

A proposal towards a unique representation of the speaker's temporal coordinate in Italian and Russian

Luca Molinari

University of Warsaw; Ca' Foscari University of Venice

l.molinari@uw.edu.pl; luca.molinari@unive.it

1. Introduction. The availability of long distance (LD) binding in a language displaying indicative/subjunctive distinction like Italian may be directly related to the mood of the embedded clause (cf. Giorgi 2006a). The binding domain of a LD anaphor (LDA) like *proprio* 'self's' may be closed by the occurrence of a verb in the indicative mood (1), while the same does not occur with a subjunctive verb (2) (both from Giorgi 2006a: 10).

- (1) *Quel dittatore_i ha detto che i notiziari televisivi *hanno parlato* a lungo delle proprie_i gesta
That dictator said that the TV news programs talked_{IND} for a long time about self's deeds
- (2) Quel dittatore_i spera che i notiziari televisivi *parlino* a lungo delle proprie_i gesta
That dictator hopes that TV news programs will talk_{SUBJ} for a long time about self's deeds

This peculiarity is explained by resorting to the concept of the speaker's temporal coordinate, represented in syntax (in the highest layer of Rizzi's (1997) split CP, labeled *C-Speaker* by Giorgi (2012: 44)) as a sort of indexical pointing directly to the speaker's *here and now*. The projection of this layer occurs only in indicative embedded sentences, and it is associated with the speaker's temporal coordinate. The latter gives raise to the Double Access Reading (DAR), in which the event expressed by the complement clause is connected both to the matrix event and to the utterance time. This is the reason why (3a) – taken from Giorgi (2006b: 101) – is infelicitous, as Maria's pregnancy should hold both at the time of Gianni's utterance and *now*, while (3b) is perfectly fine, as the pregnancy is predicted to hold only at the time of Gianni's statement.

- (3) a. #Due anni fa Gianni ha detto che Maria è incinta.
'Two years ago Gianni said that Maria is_{IND} pregnant.'
- b. Due anni fa Gianni credeva che Maria fosse incinta.
'Two years ago Gianni believed that Maria was_{SUBJ} pregnant.'

2. Issue. Russian does not give raise to DAR (cf.(4)) despite displaying an indicative vs. subjunctive distinction, expressed by a different complementizer introducing the embedded clause, *čto* (+ all tenses) vs. *čtoby* (+ past tense) (cf. Brecht 1977). However, both complementizers block LD binding when they embed a non-infinitive verb, as shown in (5)-(6) with the LDA *svoj* 'self's' (cf. Rappaport 1986). Moreover, the "subjunctive" complementizer *čtoby* can also introduce an infinitival clause. In this case, LD binding is allowed (7).

- (4) Dva goda nazad Ivan skazal, čto Marija beremenna.
'Two years ago Ivan said that Marija is pregnant.'
- (5) Ja_i čital, [_{CP} čto ego_j stat'ja o svoej_j/_{*i} rabote očēn' interesnaja].
I_i read [_{CP} that his_j article about self's_j/_{*i} job very interesting]
'I read that his article about his job is very interesting.'
- (6) *Volodja_i xočet, čtoby svoj_j syn poceloval Nadiju.
Volodya_i wants that self's_j son kissed Nadya
'Volodya wants his son to kiss Nadya.'
- (7) Ja_i prišel sjuda, (čtoby) PRO_i zabrat' svoego_i syna.
I came here (to) PRO_i take [self's_i son]-ACC
'I came here to take my son.'

3. Aim. The present contribution aims at analyzing the data from Russian in light of the theory proposed for Italian, which might prove insightful in that the two languages, which appear to be totally unrelated, display much more similarities than what appears *prima facie*.

4. Scattered subjunctive morphology. Giorgi (2006b) hypothesizes that the complementizer *che* 'that' introducing subjunctive clauses in Italian is part of the morphology of the subjunctive mood, which can be realized either scattered (i.e., appearing in the left periphery) or syncretically on the verb. *Che* can be deleted in this case does not encode the speaker's temporal coordinate, as in (8).

- (8) Gianni ipotizza (che) sia incinta. (Giorgi 2006b: 111)
'Gianni hypothesizes (that) [she] is_{SUBJ} pregnant.'

5. The complementizer *čtoby*. The “subjunctive” complementizer *čtoby* has been analyzed as being composed by the complementizer *čto* to which the particle *by* attaches (Brecht 1977). Following the same line, Melara (2016) analyzes *čtoby* as being composed by *čto*, sitting in Force (in Rizzi's (1997) split-CP), and of particle *by*, taken to be the spell out of a [Mod(ality)] feature encoding *irrealis* semantics which raises to Fin.

6. Person asymmetry. Russian seems to display an interesting person asymmetry in binding, such that a first/second person may block a third person LD antecedent. In (9) the 2nd person possessive pronoun seems to interfere with the LD binding of the anaphor. Interestingly, a 1st person possessive pronoun does not seem to block coreference with a second person pronoun; on the contrary, it does not seem to qualify as an antecedent at all (10). Such examples need to be further investigated and more data need to be collected.

- (9) Ja_i čital [tvoju_j stat'ju o sebe_{j/??i}] (examples discussed with native speakers)
 I_i read your_j article about self
 ‘I read your article about yourself/??me.’
- (10) Ty_i čital [moju_j stat'ju o sebe_{i/*j}]
 you_i read my_j article about self_{i/*j}
 ‘You read my article about yourself/*me.’

7. Towards a unified account. The data from Russian show that DAR does not arise, but LD binding is not permitted with finite embedded clauses. The proposal put forth here, following the framework sketched above, is that the speaker’s coordinate is active in blocking binding of LDAs, whose binding domain is limited to the finite embedded clause containing them, disregarding the indicative/subjunctive mood. The speaker’s temporal coordinate in Russian may be lexicalized by the complementizer *čto* in a projection of the CP layer which is however lower than Speaker-C (which may arguably not be projected). Its lower position does not allow the coordinate to temporally bind the embedded even – hence the lack of DAR – but it allows the blocking of LD binding. In the case of subjunctive clauses, *čtoby* is taken to be formed by *čto* merged with *by*, analyzed as a scattered realization of subjunctive morphology (on a par with Italian), realizing *irrealis* [Mod] (the past tense on the embedded verb is also a part of the subjunctive morphology). This guarantees that it cannot be deleted, as *čto* lexicalizes the speaker’s coordinates.

A different situation arises when *čtoby* introduces an infinitival subordinate clause: in these instances, LD is allowed and the complementizer can be deleted (see (10)), on a par with Italian. These cases suggest that *čtoby* + infinitive is a different kind of complementizer lacking the speaker’s coordinate. The presence of person asymmetries (if supported by a larger amount of data) points at the fact that the hierarchy of personal pronouns in Russian may differ from that proposed by Cardinaletti and Repetti (2008: 550), i.e., “3pl>3sg>2sg>1sg/1pl/2pl”. This issue needs to be further elaborated, as it may help understanding the puzzle of binding in Russian.

References: Brecht, R. D. (1977) ‘Čtoby or čto and by’, *Folia Slavica*, 1(1), pp. 33–41. • Cardinaletti, A. and Repetti, L. (2008) ‘The Phonology and Syntax of Preverbal and Postverbal Subject Clitics in Northern Italian Dialects’, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 39(4), pp. 523–563. doi: 10.1162/ling.2008.39.4.523. • Giorgi, A. (2006a) ‘From temporal anchoring to long distance anaphors’, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 24(4), pp. 1009–1047. • Giorgi, A. (2006b) ‘A Syntactic Way to Subjunctive’, *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 16, pp. 97–135. • Giorgi, A. (2012) ‘The Theory of Syntax and the Representation of Indexicality’, in Brugé, L. et al. (eds) *Functional Heads*. Oxford University Press, pp. 42–54. • Melara, E. (2016) ‘On the modality of the Russian particle *by* and the markedness of Coincidence’, *Generals papers*, University of Toronto. • Rappaport, G. C. (1986) ‘On anaphor binding in Russian’, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 4(1), pp. 97–120. • Rizzi, L. (1997) ‘The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery’, in Haegeman, L. (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands (Kluwer International Handbooks of Linguistics), pp. 281–337.