech-act material occupying an area placed BEYOND-FORCE, the irrealis morphological exponence (Mood) and its semantic/syntactic realization (Modality) are all paramount for the explanation of the microvariation in matrix clauses. Excluding or underrating one of the three would lead to an inadequate descriptive and interpretative account.

Arguably, most of the empirical observations concerning the matrix clauses in Italo-Romance can be said for other Romance varieties as well, in particular Ibero- and Gallo-Romance. We envisage that some of the intuitions on the variables which play a role in the morpho-syntactic distribution of matrix clauses in Italo-Romance represent the first step towards a more comprehensive understanding of the syntactic status of matrix clauses in Romance varieties and beyond. A wider comparative assessment of such matrix clauses is left for further research (Colasanti and Silvestri in progress).

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to the audience of the 'Brussels Conference on Generative Linguistics 9', as well as to two anonymous reviewers, for their valuable comments. Special thanks go to Martina Wiltschko and the 'Eh-lab' group at the University of British Columbia for their insightful feedback and suggestions on a previous version of this paper. All errors are entirely our responsibility.

The entire article is the result of joint work of the authors in all respects. For the administrative purposes of the Italian academia only, Giuseppina Silvestri takes responsibility for §1 to §3 and Valentina Colasanti for §4 to §6. Valentina Colasanti acknowledges funding from St John's College Cambridge (UK) 'Graduate Scholars' Scholarship' (October 2014–September 2018). Giuseppina Silvestri acknowledges funding from the Leverhulme-funded research project 'Fading voices in southern Italy: investigating language contact in Magna Graecia' (RPG-2015-283).

References

- Avesani, Cinzia & Mario Vayra. 2005. Quale informazione codificare per la sintesi dell'intonazione? In *Italia linguistica. Discorso di scritto e di parlato*, Marco Biffi, Luciana Salibra & Omar Calabrese (eds), 235–248. Siena: Protagon.
- Baker, Mark. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge: CUP.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511619830>
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2006. On the syntax of personal arguments. *Lingua* 116: 2023–2067.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2005.05.002>
- Bybee, Joan L. & Fleischman, Suzanne. 1995. *Modality in the Grammar and Discourse* [Typological Studies in Language 32]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.32>
- Cable, Seth. 2007. Insubordination in Tlingit: An aerial effect? *Northwest Journal of Linguistics* 5: 1–38.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. The sentential complementation of Salentino: A study of a language without infinitival clauses. In *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Adriana Belletti (ed.), 28–98. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2015. The Complementiser System of Ceparnese. MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2017. On triple complementation in Southern Lazio dialects. In *(Re/De) Contextualisation. Structure, Use and Meaning*, Elena Buja, Stanca Măda, Mona Arhire (eds), 41–50. Braşov: Editura Universităţii Transilvania.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2018. Towards a microparameter C-hierarchy in Italo-Romance. In *Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives on Romance Syntax*, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula & Alexandru Nicolae (eds), 191–225. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Colasanti, Valentina & Giuseppina Silvestri. In progress. To the left of the left periphery. Ms, University of Cambridge.
- Corr, Alice. 2017. Ibero-Romance at the syntax-pragmatics interface: The clause and beyond. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford: OUP.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199759613.001.0001>
- D'Alessandro, Roberta & Claudio Di Felice. 2015. The diachrony of Abruzzese complementation. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 60(2–3): 129–145.
- D'Eugenio, Antonio. 1976. The intonation systems of Italian and English. *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata* 8: 57–85.
- Damonte, Federico. 2005. La diffusione della particella *mi* in alcune varietà messinesi: Problemi di metodo. In *Dialecti in città. Atti del convegno Sappada/Plodn, 30 giugno–4 luglio 2004*, Gianna Marcato (ed.), 237–242. Padua: Unipress.
- Damonte, Federico. 2009. La particella *mu* nei dialetti calabresi meridionali. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 9: 101–117.
- Damonte, Federico. 2011. Matching moods: Mood concord between CP and IP in Salentino and Southern Calabrian Subjunctive complements. In *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol. 5, Paola Benincà & Nicola Munaro (eds), 228–256. Oxford: OUP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199740376.003.0008>

- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2014. Origini formali e funzionali della particella (m)i, (m)u, ma nell'area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale. In *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba.* (Potenza, Castelmezzano, Lagopesole, 6–8 novembre 2014), Patrizia Del Puente (ed.), Potenza: Il Segno Arti Grafiche.
- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2017. Between Greek and Romance: Competing complementation systems in Southern Italy. In *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean settings. Challenges for Historical Sociolinguistics*, Piera Molinelli (ed.), 135–155. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110554274-008>
- Demonte, Violeta & Fernández-Soriano, Olga. 2014. Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. In *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, Variationist and Typological Perspectives* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 214], Andreas Dufter & Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo (eds), 217–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2008. On quotative constructions in Iberian Spanish. In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions* [Typological Studies in Language 80], Ritva Laury (ed.), 35–77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.80.04etx>
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), 366–431. Oxford: OUP.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2009. *Insubordination and the Grammaticalisation of Interactive Presuppositions*. Paper given at Methodologies in determining morphosyntactic change, Osaka, March 2009.
- Franco, Irene. 2009. Verbs, Subjects and Stylistic Fronting. PhD dissertation, University of Siena.
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2010. *About the Speaker: Towards a Syntax of Indexicality*. Oxford: OUP.
- Giorgi, Alessandra & Pianesi, Fabio. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: OUP.
- Grice, Martine, D'Imperio, Mariapaola, Savino, Michelina & Avesani, Cinzia. 2005. Strategies for intonation labelling across varieties of Italian. In *Prosodic Typology: The Phonology of Intonation and Phrasing*, Sun-Ah Jun (ed.), 362–389. Oxford: OUP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199249633.003.0013>
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 1984. *On the Grammar and Semantics of Sentence Accents*. Dordrecht: Foris. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110859263>
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2014. West Flemish verb-based discourse markers and the articulation of the speech-act layer. *Studia Linguistica* 68: 116–139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12023>
- Haegeman, Liliane & Hill, Virginia. 2014. The syntactization of discourse. In *Syntax and its Limits*, Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali & Robert Truswell (eds), 370–389. Oxford: OUP.
- Heim, Johannes. 2017. How dialogical meaning can deconstruct speech acts: Insights from studying intonation. Ms, University of British Columbia.
- Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds), 174–209. London: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591.ch23>
- Hill, Virginia. 2012. A main clause complementizer. In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 190], Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds), 279–296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.190.12hill>
- Hinterhölzl, Roland & Munaro, Nicola. 2015. On the interpretation of modal particles in non-assertive speech-acts in German and Bellunese. In *Discourse-oriented Syntax* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 226], Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl, Andreas Trotzke (eds), 41–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.226.03hin>

- Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. Variation in the Romance infinitive. The case of the Southern Calabrian inflected infinitive. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96(1): 1–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.00023>
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2000. *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: La doppia serie di complementatori. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 27: 89–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: Dual complementiser systems in the dialects of Southern Italy. *Transaction of the Philological Society* 103(3): 339–396.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.2005.00157.x>
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2007. Diachrony of finiteness: Subordination in the dialects of Southern Italy. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), 335–365. Oxford: OUP.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2009. Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 9: 3–24.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. Contatto e mutamento: Complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 41: 459–480.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. Greek disguised as Romance? The case of Southern Italy. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects*, Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph, Angela Ralli & Metin Bagriacik (eds), 184–228. Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. Reconstructing complementiser-drop in the dialects of the Salento: A syntactic or phonological phenomenon? In *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*, Theresa Biberauer & George Walkden (eds), 146–162. Oxford: OUP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199687923.003.0009>
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. Complementation. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), 1013–1028. Oxford: OUP.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0063>
- Ledgeway, Adam & Alessandra Lombardi. 2014. The development of the southern subjunctive. Morphological loss and syntactic gain. In *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds), 25–47. Oxford: OUP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701781.001.0001>
- Ledgeway, Adam, Schifano, Norma & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2016. The negative imperative in Southern Calabria. Spirito greco, materia romanza again? Paper presented at the Romance Linguistics Seminars, University of Oxford, St John's College.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 1995. Recessività sintattica dell'infinito e vitalità morfologica della desinenza infinitivale in alcuni dialetti del reggino. In *Scritti linguistici e filologici in onore di Tristano Bolelli*, Roberto Ajello & Saverio Sani (eds), 331–358. Pisa: Pacini.
- Manzini Maria Rita & Savoia, Leonardo. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, 3 Vols. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause. In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 190], Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds), 79–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/la.190.04miy>

- Munaro, Nicola. 2010. On the edge-feature of particles, interjections, and short answers. In *Edge, Heads and Projections: Interface Properties* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 156], Anna Maria di Sciullo & Virginia Hill (eds), 67–86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.156.07mun>
- Munaro, Nicola. This volume. On the syntactic encoding of lexical interjections in Italo-Romance. In *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 251], Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds), 185–202. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.09mun>
- Palmer, Frank Robert. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Paoli, Sandra. 2007. The fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects. Evidence from Romance. *Lingua* 117(6): 1057–1079. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2006.05.007>
- Pierrehumbert, Janet B. & Julia Hirschberg. 1990. The meaning of intonational contours in the interpretation of discourse. In *Intentions in Communication*, Philip R. Cohen, Jerry Morgan & Martha E. Pollack (eds), 271–311. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Prins, Karine. 2014. Overt Complementizers in root clauses in southern Italian dialects. MA thesis, Leiden University.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position “int(errogative)” in the left periphery of the clause. In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds), 267–296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Reis, Marga. 2006. Is German V-to-C movement really semantically motivated? Some empirical problems. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32(3): 369–380. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TL.2006.023>
- Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2 and the EPP. In *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of the Syntactic Structures*, Luigi Rizzi (ed.), 297–328. Oxford: OUP.
- Roberts, Ian & Roussou, Anna. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486326>
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1972 [1965]. La congiunzione *mi* (in sostituzione dell’infinito) in Sicilia. In *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d’Italia*, 333–338. Florence: Sansoni.
- Ross, John Robert. 1970. On declarative sentences. In *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum (eds), 222–277. Waltham MA: Ginn.
- Sigurdsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. The syntax of Person, Tense, and speech features. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 16: 219–251. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002222670400252X>
- Sorianello, Patrizia. 2010. Il tipo esclamativo. Analisi e percezione delle risorse prosodiche. In *Parlare con le persone, parlare con le macchine: la dimensione internazionale della comunicazione verbale, Atti del VI Convegno Internazionale dell’Associazione Italiana Scienze della Voce*, Francesco Cutugno, Pietro Maturi, Renata Savy, Giovanni Abete & Iolanda Alfano (eds), 85–104. Torriana: EDK.
- Sorianello, Patrizia. 2011. Aspetti prosodici e pragmatic dell’atto esclamativo. *Studi Linguistici e Filologici Online* 9: 287–332.
- Speas, Peggy & Tenny, Carol. 2003. *Configurational Properties of Point of View Roles. Asymmetry in Grammar*, 315–345. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32(3): 257–306. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TL.2006.018>

- Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2012. Semantics of intonation. In *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, Vol. 3, Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger & Paul Portner (eds), 2039–2969. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Villa-García, Julio. 2015. *The Syntax of Multiple-que Sentences in Spanish: Along the Left Periphery* [Issues in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics 2]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ihll.2>
- Wiltschko, Martina. In progress. The syntax of the interaction. Towards a formal typology of discourse markers. Ms, University of British Columbia.
- Wiltschko, Martina & Heim, Johannes. 2016. The syntax of confirmationals. A neo-performative analysis. In *Outside the Clause: Form and Function of Extra-clausal Constituents* [Studies in Language Companion Series 178], Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds), 305–340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.178.11wil>