

## Aromanian Reflexives and Reciprocals

### Marios Mavrogiorgos (University of Cambridge)

Languages vary wrt. the number and type of strategies they use to express reflexivity and/or reciprocity. Typically, these strategies compete with each other in some way or another, however they all share the property of ‘doing’ or ‘marking’ something extra that non-reflexive/reciprocal structures lack. In this context, the immediate question that arises is which components reflexivity/reciprocity reduces to, and in what way one can use this knowledge to account for the observed competition. In this talk, I am going to address some aspects of these issues, by discussing the main strategies Aromanian, an Eastern Romance variety, uses in order to express reflexivity & reciprocity. The discussion is based on a preliminary analysis of the relevant data, which were collected via fieldwork in 4 Aromanian speaking villages in the Metsovo Municipality, Epirus, North-Western Greece. Therefore, any generalisations apply to these varieties only.

The two main strategies used in Aromanian involve, on the one hand, SE-marking with or without a subject modifier (*nəsu singuru* for  $SE_{refl}$ , and *unu ku alantu* or *doilji* for  $SE_{rec}$ ), and, on the other hand, an ACT-marked verb taking an anaphoric/reciprocal object (*nəsu* for refl; *unu alantu* for rec). Typically, these strategies are in complementary distribution (i.e. *nəsu* & *unu alantu* cannot co-occur with SE, while *unu alantu* triggers singular agreement) (1):

- (1) a. *jani<sub>1</sub> z<sub>1</sub> - lə*            (*singuru<sub>1</sub>* / *nəsu singuru<sub>subj1</sub>*)  
John SE- washed.3sg (alone /he alone)  
'John washed (himself).'  
b. *jani (\*z) -lə nəsu<sub>obj1</sub>*  
John (\*SE) -washed.3sg him  
'John washed himself.'  
c. *[jani ku maria]<sub>1</sub> z<sub>1</sub> - larə*            (*unu ku alantu<sub>1</sub>* / *doilji<sub>1</sub>*)  
John and Mary SE - washed.3pl (one and other /two.the)  
'John and Mary washed each other.'  
d. *jani ku maria (\*z) -la unu alantu*  
John and Mary (\*SE)-wash.3sg one other  
'John and Mary wash each other.'

The main claims I will make are the following: **(a)** SE-marking and ACT-marking strategies do not necessarily involve the same underlying morpho-syntax. This seems to suggest that reflexivity/reciprocity is constructed, rather than being linked to a single structure/property; **(b)**  $SE_{refl/rec}$  is not inherently reflexive/reciprocal; rather whether SE is interpreted as reflexive/reciprocal or not is *also* related to the nature of the root involved, as well as to whether modifiers are present or not (cf. also rest of Romance or Greek); **(c)** the ACT-marking strategy is used obligatorily whenever the SE strategy is unavailable for independent reasons (e.g. inside PP complements & adjuncts).

In relation to the above, I will argue for the following points: **(i)**  $SE_{refl}$ , as opposed to  $SE_{rec}$ , is restricted in terms of the Naturally Reflexive vs. Naturally Disjoint Verbs distinction (NRV vs. NDR), namely with NDRs the ACT-marking strategy is preferable or obligatory. For  $SE_{rec}$ , the use of *unu ku alantu* is required with NDRs, otherwise the ACT-marking strategy is employed; **(ii)**  $SE_{refl}$  can only appear in the Accusative, as opposed to  $SE_{rec}$  which also allows a dative construal (though the latter is highly restricted). This suggests that *SE* is not a real (theta) argument, but rather the realization of a voice head (or of its spec) and a case saturator; **(iii)** (accusative)  $SE_{refl}$  and  $SE_{rec}$ , as well as *unu alantu*, are subject to syntactic constraints (subject orientation, ungrammaticality of derived subjects, and locality). On the contrary, *nəsu*

does not seem to be subject to the same restrictions and can be bound within domains of various sizes (including the matrix domain) or appear in environments where SE (or *(unu) alantu*) is excluded. This suggests that the latter involves a distinct derivation from the former, and that the morpho-syntax of reflexivity & reciprocity must depend *also* on the inherent properties of the pronouns used (cf. *nəsu* vs. *unu alantu* vs. *SE*); **(iv)** SE-marking involves an unergative syntax and blocks object comparison and statue readings, as opposed to ACT-marking constructions which involve a transitive syntax. This suggests that SE-marked constructions do not involve an object slot (at least on the surface). On the basis of this evidence, I will argue that the reflexive/reciprocal strategies available in Aromanian are not likely to share the same underlying structure, and that SE does not seem to behave like a real argument.