

## The syntax of spatial anchoring: logophoricity in a heritage Italo-romance variety

**Introduction.** The anchoring of a sentence, i.e. the interpretation of indexical elements according to the extralinguistic context (i.e., the place and time in which the sentence is uttered) has been discussed in a large body of literature. However, most of these works have focused on the *temporal* anchoring and its interplay with verb tense and with nominative case licensing (Enç 1987, Hornstein 1990, Zagona 1995, Giorgi & Pianesi 1997, 2000, Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 1997, 2000, Bianchi 2003, Giorgi 2010, a.o.). The role played by *spatial* coordinates, on the other hand, has been paid much less attention (see e.g. Tortora 1997, 2014, Ritter & Wiltschko 2014). In this talk, we discuss new data from Stivorian, a heritage Trentino dialect spoken in Bosnia, in which the use of the locative clitic *ghe* ('there') in existential and VS clauses with unaccusative verbs is restricted to those cases in which the location of the event coincides with the place in which the speaker is located. We propose that *ghe* values positively a coincidence spatial feature [*u coin*] located in T°, which is linked to pronominal situation variable in Spec,IP expressing the Utterance situation (adapting Ritter & Wiltschko's 2014 proposal). Unlike Ritter & Wiltschko, however, we propose that there is a dedicated spatial feature (independent from tense and person anchoring), and that this variable has as its antecedent a Logophoric Centre in CP (see Bianchi 2003 and Landau 2015).

**The data.** Stivorian is a heritage Trentino variety spoken in the small village of Štivor (Bosnia) by descendants of immigrants who came from Trentino in 1883. Nowadays it is spoken by a handful of third/fourth-generation speakers in an intense language contact situation with Serbian, which is the dominant language of all the Stivorian speakers. In spontaneous data collected in a fieldwork in autumn 2018, Stivorian presents a phenomenon that is rare among Romance varieties and is not attested in other Trentino dialects: in existential (1) and VS clauses with a postverbal subject (2), two types of clitics are used: the locative clitic *ghe* or a subject clitic. The subject clitic is a default 3<sup>rd</sup> singular masculine in existential (1b) and a fully fleeted subject clitic in VS clauses (2b).

- (1a) *Gh' è tanti ucraini qua ncora.* (Stivorian)  
LOC.CL be.3 many Ukrainians here still 'There are still many Ukrainians here.'
- (1b) *Su quele tere l' è i serbi.*  
on those lands SCL be.3 the Serbs 'The Serbs are on those lands.'
- (2a) *Gh' è vegnuo todeschi.*  
LOC.CL be.3 come Germans 'Germans came.'
- (2b) *Cusì i è marciai i Polachi.*  
so they.CL be.3 leave the Polish 'So the Polish left.'

In the Trentino dialects spoken in Italy, on the other hand, all existential clauses have the clitic *ghe*, while VS clauses have no clitic at all. The Stivorian pattern is presumably due to contact, although Serbian does not show this pattern either. At first sight, it may seem that the two types of clitic are interchangeable, since they are used in the same constructions and never co-occur:

- (3a) *Deso gh' (\*l) è i ucraini*  
now LOC.CL SCL be.3 the Ukrainians 'Now there are Ukrainians.'
- (3b) *No l' (\*gh') era islamici*  
not SCL LOC.CL were Muslims 'There were no Muslims.'

**Discussion of the data.** However, at a closer inspection the choice of the clitic is not optional, because it depends on the context, as this example shows:

- (4) [A Srbac] *gh' è qua un paese, l' è la Sava là*  
in Srbac LOC.CL is herea village SCL is the Sava there  
'Here, in the area of Srbac, there is a village, and the Sava is over there.'

The selection is ruled by deixis: *ghe* is used when the place of the event matches the place of the speaker. Otherwise, a subject clitic is used. Similar patterns are found in Borgomanerese,

but only in VS clauses with goal-verbs like *arrive* (Tortora 1997, 2014) and in Sardinian existentials (Bentley et al. 2015). No documented variety has gone as far as Stivorian, extending systematically this pattern to both existentials and VS clauses with any unaccusative verb of movement. In most languages, existential clauses are introduced by a single locative element like English *there* or Italian *ci*, which are generally analysed as pro-arguments inserted in a Small Clause (Moro 1997, Cruschina 2012, Irwin 2018, a.o.). According to Francez (2007), the location itself, which is held to be part of utterances about the existence or presence of an entity (the ‘pivot’, e.g. Partee & Borschev 2004, McNally 2011), is always implicit and determined by context. The presence of a null element, i.e. a null locative argument, has also been proposed for unaccusative VS sentences (Benincà 1988, Pinto 1997, Sheehan 2010, 2016, Tortora 2014, Bentley & Cruschina 2018, a.o.).

Stivorian is doubly interesting in this respect: not only does it show a unified pattern for both existential and VS clauses, but it also codifies the spatial deixis through the use of two different types of clitic, which are standardly assumed to be located in T. This fact requires to conceive T not only as T(ense) head, as generally assumed, but as a Head also encoding (at least) Space, as claimed by Ritter & Wiltschko (2014) on the basis of data from native American languages. However, our data challenge their concept of a coincidence [*u coin*] feature: Ritter & Wiltschko claim that [*u coin*] expresses either time, space or participant coordinates, but no more than one at a time. This is clearly incompatible with Stivorian data, where INFL is specified for both Tense (as all Romance languages) and Space.

**The proposal.** The Stivorian data lead us to split Ritter & Wiltschko’s [*u coin*] into a spatial (which we call [*u S-coin*]) and a temporal coincidence feature. This is necessary because the presence of a single feature for both Space and Time would be at odds with cases in which there is a mismatch between spatial and temporal deixis, one being proximal and the other distal (in Stivorian sentences in which *gh’era* or *l’è* appear). What both the spatial and the temporal [*u coin*] features have in common is that they are both linked to the context (the *hic et nunc* of the speaker). Following Ritter & Wiltschko, we propose that [*u S-coin*] is valued by the morphological marking of the verb: in Stivorian this is done by the clitics, which are standardly assumed to be morphological markers in Northern Italian Dialects (Brandi & Cordin 1981, 1989, Rizzi 1986, Poletto 2000, a.o.). However, while Ritter & Wiltschko claim that the Utterance situation is codified as a pronominal situation variable in Spec,IP with no proper antecedent, we suggest that it does have an antecedent, namely a Logophoric Centre (‘LC’) in C, as proposed by Bianchi (2003) in order to formalise a Reichenbachian approach to Tense (see also Hornstein 1990, Zagana 1995, Giorgi & Pianesi 1997, 2000, Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 1997, 2000, Giorgi 2010, a.o.), and then readapted by Landau (2015).

**Conclusions.** We thus propose to unify the way in which Time and Space are syntactically linked to the extra-linguistic context. This analysis can be extended to other cases in which a verb expresses both temporal and spatial relations linked to context, like in spatial indications of many Northern Italian Dialects (e.g., to say ‘go to Trento’, Trentino speakers say *nar su a Trènt* ‘go up to Trento’, *nar fòra a Trènt* ‘go out to Trento’ or *nar zó a Trènt* ‘go down to Trento’, the choice of the locative element depending on the position of the speaker, see Pescarini 2004, Irsara 2015, Prandi 2015). This approach also allows us to link concretely [*u coin*] to the context in which the sentence is uttered, unlike in Ritter & Wiltschko’s account.

**Selected literature:** V. Bianchi. 2003. On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. in J. Guéron & L. Tasmovski (eds.), *Temps et point de vue/Tense and Point of View*, Université Paris X - Nanterre, 213-246. D. Bentley, F.M. Ciconte & S. Cruschina. 2015. *Existentials and Locatives in Romance Dialects of Italy*. Oxford: OUP. Ch. Tortora. 2014. *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese*. Oxford: OUP. P. Irwin. 2018. Existential unaccusativity and new discourse referents. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1): X. 1–42. E. Ritter & M. Wiltschko. 2014. The composition of INFL An exploration of tense, tenseless languages, and tenseless constructions. *NLLT* 32:1331–1386.