# Force, Mood and Modality:
## (matrix) complementisers in Upper-Southern Italian Dialects

Valentina Colasanti (vc314@cam.ac.uk), Giuseppina Silvestri (gs486@cam.ac.uk)
University of Cambridge

Complementation in Southern Italian Dialects (SIDs) has received much attention over recent years and made an important contribution to our understanding of the structure of the discourse-domain. The postulation of the fine structure of the left periphery by Rizzi (1997; see also Benincà&Poletto 2004) was much helped by the presence of dual complementiser systems in southern Italian dialects (cf. i.a. Ledgeway 2003; 2005; Damonte 2006; 2010; D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010; D'Alessandro & Di Felice 2010).

While the main function of complementisers is to introduce subordinate clauses, in Romance they can also introduce main clauses as well, i.e. declaratives, exclamatives, adhortative/exhortative clauses and interrogatives (cf. Etxepare 2008; Demonte&Fernández Soriano 2014; Corr 2016; in prep.). Several studies have highlighted how complementisers in root clauses signal a special function or value of the clause (D'Alessandro&Ledgeway 2010). Specifically, the distribution of these complementisers has been already linked to illocutionary force, empathic assertion, focus or polarity (cf. Cruschina&Ledgeway, in press). In this respect, the presence of overt complementisers in root clauses has been noticed in evidential contexts in modern Abruzzese (D'Alessandro&Di Felice 2015; cf. 1). In short, these *evidential* complementisers are spelt out at the beginning of declaratives and seem to express the speakers' assessment of the evidence for their statement (cf. 1).

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

In this paper previously unexplored data from upper-SIDs (USIDs) will be taken into consideration with respect to the pragmatico-syntactic nature of *matrix* complementisers. Specifically, it seems that the distribution of matrix complementisers or complementiser-like elements in main clauses is sensitive to three strictly related variables, namely the illocutionary Force of the sentence and its related syntactic position in the split-CP (i.e. *Force*; Rizzi 1997), morphological mood and modality. As we can see in (2) in both USIDs taken into consideration, the complementiser *ca* can be dropped either in jussive and concessive utterances (cf. Ledgeway 2000).

(2)　　a. (***Ca*** / *****Chə***) (*Màriə*) *vinissədə (Màriə)!*　　　　　　[jussive]
　　　　　ca　　chə Mario　come. 3SG.PST.SUBJ
　　　　　'Mario had better come!'
　　　　b. (C***a*** /?***Chə***) (*****Màriə***) *vinissədə* (*Màriə*)　　　　　[concessive]
　　　　　ca　　chə　　Mario　come.3SG.PST.SUBJ
　　　　　'Mario may come'　　　　　　　　　　　　(Santa Maria del Cedro, CS)

(3)　　a. (***Ca***) (*Màriə*) *facesse u brave* (*Màriə*)　　　　　[jussive]
　　　　　ca　Mario　do. 3SG.PST.SUBJ the good
　　　　　'Mario had better behave!'
　　　　b. (***Ca***) (ci) (*****Mariə***) *venesse* (*Mariə*)　　　　　[concessive]
　　　　　ca (there) come. 3SG.PST.SUBJ
　　　　　'Mario may come'　　　　　　　　　　(Santa Maria Capua Vetere, CE)

These facts recall complementiser drop which proves to be generally limited to null subject languages and to irrealis subordinate clauses, and is found in Romance under specific conditions, such as Italian (cf. 4) where the complementiser *che* always appears to be optional (cf. Cruschina&Ledgeway, in press; see also Cruschina 2010; 2012):

(4)    (**Che**) ti facciano entrare!                    (Italian)
       that yoy.OBJ do.3PL.SUBJ.PRS enter.INF
       'May they let you in'

The USIDs data suggest that this apparent optionality is linked to the position of the subject, which can appear in pre-verbal position only in jussives (cf. 2a, 3a). Hence, the interplay of Force, Mood and Modality together with the 'optionality' of these matrix complementisers (cf. Giorgi&Pianesi 2004; Cocchi&Poletto 2007) will be discussed.
Optative utterances (5-6) are alternatively realised with 'want/can', which is possibly overtly marked as subjunctive mood in (5b) as well. Also, it seems that the complementisers can only be dropped when the following verb is a subjunctive which has to do, again, with Force, Mood and Modality.

(5)    a. (***Chə/*Ca***) *si ruppissədə nu vrazzə!*                    [optatives]
          chə   ca    self=break.3SG.PST.SUBJ an arm
          'May he break his arm!'
       b. *(***Chə***) *tə vo piglià nu lampə!*
          chə you.OBJ want.3SG.PRS take.INF a lightning
          'May lightening strike you!'                    (Santa Maria del Cedro, CS)
(6)    a. (***Ca***) *te putessere accidə!*
          ca you.OBJ can.3PL.PST.SUBJ kill.INF
          'May you be killed!'
       b. (***Ca***) *te pozza piglià ne colpə!*
          ca you.OBJ can.3SG.PRS.SUBJ take.INF a blow
          'May you be hit!'                    (Santa Maria Capua Vetere, CE)

Only a comparison between these two dialects with similar USIDs varieties will provide the necessary clues to answer some of our research questions. Overt complementisers proved to be able to lexicalise functional heads within the CP that perform modal or speech act markers. Hence, which are the similarities and the differences between complementisers and modal particles? Can we define and generalise them throughout different clause types? What is the relationship between these overt complementisers and clause-typing? In short, is the complementiser (e.g. *ca*), which is used to mark different values, the same complementiser in all cases or can the same lexical item lexicalise (or move to) distinct positions within the CP?
The main question will be related to the possibility of a generalisation in terms of definition of overt complementisers in optatives, jussives and concessive sentences and a consequent separated or unified account. We will also consider the question of the pragmatic difference regarding the meaning, if any, with respect to the complementiser drop. In short, is the complementisers drop in root clauses a case of apparent optionality or real optionality or does it result in difference meaning/function? Theoretical questions will be raised from USIDs data about the structure of the CP, the different types of illocutionary force that can be licensed and how, its interaction with Mood/Modal marking within the T-domain (i.e. subjunctive on the verb) and such related phenomena as subject positions and *true optionality* (cf. Biberauer&Richards 2004).

**Selected references**
Ledgeway, A. (2005). 'Moving Through the Left Periphery: The Dual Complementiser System in the Dialects of Southern Italy'. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103: 336–96.

Cruschina, S., Ledgeway, Adam, in press. 'Structure of the Clause', in Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

D'Alessandro, R., Di Felice, C. (2015). The diachrony of Abruzzese complementation (with Claudio Di Felice). *Revue roumaine de linguistique* (1-2),129-145.