

## Aromanian reflexive possessors

Marios Mavrogiorgos, University of Cambridge

**The issue:** Languages vary as to the type and number of strategies they employ to encode the possessor-possessum relationship. One such strategy is external possession or possessor raising, where a possessor appears outside the domain of the possessum (see (1) from Spanish):

- (1) Le cortaron la mano a Juan // Le han roto la pata a la mesa.  
 3sg.dat.cl cut.3pl the hand to John // 3sg.dat.cl have.3pl broken the leg to the table  
 ‘They cut John’s hand. // They cut the table’s leg.’

One central issue raised by constructions like (1) is the fact that the external possessor (arguably an argument of the constituent containing the possessum) is also a verbal argument. To account for this fact, various researchers have proposed that the possessor is linked to the possessum via syntactic raising or control (see Guéron 2006 for an overview). An alternative hypothesis offered is that (1) is a double object construction (see e.g. Pylkkänen 2008). Within this background, I will present data from a reflexive possessor raising construction documented in some Aromanian varieties spoken in north-western Greece. Empirically, I will show that the reflexive possessor behaves like a base generated subject-oriented dative anaphor. Theoretically, I will argue that it is introduced by an applicative head within the VP domain.

**Empirical observations:** Aromanian has both internal (2) and external (3) possession constructions:

- (2) a. maria scoase paltolu a le leni di tu kushugu  
 Maria.the.nom took.out.3sg coat.the.acc to the Leni from at cupboard  
 ‘Maria took out Lena’s coat from the cupboard.’ [genitive DP]  
 b. u aflashi sor -ta nafoarə di bisearikə?  
 3.sg.fem.acc.cl found.2sg sister.acc.-your.cl outside of church  
 ‘DID you find your sister outside the church?’ [possessive determiner-weak]  
 c. kasa amea easte multu mare  
 house.the mine.fem.nom is very big.fem  
 ‘My house is very big.’ [possessive determiner-strong]
- (3) a. γiani lji frimpse tshiorlu (a lu kosta)  
 Jani.nom 3sg.masc.dat.cl broke.3sg leg.the.acc (to the Kosta)  
 ‘Jani<sub>i</sub> broke his<sub>j</sub> leg to Kostas<sub>j</sub>.’ [possessor raising]  
 b. γiani u agudi muljearea tu tshioru  
 Jani.nom 3sg.fem.acc.cl hit.3sg woman.the to leg  
 ‘Jani hit the woman on her leg.’ [PP construction]  
 c. γiani shə frimpse tshiorlu  
 Jani.nom 3sg.dat.refl.cl broke.3sg leg.the.acc  
 ‘Jani<sub>i</sub> broke his<sub>i</sub> leg.’ [reflexive possessor]  
 d. γiani frimpse tshiorlu  
 Jani.nom broke.3sg leg.the.acc  
 ‘Jani<sub>i</sub> broke his<sub>i</sub> leg.’ [null possessor]

The reflexive possessor construction has the following properties: (i) it is possible with all persons (4a-b); (ii) it is compatible with both inalienable (4a) and alienable possession (4a-b); (iii) it is possible with transitive predicates only and is bound by an external argument (4a-c); it is interchangeable with the null possessor construction, although it has an additional affective reading (4d), or its presence-absence may be related to additional semantic and/or pragmatic factors (4e-g):

- (4) a. z- nə spilamu minile // leagə -tsə ghine kalu!  
 Subj 1pl.dat.refl.cl wash.1pl hands.the.acc//tie.2sg.imper-2sg.dat.refl.cl well horse.the  
 ‘Let us wash our hands.’//‘Tie your horse well!’

b. *teta-nji shə aflə stranjile nəuntru tu tasturu*  
 Aunt.the.nom-mine.cl 3sg.dat.refl.cl found.3sg clothes.the.acc inside at bag  
 ‘My aunt<sub>i</sub> found her<sub>i</sub> clothes inside the bag.’

c. *kari mincə di mearile atseale*  
 Who ate.3sg of apples.the those

*il<sub>i</sub> /\*shə<sub>i</sub> fudzi kufamara*  
 3sg.masc.dat.cl/\*3sg.dat.refl.cl left.3sg deafness.the.nom  
 ‘Whoever ate of these apples found his hearing.’

d. *γiani (shə<sub>i</sub>) freadze pyiatulu*  
 Jani.nom (3sg.dat.refl.cl) broke.3sg dish.the.acc  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> broke his<sub>i</sub> dish (on him).’

e. *γiani \*(shə)/(shə) aflə fexa<sub>1</sub>/fexa<sub>2</sub>*  
 Jani.nom \*(3sg.dat.refl.cl)/(3sg.dat.refl.cl) found.3sg light.the.acc<sub>1</sub>/light.the.acc<sub>2</sub>  
 ‘Jani found his vision<sub>1</sub>/light<sub>2</sub>.’

f. *γiani (\*shə) inclise oclji*  
 Jani.nom (\*3sg.dat.refl.cl) closed.3sg eyes.the.acc  
 ‘Jani closed his eyes.’

g. *γiani (shə) frimpse tshiorlu //γiani frimpse tshiorlu (a measəlj<sub>i</sub>)*  
 Jani (3sg.dat.refl.cl) broke.3sg leg.the.acc//Jani broke.3sg leg.the.acc (to table.the.gen)  
 ‘Janis<sub>i</sub> broke his<sub>i</sub> leg (himself).//Jani<sub>i</sub> broke its<sub>j</sub> leg (of the table<sub>j</sub>).’

In addition, the relationship between the subject possessor and the possessum must be local:

(5) *kosta<sub>i</sub> lə<sub>j</sub> kaftə si PRO<sub>j</sub> shə<sub>j</sub>/\*<sub>i</sub> ingroapə mortulu<sub>j</sub>/\*<sub>i</sub>*  
 Kosta.nom 3pl.dat.cl asked.3sg subj PRO 3pl.dat.refl.cl bury.3sg dead.the.acc  
 ‘Kostas asked them to bury their dead.’

At the same time, the possessor must c-command the possessum (or its trace):

(6) a. *[sora alui<sub>i</sub>]<sub>j</sub> shə<sub>j</sub>/\*<sub>i</sub> cirdu lucrile<sub>j</sub>/\*<sub>i</sub>*  
 sister.the his 3sg.dat.refl.cl lost.3sg things.the  
 ‘His sister lost her/\*his things.’  
 b. *a preftulji lji dzisirə s- vində prəvdzile<sub>i</sub>*  
 To priest.the.dat 3sg.masc.dat.cl told.3pl subj sell.3sg animals.the.acc  
*tsi shə avea t<sub>i</sub> tu ahure-lji*  
 that 3sg.dat.refl.cl had.3sg t at basement-his.cl  
 ‘They told the priest to sell his animals which he had in his basement.’

Finally, the reflexive possessor can be doubled by a co-referential possessive determiner (7):

(7) *goglu<sub>i</sub> shə<sub>i</sub> brea fatsa alui<sub>i</sub> tu yilie*  
 Gogu.the.nom 3sg.dat.refl.cl looked.3sg.impf face.the.acc his at mirror  
 ‘George was looking at his face in the mirror.’

**Analysis:** On the basis of the above evidence, I will make the following claims: (a) reflexive possessors are subject oriented anaphors. In this respect, they differ from null possessors (which are anaphors only if they denote inalienable possession, and whose presence is linked to discourse/semantic factors), or from non-reflexive possessors, which are pronominals (and hence cannot be bound by a local subject – cf. *γiani<sub>i</sub> lji<sub>j</sub>/\*<sub>i</sub> frimpse tshiorlu alu kosta<sub>j</sub>*); (b) reflexive possessors are not raised from inside the possessum, as they can be doubled by a strong or weak internal possessive determiner. Moreover, they are not licit inside the possessum (as opposed to non-reflexive possessors: **(nji) skapə kafelu-nji//nji skapə kafelu(-nji)** (my) *finished.3sg coffee.the.nom(-mine)*). This suggests that external possessors (reflexive or non-reflexive ones) take dative case from a verbal head in situ, whereas (non-reflexive) internal possessors take genitive case from a nominal head in situ. This analysis is further corroborated by the fact that external possessors have an affective reading, as opposed to internal possessors, which don’t; (c) reflexive possessors are introduced by a low applicative

head, which relates the possessor to the possessum: [vP v [ApplP IO (refl. Possessor)[Appl' Appl [DO (possessum)]]]](see also Pylkkänen 2008). Being clitics, they raise to T.