

Non-verbal predication and clitics in Aromanian*

Marios Mavrogiorgos and Adam Ledgeway

University of Cambridge

This paper discusses predicational structures in some Aromanian varieties which involve PP or AP predicates combining with the copula BE. In these structures the internal argument and subject of BE is cross-referenced by an accusative clitic, as long as it is 3rd person and a topic. However, Individual-Level APs typically resist cliticisation. We propose that the clitic is the spell-out of topic and gender/number features available in Stage-Level predicates only (a spatio-temporal argument à la Kratzer 1995), with which the subject agrees, before agreeing with T. We argue that this structural property captures the restriction to Stage-Level predicate subject topics, the person restriction, and also the fact that the clitic behaves like a direct object clitic morpho-syntactically.

Keywords: nonverbal predication, clitics, Stage Level Predicates, Individual Level Predicates, subject topics, split-person ergative marking, differential object marking, Aromanian, Romance

1. Introduction

Some Aromanian varieties spoken in North-Western Greece have the structure exemplified in (1). This construction involves some lexical predicate (the PP *a'qa* in (1)), the copula BE, and a clitic (henceforth, INTERNAL ARGUMENT (IA)-clitic) which cross-references the internal argument (in this case, PATIENT) and subject of the predicate (the DP *'frats̩i a'mej* in (1)); for

* For helpful comments and discussion, we would like to thank Víctor Acedo-Matellán, Nikos Angelopoulos, Imme Kuchenbrandt, Dominique Sportiche, Arhonto Terzi, and especially Ora Matushansky, as well as audiences at Going Romance 30. Moreover, we would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions. Finally, we would like to thank our speakers for data and valuable insights. Remaining errors are, of course, our own. This research has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 657663 (AROSYN-Aromanian Syntax project).

theta-role labels see Dowty 1991) and has the same form as the direct object/accusative clitic (cross-referencing is marked in bold).

- (1) A'QA **li** 'sintu **'fratsli** a'meḯ
here 3PL.MASC.CL ARE.3PL brothers.the mine
'HERE are my brothers.'

The main properties of the construction are summarised in (2):

- (2) a. The IA-clitic is only attested with PP and (some) AP predicates (such as Stage-Level APs) (but not with NP or VP predicates);¹
b. The IA-clitic can only be 3rd person (singular or plural);
c. The IA-clitic is possible with a tensed or untensed BE;
d. The IA-clitic may only cross-reference a (definite/specific or D(iscourse)-linked)² internal argument (subject) topic, on a par with direct object clitics (which cross-reference an internal argument (object) topic).

¹ Stage-Level predicates (SLPs), such as *grow* or *hungry*, denote properties of stages (typically non-permanent ones), whereas Individual-Level predicates (ILPs), such as *belong* or *female*, denote properties of individuals (typically permanent ones) (see Carlson 1977).

² D-linked phrases (see Pesetsky 1987) imply the existence of familiar discourse entities. For instance, the wh-phrase *Which men* in the sentence *Which men came?* (as opposed to *Who* in the sentence *Who came?*) is D-linked, as the range of felicitous answers is limited by a particular set of men shared among speaker and hearer in the domain of discourse. D-linking has been linked to syntactic effects such as base generation/non-quantification, and at least according to some authors (e.g. Enç 1991: fn. 8) can be conflated with specificity.

The following research questions arise: (i) Is the IA-clitic a (direct) object clitic, and, if yes, why does it cross-reference a subject?; (ii) What accounts for its restricted distribution (cf. (2))?; (iii) What are the wider implications for the morphosyntax of predicational structures in Aromanian and beyond? In what follows we argue that the IA-clitic spells-out features contained in the functional structure located above PredP (where the IA/SUBJECT is generated), and below the copula BE:

(3) [TP...T_[+phi]...[copP BE [FP[F' F_[+top]] [FP [F' F_[+g/n]] [PredP ...IA/SUBJECT...]]]]]]]

In (3), the F head(s) contain gender and number features, as well as a topic feature, all of which agree with the IA (see also Jiménez-Fernández & Spyropoulos 2013 for small clauses). The IA-clitic is the reflex of this agreement. The IA further agrees with T, triggering (subject) agreement on BE. The content and location of the F structure accounts, in our view, for the person restriction and the object properties of the IA-clitic (cf. (2b)-(d)). We further propose (following Kratzer 1995; Ramchand 1997; Jiménez-Fernández 2012; Gallego & Uriagereka 2016, among others) that the F structure in (3) instantiates the (spatio-temporal) event-argument of Pred. Since only SLPs have such an argument (cf. Kratzer 1995), this explains why the IA-clitic is only found with SLPs, namely Ps and SL As (Ns and Individual-Level As lack it, as they typically denote properties of individuals, and VPs are not selected by BE). Moreover, it correctly predicts that

SLPs make available more structural positions for (subject) topics, in comparison to ILPs (Diesing 1992; Hallmann 2004) (Section 4).

This paper is of descriptive, typological, and theoretical importance: At a descriptive level, it presents a predicational construction not previously reported in the Romance literature, which resembles the *estar/ser* construction in Spanish. In this respect, in addition to enhancing our understanding of how predication is encoded in Aromanian, it opens up the possibility for cross-linguistic comparison with predicational constructions in other languages. At a typological level, it complements the inventory of split-person marking constructions attested cross-linguistically, and it illustrates how structurally conditioned ergativity (see (2)-(3)) is possible within a non-ergative language (cf. D’Alessandro and Ledgeway 2010 for Abruzzese). The fact that this particular instance of split-person marking is consistent with two typological tendencies related to feature hierarchies and Differential Object Marking (DOM) (discussed in Section 4) only adds to the importance. Finally, at a theoretical level, the IA-clitic phenomenon supports the idea that predicational BE structures share some, but not all, of their underlying properties, their differences being reducible to the functional structure distinct predicate types (Ps or As vs. Ns or Vs) may project, and to the selection properties of the copula (Roy 2013). The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 offers the socio-linguistic background and methodology, Section 3 presents the phenomenon, Section 4 offers the analysis, and Section 5 concludes.

2. Socio-linguistic background and methodology

Aromanian is an Eastern Romance variety spoken in the Balkans. In Greece, Aromanian is an oral variety used by bilingual speakers fluent in both Greek (the dominant variety) and Aromanian (the non-dominant variety). Currently, it is considered to be endangered (Bakalis & Galani 2012). Moreover, it is heavily influenced by Greek, due to language contact. The data reported in this paper were collected via fieldwork *in loco* in the Metsovo municipality, Epirus, North-Western Greece. Tasks used included sentence translation (from Greek to Aromanian) and (informal) acceptability judgments. 4 speakers were interviewed (mean age: 82). All speakers are fluent bilinguals who have resided in their village all their life. All tasks were administered orally and recorded using a digital recording device. Data are broadly transcribed following the IPA standard (see also Dinas & Katsanis 1990 for Aromanian transcription guidelines), although cross-speaker variation is not taken into consideration, as it is orthogonal to the discussion. Unless otherwise specified, all speakers concurred with the reported data.

3. The phenomenon and its distribution

3.1 *The general picture*

Consider the following sentence, which repeats the phenomenon at hand:

- (4) 'kumɥ i'mna vi'dzu kə 'u**fa**
while walked.IMPF.3SG saw.3SG that door.the
u e'ra dis'cɫisə
3SG.FEM.CL WAS.3SG open.FEM
'While he was walking, he saw that the door was open.'

In (4), the clitic *u* cross-references the internal argument and subject topic *'ufa* inside the embedded *kə*-clause. *U* is homophonous with the accusative/direct object clitic (5):

- (5) **u** dis'cɫise '**ufa** 'ftɟiorlu
3SG.FEM.CL opened.3SG door.the child.the
'The child opened (it) the door.'

However, and in view of the fact that Aromanian has case syncretism for nominative-accusative (see Dinas & Katsanis 1990), it is not a priori impossible to assume that *u* in (4) is nominative (given that it cross-references a

subject). Unfortunately, we cannot use syntactic tests to determine the case on the clitic, as Aromanian lacks true infinitives, or more generally structures that have been traditionally analysed as blocking nominative assignment. However, there are certain properties which suggest that the IA-clitic behaves morphosyntactically on a par with direct object clitics proper. In particular, (i) both the IA-clitic and a direct object clitic may only cross-reference an IA: in (6a) the IA-clitic may cross-reference an internal argument subject, although in (6b) this option is unavailable, as the subject is an AGENT/external argument. (7a-b) illustrates that the same distribution holds for object clitics:

- (6) a. **ats'ɛa u** 'ɛaste cipti'natə
 that.one 3SG.FEM.CL IS combed.FEM
 'That one is combed.'
- b. **ats'ɛa (*u)** 'ɛaste ar'katə
 that.one (*3SG.FEM.CL) IS jumped.FEM
 '*That one is jumped.'
- (7) a. **ats'ɛa u** cipti'nə 'misa
 that.one 3SG.FEM.CL combed.3SG mother.her
 'That one, her mother combed her.'
- b. **a'tselu (*u)** a'rukə 'nsusu ng'iosu
 that.one (*3SG.FEM.CL) jump.3SG up down

‘That one jumps (*her) up and down.’

(ii) Both object clitics (8a-b) and IA-clitics (9a-b) cannot co-occur with *sə* in the future tense, although they can co-occur with the subjunctive *sə*:

(8) a. *va (*sə) lu spi'latsi a'tselu*
FUT (*SUBJ) 3SG.MASC.CL wash.SUBJ.2PL that.one

‘You will wash him, that one.’

b. *(voj) z- lu spi'latsi a'tselu*
(want.1SG) SUBJ 3SG.MASC.CL wash.SUBJ.2PL that.one

‘(I want that) you wash him, that one!’

(9) a. *'mine trei mu'leri mu'fate tse ku'nosku*
tomorrow three women beautiful that know.1SG

*va (*sə) le 'çibə a'qatse*
FUT (*SUBJ) 3PL.FEM.CL BE.SUBJ.3PL over here

‘Tomorrow, three beautiful women I know will be over here’.

b. *ma'kari ma'ria sə u 'çibə a'qa di 'totuna*
wish.adv Maria.the SUBJ 3SG.FEM.CL BE.SUBJ.3SG here of always

‘I wish Maria were here forever.’

(iii) Finally, there is no other environment reported within Aromanian where the accusative clitic form cross-references a (deep or surface) subject. If the

IA-clitic were a true nominative clitic cross-referencing a nominative DP subject, this would be surprising.

The properties in (i-iii) lend support to the hypothesis that the IA-clitic cross-references an object (position) *despite* the fact that the cross-referenced argument is certainly (also) a subject (as it triggers nominative agreement on BE). This somewhat paradoxical conclusion will be further supported by the observation that IA-clitics do not seem to involve any co-occurrence restrictions with structural heads located within the TP - CP domain, which suggests that any checking involves lower portions of the clause. An account for this paradox is offered in section 4.

3.2 Environments in which the IA-clitic is found

The distribution of the IA-clitic is in fact highly restricted:

(i) the clitic only appears with the copula *'çiy* 'BE' (10a)³. It is not possible with other intransitives (including unaccusatives (10b-c), other copulas (10d), raising verbs (10e), or unergatives (10f)). It is also impossible with transitives (10g) (unless the clitic cross-references the object):

³ The present tense (indicative) paradigm for *'çiy* is as follows: *'çiy* (1SG), *'çiy* (2SG), *'easte/i(-e)* (3SG), *'çimü* (1PL), *'çitsi* (2PL), *'sin(t)u* (3PL). See also Dinas & Katsanis (1990).

- (10) a. 'i_u **lu** 'easte **a'tsel_u** **ku'fugu?**
 where 3SG.MASC.CL IS that cupboard
 'Where is that cupboard?'
- b. **ats'ea** (***u**) 'vine voto'nof_u
 that.one (*3SG.FEM.CL) came.3SG Votonosi
 'That woman came to Votonosi.'
- c. '**piatulu** (***lu**) s- 'frimpse (a'qa)
 dish.the (*3SG.MASC.CL) SE broke.3SG (here)
 'The dish broke here.'
- d. **a'tsel_u** (***lu**) s- a'drə 'mare
 that.one (*3SG.MASC.CL) SE made.3SG big
 'That one became big.'
- e. **a'tsel_u** **ni** (***lu**) z -'vɛade apostu'situ
 that.one 1SG.DAT.CL (*3SG.MASC.CL) SE see.3SG tired.MASC
 'That one seems to me tired.'
- f. **ats'ea mu'ɛare_i** (***u_i**) lu'kra/ i'mna
 that woman (*3SG.FEM.CL) worked/ walked.IMPF.3SG
 'dzua 'tutə
 day.the all
 'This woman was working/walking all day.'
- g. **ats'ea mu'ɛare_i** **u^{*i/j}** mi'nkə gi'kina_j
 that woman 3SG.FEM.CL ate.3SG chicken.the
 'That woman ate (it) the chicken.'

(ii) the clitic is possible only with *certain* instances of the copula verb *'çiy*, namely with a predicational *'çiy* that c-selects a PP or an AP predicate (mainly participles of unaccusatives and transitives; see also Section 4.2):

- (11) a. **mu'ʕearea a'taeə u** e'ra a'klo / 'nxoərə
 wife.the yours 3SG.FEM.CL WAS.3SG there / in.village
 'Your wife, she was there/in the village.'
- b. **a'tselu bir'batu lu** e'ra fu'dzitu
 that man 3SG.MASC.CL WAS.3SG gone.MASC
 di 'multu ci'ro
 of much time
 'That man had been gone for a long time.'
- c. **'lena u** e'ra necipti'natə di 'sor -sa
 Lena.the 3SG.FEM.CL WAS.3SG uncombed.FEM of sister.the-her.cl
 'Lena was uncombed (because of/by her sister).'
- d. **'maja am'ea u** 'easte 'multu a'dinatə
 grandmother.the mine 3SG.FEM.CL IS very thin.FEM
 'My grandmother is (indeed) very thin.'

Standardly, speakers reject the clitic when the predicate is an NP:

- (12) 'tata -ni (?*lu) 'ɛaste 'bunɔ 'omɔ // 'jɪatru
 father.the -mine.cl (?*3SG.MASC.CL) IS good.MASC man // doctor
 'My father is a good man// a doctor.'

(iii) Non-predicational uses of 'çiy are incompatible with the clitic:

- (13) a. 'preftulɔ di xɔarə (*lu) 'ɛaste 'jɪani
 priest.the of village (*3SG.MASC.CL) IS Jani
 'Priest of the village is John.' [specificational BE]
- b. nə'untru 'nkasə (*lu) 'ɛaste 'unɔ 'omɔ
 inside in.house (*3SG.MASC.CL) IS a man
 'There is a man inside the house.'⁴ [existential BE]

(iv) The clitic can be 3rd person (singular or plural) only (split person-marking):

- (14) a. 'eɥ (*me) 'çiy a'naltu stə 'pomɔ
 I (*1SG.CL) AM high.adv on tree
 'I am high up on the tree.'
- b. 'tini (*te) 'çij a'naltu stə 'pomɔ
 you (*2SG.CL) ARE.2SG high.adv on tree

⁴ Note that a preverbal subject would render (13b) grammatical, albeit without the existential reading – see fn. 10 (as preverbal subjects typically receive a strong reading – see 3.3).

‘You are high up on the tree.’

- c. **a'tselu lu** 'easte a'naltu stə 'pomu
that.one 3SG.MASC.CL IS high.adv on tree

‘That one is high up on the tree.’

(v) Finally, the clitic does not seem to interact with other heads within the TP - CP domain in any informative way. In particular, the clitic may appear with all the available tense forms for *'çiu*:

- (15) **a'tselu lu** 'easte /e'ra ||va **lu** 'çibə
that.one 3SG.MASC.CL IS/WAS.3SG ||FUT 3SG.MASC.CL BE.SUBJ.3SG
'jjanə
Janena
‘That one is/was/will be in Janena.’

Obligatory controlled clauses, which are typically considered to be tenseless in Balkan languages (see Landau 2004), also license the clitic:

- (16) a'eri **'kosta s -agər'fī**
yesterday Kosta SE forgot.3SG
z - **lu** 'çibə tu pla'teḯ (*'astaz)
SUBJ 3SG.MASC.CL BE.SUBJ.3SG to square (*today)

‘Yesterday, Kostas forgot to be at the square (*today).’

The IA-clitic may also co-occur with preverbal modality markers (such as the subjunctive *sə* and the future *va* (*sə*), both of which presumably reside above T, as they precede auxiliaries), and with the negative particle *nu*:

- (17) a. **a'tselu 'omu va lu** 'çibə 'jjanə ('mine)
that man FUT 3SG.MASC.CL BE.SUBJ.3SG Janena (tomorrow)
‘That man is going to be at Janena (tomorrow).’
- b. **a'tselu 'omu 'prinde sə lu** 'çibə
that man must.3SG SUBJ 3SG.MASC.CL BE.SUBJ.3SG
a'qatse
over.here
‘That man must be over here.’
- c. **a'tselu nu lu** e'ra a'klo
that.one NEG 3SG.MASC.CL WAS.3SG there
‘That one was not there.’

Finally, the IA-clitic is found with various complementisers:

- (18) a. **ma'ria** vi'dzu tu 'jisu kə u e'ra
Maria.the saw.3SG in dream that 3SG.FEM.CL WAS.3SG

ta 'unə li'vaðe

in a pasture

‘Maria dreamed that she was in a green pasture.’ [factive]

b. **bir'batulɯ** tse **lu** 'easte a'qa

man.the that 3SG.MASC.CL IS here

ni si 'spare kə 'easte 'bunɯ

1SG.DAT.CL SE seem.3SG that IS good.MASC

‘The man that is here seems to me to be a good man.’ [relative]

c. **'kola**, 'vəɾɯ nu ʃte'a 'iɯ **lu** e'ra

Kola, anyone NEG knew.IMPF.3SG where 3SG.MASC.CL WAS.3SG

‘Kola, no one knew where he was.’ [wh-embedded]

These properties show two things: (a) the IA-clitic does not contain features which correlate with features located in the TP - CP domain. This could indicate that the features relevant for the clitic are generated lower, even though the clitic ends up pronounced in T; (b) the position of the clitic mirrors the position of direct object clitics, which must also follow the preverbal markers but immediately precede the AGR-finite T.⁵ The null hypothesis, then, is that the IA-clitic is an object clitic. This is corroborated by the same morphosyntactic distribution shared between IA-clitics and true direct object clitics (see 3.1 above). One prediction this hypothesis makes is that

⁵ Note that the varieties under investigation do not have gerunds or (true) infinitives. As a result, it is impossible to test whether the absence of AGR would force enclisis.

IA-clitics and direct object clitic doubling/left dislocation should share the same semantico-pragmatic restrictions (as the clitic cross-references an internal argument in both cases). In the following section, we argue that this prediction is borne out.⁶ Restrictions (i-iv) are taken up in Section 4.

3.3 Further restrictions: the DP subject is a topic

In this section, we show that the IA-clitic may only cross-reference definite/specific subjects that are interpreted as topics. This distribution is similar to direct object clitic doubling/left dislocation (which are Differential Object Marking (DOM) constructions). Consider (19):

- (19) a. - *What is new?*
- (***lu**) 'ɛaste 'jiani 'nkasə
 (*3SG.MASC.CL) IS John in.home
 'John is at home.'
- b. - *What about John?*
- 'jiani *(**lu**) 'ɛaste 'nkasə
 John *(3SG.MASC.CL) IS in.home
 'John is at home.'

⁶ In this respect, note that subject agreement does not impose a topic or specificity related restriction on the subject, unlike object clitics (see examples in main text).

The sentences in (19) illustrate that the presence of the IA-clitic is not optional. Rather, it is related to information structure, in particular to whether the subject is a topic or not. In addition, the interpretation of the subject as a topic correlates with its position before or after the copula. That the IA-clitic can cross-reference overt or covert topics is shown below (see Frascarelli 2007 for a typology of topics):

- (20) a. **'niklu (a'tselu) lu** 'easte fu'dzitu
 Nick.the (that one) 3SG.MASC.CL IS gone.MASC
 'Nick, he/that one is gone.' [hanging topic]
- b. - *What about Kola?*
'kola lu e'ra a'naltu stə 'pomu sh ki'dzu
 Kola 3SG.MASC.CL WAS.3SG high.adv on tree and fell.3SG
 'Kola, he was high on the tree and fell.' [aboutness topic]
- c. **ma'ria** vi'dzu tu 'jisu
 Maria.the saw.3SG in dream
 kə **pro u** e'ra tə 'unə li'vaði
 that pro 3SG.FEM.CL WAS.3SG in a pasture
 'Maria dreamed that she was in a pasture.' [pro topic]
- d. **'kola lu** 'easte a'qa, **ma'ria** 'omos
 Kola 3SG.MASC.CL IS here, Maria.the but
u 'easte 'naparte
 3SG.FEM.CL IS over.there

‘Kola, he is here, but Maria, she is over there.’ [contrastive topic]

On the other hand, the IA-clitic cannot cross-reference a non-topic subject.

This includes, among others, foci (21), wh- (22) and negative operators (23):

(21) a. - *Who was further away?*

'KOla (*lu) e'ra

KOla (*3SG.MASC.CL) WAS.3SG [narrow focus]

‘It was COLA who was further away.’

b. **'NIklu (*lu)** 'ɛaste fu'dzitu, 'oçi 'kola

NICK.the (*3SG.MASC.CL) IS gone.MASC, not Kola

‘NICK is gone, not Kola.’ [contrastive focus]

c. - *What is happening?*

(*lu) 'ɛaste **a'tselu 'omu** a'naltu stə 'pomu

(*3SG.MASC.CL) IS that man high.adv on tree

‘That man is high on the tree.’ [broad focus]

(22) a. **'kare** [numi'sefti kə] **(*lu)** e'ra a'qa?

who [think.2SG that] (*3SG.MASC.CL) WAS.3SG here

‘Who [do you think] was here?’ [Wh-subject]

b. ??/* **'kare 'qaspe** [numi'sefti kə] **lu** e'ra a'klo?⁷

which friend [think.2SG that] 3SG.MASC.CL WAS.3SG there

'Which friend do you think was there? [D-linked Wh-subject]

(23) (**'vəru**) nu (***lu**) e'ra (**'vəru**) a'qa

anyone NEG (*3SG.MASC.CL) WAS.3SG (anyone) here

'No one was here.' [non-referential quantifier subject]

If it is true that the IA-clitic only cross-references subject topics, it is expected that these will be definite and/or specific, as definite/specific DPs have strong/referential readings (and hence qualify as topics *par excellence*).⁸ This prediction is borne out: as shown in (24-27) below, the IA-clitic may only cross-reference specific and/or definite subjects. In fact, doubling of a bare subject or of a subject with a non-referential quantifier leads to ungrammaticality (*unless* D-linking applies – see e.g. 22b above, or 25c below).

⁷ Cliticised D-linked subjects are only allowed by those speakers who also accept cliticisation of D-linked direct object/accusative operators. This lends further support to the proposal that IA-clitics pattern like direct object clitics morphosyntactically.

⁸ Although the syntactico-semantic properties of a 'doubled' subject restrict whether it can be 'doubled' or not, the presence or absence of the clitic ultimately depends on information structure (note that the same applies in Modern Greek - see Mavrogiorgos 2010 and references therein). This is illustrated below, where a definite QP may remain 'undoubled' even in preverbal position, if used in a broad focus context:

(i) – *What about the three women? // Are the three women gone?*
'trejle mu'leri li 'sintu fu'dzite
 three.the women 3PL.FEM.CL ARE.3PL gone.PL.FEM
 'The three women are (indeed) gone.'

(ii) – *What is new? // (What is happening to the three women?)*
'trejle mu'leri (li) 'sintu fu'dzite
 three.the women (3PL.FEM.CL) ARE.3PL gone.PL.FEM
 'The three women are gone.'

(24) - *What about that man? // Is that man back in Metsovo?*

a'tselu lu 'ɛaste tur'natu a'mintfu

that.one 3SG.MASC.CL IS returned.MASC Metsovo

'That one is (indeed) back in Metsovo.' [definite subject]

(25) a. - *What is new?*

(*li) 'sintu 'trej mu'leri nə'untru tu bi'sɛarikə

(*3PL.FEM.CL) ARE.3PL three women inside at church

'There are three women inside the church.' [non-specific subject]

b. - *I am looking for 3 women around here.*

'trej mu'leri li 'sintu nə'untru tu bi'sɛarikə

three women 3PL.FEM.CL ARE.3PL inside at church

'Three specific women are inside the church.' [specific subject]

c. - *Some (specific) women are not inside the church.*

Li 'sintu na'skinte mu'leri nə'untru tu bisɛarikə

3PL.FEM.CL ARE.3PL some women inside at church

'There ARE some women inside the church.' [D-linked subject]

(26) sə nu (*li) 'çibə 'ksepi a'ɔatse

SUBJ NEG (*3PL.MASC.CL) BE.SUBJ.3PL strangers over.here

'anda mi'nkəmu

when eat.1PL

'Strangers should not be over here when we eat.' [bare noun subject]

- (27) sə nu (*lu) 'çibə 'vəru 'ksenu a'qatse
 SUBJ NEG (*3SG.MASC.CL) BE.SUBJ.3SG any stranger over.here
 'No stranger should be over here (when we eat).'
- [non-specific non-referential subject]

Exactly the same patterns apply to Clitic Left Dislocated (CLLDed) and Clitic Doubled (CDed) accusative/direct objects:

- (28) - *What is new?*
- a. # ('unu bir'batu) lu vi'dzui ('unu bir'batu) tu pla'tej
 (a man) 3SG.MASC.CL saw.1SG (a man) at square
 'I saw a certain man at the square.'
- b. vi'dzui 'unu bir'batu tu pla'tej
 saw.1SG a man at square
 'I saw a man at the square.'
- (29) - *I am looking for a man. Have you seen him?*
- a. ('unu bir'batu) lu vi'dzui ('unu bir'batu) tu pla'tej
- b. # vi'dzui 'unu bir'batu tu pla'tej
- (30) a. (*lu) vi'dzui bir'batu tu pla'tej
 (*3SG.MASC.CL) saw.1SG man at square
 '*I saw him man at the square.' (uttered in a village with no men)

- b. nu (*lu) vi'dzuj 'vəru (bir'batu) tu pla'tej
 NEG (*3SG.MASC.CL) saw.1SG any (man) at square
 ‘*I did not see him any man at the square.’

Summing up, the distribution of the IA-clitic is restricted by properties of the cross-referenced/doubled subject: the latter can only be definite/specific (a syntactico-semantic requirement) and a topic (a syntactico-pragmatic requirement). In addition, the same distribution is found with direct object clitics/DOM markers. This fact supports the hypothesis that the IA-clitic is a direct object clitic/DOM marker.

4. The analysis

4.1 *The structural properties of IA-clitics*

This section presents our analysis. We propose that the IA-clitic spells-out features in the functional structure sandwiched between PredP and BE. The features involved include [topic] and [number/gender], though crucially not [person].⁹ The derivation of an IA-clitic structure is given in (31) (copies of moved constituents are in brackets):

⁹ In essence, the intuition behind this choice is that the Top & Asp heads are related to the nature of the PredP and the BE-copula that c-selects them. An alternative would be to put

a) Restriction of IA-clitics to PPs and APs (cf. ii, Section 3.2): Only Ps and As project the required functional suprastructure (being SLPs). Ns do not have such structure (alternatively, accessibility to it is independently blocked (e.g. by a more complex structure, specific to Ns)). Vs are not selected by BE in Aromanian (cf. that no such structures are ever attested).

b) Restriction to predicational BE (cf. i & iii, Section 3.2): The impossibility of a clitic in the case of other unaccusative/intransitive verbs (including other copulas) is related to the fact that the latter involve roots embedded under a VP structure. Presumably, VPs proper do not contain Asp/Top information, while higher unaccusative v heads lack such features (which captures the preverbal position of subject topics, as they agree with a higher CP/TP topic head). As for non-predicational instances of BE, it is not clear to us why they never allow a IA-clitic. A detailed analysis cannot be provided here for space reasons. However, it is worth mentioning that our account predicts the relevant factor should be related to the fact that these structures involve different types of predicates (typically, DPs), compared to predicational BE structures which only involve Ps and As. This hypothesis needs to be tested independently.¹⁰

c) Restriction to 3rd person (cf. iv, Section 3.2): The 3rd person restriction follows from the fact that Asp lacks person. This entails that IA/SUBJECTS of all persons are compatible with the predicational BE-structure: they can check [number] and [gender] against Asp, then check [person] against T. However, it

¹⁰ A reviewer points out that this may be connected to the fact that non-predicational predication has no topic interpretation (see also fn. 4). We add here that, for specificational BE, one could argue that the predicate is the topic, which cannot be spelled-out by a D-clitic.

is only 3rd person clitics that can spell-out the Asp head, since they are the only morphemes lacking [person] in their morphological specification. If this is true, then we expect preverbal 1st and 2nd person strong pronouns to also allow for a topic interpretation in predicational BE-structures, even if they do not allow for cliticisation. This, in fact, is borne out:

(32) a. – *And what about you?*

('eṽ) 'çiụ tu pla'teṽ

(I) AM at square

'I am at the square.'

b. – *What's new?*

'çiụ ('eṽ) tu pla'teṽ

AM (I) at square

'I am at the square.'

According to this analysis, then, the 3rd person restriction is the result of multiple checking of a single DP (=the IA/SUBJECT) against two heads (Asp & T), combined with the fact that the Asp head lacks a person feature.

d) Restriction to definite/specific topic IAs/SUBJECTS (cf. 3.3): This follows from the presence of the Top head, which contains topic features. These may only be checked by a definite and/or specific (D-linked) IA/SUBJECT (whether this a semantic or a purely morphosyntactic issue is not of relevance here).

e) Case: Regarding the abstract case features assigned to the IA-clitic, as we have already said, Aromanian has nominative-accusative case syncretism. Therefore, morphology cannot help us in this regard. Theoretically, there are two possibilities: (i) the clitic cannot receive accusative case by Asp, as the latter does not contain a full set of phi-features (see Chomsky 2001). As a result, the clitic (and the coreferential IA/SUBJECT) receive nominative from T (which contains a full set of phi-features); (ii) the second possibility is that Asp *does* assign accusative. As a result, the clitic (and the coreferential IA/SUBJECT) receive two cases, an unwelcome result.¹¹ Alternatively, the clitic receives accusative case, while the coreferential IA/SUBJECT receives nominative, also an unwelcome result, as Aromanian does not allow case mismatches in clitic dependency chains (cf. e.g. doubled datives). For these reasons, we will assume here that the clitic-IA/SUBJECT dependency has nominative. However, the overall morphosyntactic behavior of the IA-clitic is that of a direct object clitic. This is so, because it is the spell-out of features located in the functional periphery of PredP, not of features in TP - CP. This is hardly surprising, as case marking does not necessarily correlate with theta-marking (see Marantz 1991).

4.2 Implications and predictions

The proposed analysis has a number of implications and predictions:

¹¹ Note that it is unlikely that the accusative is inherent here, as inherent cases do not normally correlate with strong-only readings (cf. e.g. de Hoop 1992; Ramchand 1997).

- i. It captures, in structural terms, the typological observation that 3rd person arguments are more likely to be marked when interpreted as topics, compared to 1st and 2nd person arguments. This is so, as 1st and 2nd persons are deictic, as opposed to 3rd person, and deictic persons are more readily interpreted as topics (see also discussion around (32); for feature hierarchies and how they affect argument marking cross-linguistically see e.g. Silverstein 1976). Here, this observation applies to a particular type of subject, namely 3rd person IA/SUBJECTS of PP and AP predicates, and it is reduced to the presence of certain functional heads at the periphery of PredP, against which IAS/SUBJECTS check their features on their way to T.
- ii. It captures the intuition that deep objects are less likely to be interpreted as topics, as opposed to deep subjects. Therefore, the former are typologically more likely to be marked when interpreted as topics, as opposed to the latter (in fact, object CD/CLLD is a more general instantiation of this tendency; see Silverstein 1976, among others, for marking of non-prototypical arguments).
- iii. It predicts that the IA-clitic will not be present if the required functional structure on top of PredP is also not present. In this case, the IA/SUBJECT will only check features against T (or some higher available head). As a result, there will be only one copy of the IA/SUBJECT below TP, namely that in [Spec PredP]. One piece of evidence that this is a valid prediction comes from the behavior of

APs. Generally, APs allow for an IA-clitic. However, SL As seem to behave differently from IL ones, as shown by the following sentences:

(33) - *What about that one?*

a. **ats'ɛa u** 'ɛaste nipo'tutə / a'ðinatə
 that.one 3SG.FEM.CL IS sick.FEM / slim.FEM
 / 'grɔasə / fu'dzitə
 / fat.FEM / gone.FEM

b. **ats'ɛa u** e'ra nipo'tutə / a'ðinatə
 that.one 3SG.FEM.CL WAS.3SG sick.FEM / slim.FEM
 / 'grɔasə / fu'dzitə
 / fat.FEM / gone.FEM

‘That one is//was sick / slim / fat / gone.’ [SL As]

c. **a'tselu (?*lu)** 'ɛaste a'naltu / 'bunu / 'eksipno
 that.one (?*3SG.MASC.CL) IS tall.MASC / good.MASC / smart.MASC

d. **a'tselu lu** e'ra a'naltu / 'bunu / 'eksipno
 that.one 3SG.MASC.CL WAS.3SG tall.MASC/good.MASC/smart.MASC

‘That one is//was tall / good / smart.’ [IL As]

These sentences show that although SL As freely allow for a IA-clitic, provided a topic DP is cross-referenced, IL As are more restricted. In fact, only 3 out of 4 speakers accepted structures like (33d), and in this case, they interpreted the

IA/SUBJECT as ‘not alive’, a hallmark of ILPs (Kratzer 1995). Finally, speakers may differ as to whether they interpret a particular adjective as SL (cf. e.g. *a'dinatə* or *'grəsaθ*). How can we accommodate these facts?

For those speakers who reject IA-clitics with IL As across the board, it is reasonable to assume that they do not project Topic & Asp with these particular As (on a par with Ns, which are also ILPs). As a result, they lack the spatio-temporal argument SLPs have, and a topic IA/SUBJECT can only agree with T. On the contrary, SLP IAS/SUBJECTS may or not be interpreted as Topics, but when interpreted as such, they must be preverbal and the IA-clitic present. Presumably, this is because the IA/SUBJECT must stop at Asp & Top, before it moves to T, which is not the case for ILPs. That this may be true is supported by the fact that ILPs constitute much better answers to topic questions as opposed to wide focus questions, provided the IA/SUBJECT is preverbal:

(34) a. - *What's new?*

(#ma'ria) 'ɛaste 'bunə (#ma'ria)

(Maria.the) IS good.FEM (Maria.the)

b. b. - *What about Maria?*

(ma'ria) 'ɛaste 'bunə (#ma'ria)

(Maria.the) IS good.FEM (Maria.the)

‘Maria is good/a good person.’ [neutral intonation]

(34) suggests that ILP IAs/SUBJECTs must be interpreted as topics, and the only available position for this interpretation is the preverbal position (without a clitic being possible in this case). This follows from the analysis proposed here (inasmuch as the presence of the clitic is reduced to the presence of Asp & Top in the relevant structures), and it agrees with the observation that cross-linguistically ILP IAs/SUBJECTs may only be interpreted as Topics, as opposed to SLP ones which may or not be interpreted as such (Kratzer 1995; see also Jiménez-Fernández 2012 for Spanish). As for why certain roots are more amenable to being embedded within some functional structure as opposed to others, this is a question we will have to leave aside. However, the reasons may lie with the semantics/pragmatics, rather than the actual morphosyntax.¹²

What about those speakers who accept IA-clitics with IL As in the past tense (cf. (33d))? We assume that the presence of the past tense somehow licenses the extra clitic position (and related functional structure). Although it is not clear to us why this should be (especially, as these predicates give rise to life-time effects, a hall-mark of ILPs, even when an IA-clitic is present), this is a well-known effect of past tense operators (Kratzer 1995). We leave this issue for further research.

¹² This conclusion may be supported by the fact that speakers can get an evidentiality reading when the clitic is used, which has been attributed to the pragmatics of the extra spatio-temporal argument (see e.g. Maienborn 2005).

5. Conclusion

We have reported the existence of a peculiar clitic construction attested in some Aromanian varieties spoken in North-Western Greece. This involves the presence of a direct object clitic form on the predicational copula BE, when the latter selects PP and AP predicates as complements. This structure is highly constrained in morphosyntactic terms, and we offered an analysis that reduces these constraints to structural properties, in particular to the presence/absence of an Asp and Top head at the left periphery of the PredP c-selected by BE. Finally, we discussed some implications and predictions of this analysis, and how it fits into the more general typological, empirical and theoretical picture.

References

- Bakalis, Evangelos and Alexandra Galani. 2012. "Modeling language evolution: Aromanian, an endangered language in Greece." *Physica A* 391: 4963-4969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2012.05.033>
- Bowers, John. 1993. "The Syntax of Predication". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591-656.
- Carlson, Gregory. 1977. Reference to kinds in English. PhD dissertation, UMass Amherst.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by Phase". In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta and Adam Ledgeway. 2010. "The Abruzzese T-v system: feature spreading and the double auxiliary construction". In *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*, ed. by Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway, and Ian Roberts, 201-209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Hoop, Helen. 2002. Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation. PhD Dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

- Dinas, Konstantinos and Nikolaos Katsanis. 1990. *Γραμματική της Κοινής Κουτσοβλαχικής* [Grammar of the Common Kutsovlach]. Thessaloniki: Archives of Macedonian studies.
- Dowty, David. 1991. "Thematic-Proto-Roles and Argument Selection". *Language* 67 (3): 547-619. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1991.0021>
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. "The Semantics of Specificity". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22 (1): 1-25.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2007. "Subjects, topics and the interpretation of referential pro: an interface approach to the linking of (null) pronouns." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 691-734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-007-9025-x>
- Gallego, Ángel and Juan Uriagereka. 2016. "ESTAR = SER + X." *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 5 (1): 123-156. <https://doi.org/10.7557/1.5.1.3634>
- Hallmann, Peter. 2004. "NP Interpretation and the Structure of Predicates." *Language* 80 (4): 707-747. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2004.0195>
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel Luis. 2012. "What Information Structure tells us about Individual/Stage-Level Predicates." *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 1 (1): 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.7557/1.1.1.2293>
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel Luis and Vasilios Spyropoulos. 2013. "Feature inheritance, vP phases and the information structure of small clauses." *Studia Linguistica* 67(2): 185-244. <https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12013>
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. "Stage-Level and Individual Level Predicates." In *The Generic Book*, ed. by Gregory Carlson, and Francis Pelletier, 125-175. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. "The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811- 877. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-004-4265-5>
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2005. "A discourse-based account of Spanish ser/estar." *Linguistics* 43 (1): 155-180. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2005.43.1.155>
- Marantz, Alec. 1991. "Case and Licensing." In *Proceedings of ESCOL '91*, ed. by German Westphal, Benjamin Ao, and Hee-Rahk Chae, 234-253. Cornell Linguistics Club.
- Mavrogiorgos, Marios. 2010. *Clitics in Greek: A Minimalist Account of Proclisis and Enclisis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.160>
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. "Wh-in-Situ: Movement and Unselective Binding." In *The Representation of (Ind)definiteness*, ed. by Eric J. Reuland, and Alice G.B. ter Meulen, 98-129. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ramchand, Gillian. 1997. *Aspect and Predication: The Semantics of Argument Structure*. Oxford: OUP.
- Roy, Isabelle. 2013. *Nonverbal Predication: Copular Sentences at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Oxford: University of Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199543540.001.0001>

Siverstein, Michael. 1976. "Hierarchy of features and ergativity". In *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, ed. by Robert Malcom Ward Dixon, 112-171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.