

Variation and change in the Romance possessive constructions: An overview of nominal, adverbial and verbal uses¹

MIRIAM BOUZOUTA
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
MATTI MARTTINEN LARSSON
Stockholm University

Abstract

In this introductory article, we will first illustrate the great morpho-syntactic diversity that exists in the Romance possessive systems from a comparative perspective, and then detail the recent changes that have taken place. After discussing the various nominal patterns, the use of tonic possessives in the adverbial and verbal domain will be examined. Subsequently, the various contributions of this special issue will be summarized and evaluated.

Keywords: Romance, possessive, noun, prepositional phrase, adverbial, verbal, analogical extension, reanalysis

1. Introduction

Despite having a common ancestor, there are important morpho-syntactic differences between the various Romance possessive systems.² While some possessives behave like adjectives, others function like determiners, and yet others as pronouns (e.g. Lyons 1985; Schoorlemmer 1998; GLA 2001:108; Ledgeway 2011; Van Peteghem 2012; De Andrés Díaz 2013:375, among others). Indeed, while Latin possessives are strong forms with a distribution similar to that of lexical adjectives, various divergent systems exist in the Romance languages (e.g. Van Peteghem 2012). To illustrate the great (morpho-)syntactic diversity that exists in the Romance possessive systems and the different recent changes that have taken place, we will give a broad comparative overview of the various possessive configurations in the nominal, adverbial and verbal domains (sections 1.1 and 1.2), detailing similarities and differences. We will focus especially on the Ibero-Romance varieties, albeit not exclusively, as they have received less attention in the

¹ We would like to thank the participants and audience of the *Possessive Constructions in Romance Conference (PossRom2018)*, held at Ghent University (27th-28th of June 2018) for their valuable input. All the contributions of this special issue, except for this introduction, have been presented there. We wish to extend our thanks to Virginia Bertolotti, Mónica Castillo Lluch, Joan Coba, Claudia Crocco, Luis Eguren, Martin Elsig, Andrés Enrique-Arias, Xosé Ramón Freixeiro Mato, Ana Isabel García Tesoro, María Mare, Ramón Mariño, Laura Migliori, Carmen Moral del Hoyo, Dorien Nieuwenhuijsen, Azucena Palacios Alcaine and Eva-Marie Remberger for their help, as well as Laura Álvarez López, Anna Gudmundson and Johan Gille of *Moderna språk*.

² This does not, however, imply that all Romance possessives derive from the same Latin forms.

possessive literature.³ The prenominal possessive constructions will be scrutinized in section 1.1.1, followed by their postnominal counterparts in 1.1.2. Subsequently, the prepositional constructions used in nominal contexts to express possession (and other related semantic interpretations) will be examined in section 1.1.3. These prepositional cases will provide the stepping stone to the adverbial and verbal uses of the tonic possessives (section 1.2), as the analogical extensions to these domains are due to the similarities found between the prepositional and the tonic possessive constructions. In the second part of this article, we will summarize and critically evaluate the various contributions that appear in this special issue on possessive constructions in Romance.

1.1 Possessives in the nominal domain

1.1.1 Prenominal possessives

As regards the prenominal cases, there is considerable diversity as to whether the possessive forms can co-occur with **definite articles** ([definite article + possessive + noun]) or not ([∅ + possessive + noun]). The French and Spanish examples in (1a) illustrate the determiner behavior of the prenominal possessives ([∅ + possessive + noun]), which have been said to be clitics. In the European Portuguese, Galician, Asturian, Aragonese and Italian cases in (1b), on the contrary, the combination of a definite article and a prenominal possessive is used to express the same as in (1a) and the possessives appear to be adjectival stressed forms ([definite article + possessive + noun]; GLA 2001:108; Ledgeway 2011; Van Peteghem 2012; De Andrés Díaz 2013:375; Frías Conde 2014:38-39; Dubert & Galves 2016:445; EFA 2021:116-117 among others).⁴

- (1) a. *mon livre / mi libro* [French / Spanish]
my book
b. *o meu livro / o meu libro / el mio llibru / lo mío libro / il mio libro*
the my book [European Portuguese / Galician / Asturian / Aragonese / Italian]
'my book'

The determiner-like status of (oral standard) French and Spanish prenominal possessives is corroborated by their inability to co-occur with other determiners, as exemplified in (2a)-(2b) for the definite and indefinite articles, the demonstrative and the universal quantifier *chaque / cada* 'each', and in (3a)-(3b) for existential quantifier *quelques / algunos* 'some', the numeral *trois / tres* 'three' and the indefinite quantifier *plusieurs / varios* 'several' respectively (e.g. Lyons 1985; Van Peteghem 2012). The French and Spanish prenominal possessives appear thus to be

³ For space reasons, we will only focus on the attributive uses of the possessives, thus leaving the predicative structures aside. Similarly, possessive meanings expressed by dative clitics to the verb fall outside the scope of this overview, as well as vocative and doubling constructions.

⁴ Cardinaletti (1998) proposes a tripartite classification, in which the possessive forms in (1a) are considered clitics, those in (1b) weak, and postnominal cases, such as the Spanish *el libro mío* lit. 'the book mine', are strong.

in complementary distribution with the other determiner elements, unlike their Italian counterparts, which can appear simultaneously, as shown in (2c) and (3c).⁵

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--|-----------|
| (2) | a. | <i>*le / *un / *ce / *chaque mon livre</i> | [French] |
| | b. | <i>*el / *un / *este / *cada mi libro</i> | [Spanish] |
| | c. | <i>il / un / questo / ciascun mio libro</i> | [Italian] |
| | | the / a / this / each my book | |
| | | 'my book / a book of mine / this book of mine / each book of mine' | |
| (3) | a. | <i>*quelques / *trois / *plusieurs mes livres</i> | [French] |
| | b. | <i>*algunos / *tres / *varios mis libros</i> | [Spanish] |
| | c. | <i>alcuni / tre / molti miei libri</i> | [Italian] |
| | | some / three / several my books | |
| | | 'some / three / several of my books' | |

Additionally, not all languages have either only determiner (or adjectival) possessives, as prenominal systems can display mixed syntactic patterns and can thus be more complex. Catalan and Occitan, for instance, contain both types of possessives, although the former appear only for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons in singular (Coba Femenia 1999:87; Carrera 2009:10; Ledgeway 2011:416; De Andrés Díaz 2013:375, 380; Labrousse 2018:35; GBIEC 2019:197-200; GEIEC 2020; Pescarini 2020). In Catalan, these determiner possessives, such as *mon* and *ma* in (4a), are unstressed and cannot co-occur with definite and indefinite articles, demonstratives, and quantifiers (cf. French and Spanish examples in (2a) and (2b)). They are further lexically restricted as they appear with certain **kinship terms** only (4a), unlike in Occitan where no such constraint applies (for a diachronic account of this construction in Catalan and European Portuguese, see Labrousse in this volume; cf. the distribution of adjectival and enclitic possessives in the southern dialects of Italy, for a detailed analysis see De Sisto and Torres-Tamarit in this volume; Ledgeway 2016:258).⁶ Similar to Catalan, Aragonese also uses unstressed determiner possessives with nouns expressing family relations (*mi*, *tu*, *su*). However, as illustrated in (4c), variation with the [definite article + possessive + kinship noun] construction is observed for these contexts (Lozano Sierra 2010:95; EFA 2021:117).

⁵ Contrary to oral standard Spanish, prenominal possessive configurations with demonstratives are still encountered in formal written registers (RAE & ASALE 2009:1345-1346; see example (12f)), and in Andean and Paraguayan Spanish (see example (12g)), as in Old Spanish, exemplified in (6c).

⁶ Catalan determiner possessives can also appear with honorary titles, as in *ses majestats els Reis de l'Orient* 'their Majesties the Kings of the East', and in fixed phrases, such as those with *vida* and *casa*, as in *en ma vida* lit. 'in my life / never', *ma casa* 'my house' (e.g. Coba Femenia 1999:104; De Andrés Díaz 2013:379; GEIEC 2020; see also footnote 8 for similarities with Portuguese, Galician and Asturian, GLA 2001:111-112). Interestingly, constructions with *casa* never appear with a definite article in Aragonese, but take a postnominal possessive, as in *casa nuestra* 'my / our house' (e.g. Saura Rami 2003:145; Ánchel Barcos 2007:61; Lozano Sierra 2010:95).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--|----|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (4) | a. | <i>el meu amic – la meva casa</i> | vs | <i>mon pare – ma mare</i> | [Catalan] |
| | b. | <i>eth mèn amic – era mia casa</i> | vs | <i>ma pair – ma mair</i> | [Aranese] |
| | | the my friend – the my house | | my father – my mother | |
| | | ‘my (male) friend – my house’ | | ‘my father – my mother’ | |
| | c. | <i>el / lo / o mío pai – la mía mai</i> | vs | <i>mi pai – mi mai</i> | [Aragonese] |
| | d. | <i>el / lo meu pare – la meu / meva mare</i> | | | [Central and north-western Catalan] |

A closer look at the Romance diatopic varieties reveals an abundance in divergent pronominal possessive systems and corroborates that, indeed, possessive paradigms can contain both determiner and adjectival possessives. To exemplify, central Catalan and certain north-western varieties prefer the [definite article + possessive + noun] construction with kinship terms, as in (4d),⁷ unlike Valencian, Balearic and Algherese, as is evidenced in detail in the *Atlas Lingüístic del Domini Català* (ALDC 2001-2018) for a range of terms denoting family relations (ALDC 2016: maps 1936-1942).⁸

Similarly, there is significant geographic microvariation in Occitan with respect to the [definite article + (stressed) possessive + noun] vs [(unstressed) possessive + noun] structures: unlike standard Occitan, but similar to Catalan, the unstressed determiner possessives are limited lexically in Aranese and Nissart,⁹ –Occitan varieties that display both types of possessives–, as illustrated in (4b) (De Andrés Díaz 2013:375; Pescarini 2020). Yet other dialects, such as Rhodanian, lack the tonic adjectival forms altogether (Oliviéri & Sauzet 2016:332; cf. Rohlf 1977:187).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------------------|----|---|----------------------------------|
| (5) | a. | <i>Falei com teu pai</i> | vs | <i>Falei com o teu pai</i> | [Portuguese] |
| | b. | <i>Falei con teu pai</i> | vs | <i>Falei co teu pai</i> | [Galician] |
| | c. | <i>Falé con to pá</i> | vs | <i>Falé col to pá</i> | [Asturian] |
| | | I-spoke with your father | vs | I-spoke with-the your father | |
| | d. | [ma ‘bu:ba] | | | [Franco-Provençal from Liddes] |
| | | my daughter | | | |
| | e. | [e mæy ‘bubə] | vs | [mjə ‘fiajəø] | [Franco-Provençal from Lourtier] |
| | | the my daughter | | my brother ‘my daughter vs my brother’ | |
| | f. | <i>mio fratello</i> | vs | <i>i miei fratelli</i> | [Italian] |
| | | my brother | | the my brothers ‘my brother vs my brothers’ | |

⁷ Notice how in some Central varieties, such as those spoken in Girona and its neighboring areas, there appears to be an agreement mismatch, as shown in the 2nd example in (4d): to wit, there is no agreement between, on the one hand, the feminine noun *mare* ‘mother’ and definite article *la*, and, on the other, the unmarked / masculine possessive *meu* (Rull i Muruzàbal 2020:42-43). A similar observation can be made for the adjectival clitic possessives in Central Trentino in (5e), which are invariable (Casalicchio & Cordin 2020:77; cf. central and eastern Asturian use of possessive *mío* which is nowadays used with both masculine and feminine nouns, as exemplified in *el mio amigo* ‘my friend’ and *la mio casa* ‘my house’ respectively, Lorenzo 1998:26, 2020; GLA 2001:107; De Andrés Díaz 2013:383).

⁸ In Rossellonese (northern Catalan) there appears to be variation between both syntactic configurations (ALDC 2016: maps 1936-1942).

⁹ Aranese is an Occitan variety spoken in the Iberian Peninsula in Val d’Aran, whereas Nissart (or Niçard / Niçois) is found in southern France, in the city of Nice.

- | | | | | |
|----|---|----|--|--------------------|
| g. | <i>el me libro – la me bici</i>
the my book – the my bike
'my book – my bike' | vs | <i>me pare – me mama</i>
my father – my mother
'my father – my mother' | [Central Trentino] |
| h. | <i>(il) miu cavagl</i>
the my horse 'my horse' | | | [Surselvan] |
| i. | /mjo fi/
'my son' | | | [Friulian] |

Interestingly, Portuguese, Galician, and Asturian display a somewhat similar structure to the Catalan ones in (4a): as exemplified in (5a), (5b) and (5c), bare possessives can be used when a (close) family term follows the prenominal possessive (GLA 2001:111-112; Frías Conde 2012:66; De Andrés Díaz 2013:378; Bleurçu 2020:103). Observe though that the determiner possessives in these Ibero-Romance languages are tonic and have the same form as their adjectival counterparts that co-occur with determiners,¹⁰ in contrast to the ones in standard Catalan (4a), Aranese (4b) and Aragonese (4c).

Franco-Provençal (or Arpitan) also has various types of possessives in the prenominal domain. While the unstressed determiner possessives ([∅ + possessive + noun]), as in (5d), are found everywhere in Franco-Provençal language area, some varieties also have adjectival ones, which can be preceded by the definite article ([definite article + possessive + noun]), often identical to the possessives, as in the first example in (5e). Note further that, like in Portuguese, Galician, Asturian and Italian, the article can be omitted in these stressed possessive configurations, as in the 2nd example of (5e) (Kristol 2016:359).

Italian allows an equivalent structure with certain singular family terms, as in *mio fratello* 'my brother', but requires the article for the plural (5f) (Cardinaletti 1998; Van Peteghem 2012). Comparable patterns to the ones encountered in standard Catalan (4a) are also attested in Italy's northern diatopic varieties, as shown for central Trentino in (5g) (see section 1.1.2 and Silvestri in this volume for an overview of the various syntactic constructions in Italo-Romance). Notwithstanding this, the adjectival possessives in this diatopic variety, which can be preceded by a definite or indefinite article, are not stressed like in Catalan: they

¹⁰ Note that in historical varieties of Galician and Portuguese, unstressed prenominal possessives also existed, as in *en ma vida* 'in my life' (see Silva Domínguez 2002 for a contrastive diachronic account of these possessives with nouns denoting family and social relations). Further, similar to Catalan, the article can be omitted in constructions with stressed prenominal possessives with honorary titles, as in *Sua Majestade* (Portuguese), *Súa Maxestade* (Galician), and in phrases with *casa*, as in (i)-(iii), and with *vida*, as in (iv) (GLA 2001:111-112; De Andrés Díaz 2013:378; see footnote 4 for parallel Catalan examples):

- | | | | | |
|-------|--|----|--|--------------|
| (i) | <i>Estou em minha casa</i> | vs | <i>Estou na minha casa</i> | [Portuguese] |
| (ii) | <i>Estou en miña casa</i>
I-am in my home | vs | <i>Estou na miña casa</i>
I-am in-the my home | [Galician] |
| (iii) | <i>Voi pa mio casa</i>
I-am going to my house | | 'I'm going home.' | [Asturian] |
| (iv) | <i>en so vida</i>
in his / her life | | 'in his / her life' | |

are invariable clitics. Possessive constructions with singular terms referring to close family members tend to appear without the article, although less frequently they may co-occur (Casalicchio & Cordin 2020:77-79).

For Rhaeto-Romance too, various possessive configurations are documented (Haiman & Benincà 1992:141-152): while some, such as Friulian, require the presence of definite articles, others, like Ladin, do not (e.g. Haiman & Benincà 1992; Salvi 2016). Yet, Haiman & Benincà (1992:152) note that there is a tendency to allow the definite article constructions in all Rhaeto-Romance varieties, possibly as a result of language contact with Italian (cf. also Salvi 2016:162). The Surselvan data in (5h) illustrate said microvariation within the same geographic variety. In general, though, the article does not appear with kinship terms, as shown in (5i) for Friulian (Iliescu 1972:172 cited by Haiman & Benincà 1992:152).

From all the previous, we can conclude that, although a possessive system includes the definite article in prenominal configurations, terms for close family relations tend to be excluded from this distribution. This configuration has been observed to be part of a larger pattern, whereby inalienable and alienable possession are treated differently (cf. Nichols 1992:116-123; Vincent 2017:755).

Now turning briefly to the diachronic varieties, we would like to point out that, although nowadays standard Spanish only employs determiner possessives (1a), earlier stages exhibit the same syntactic patterns as in Italian (1b), (2c) and (3c).¹¹ More specifically, we find in Old Spanish prenominal adjectival possessives that can co-occur with definite and indefinite articles, demonstratives, different types of quantifiers and numerals, as shown in (6a)-(6g) (Company Company 2005, 2006, 2009 among others). Note that the possessive forms in these configurations can be tonic, as in *mío* in (6a), which still displays masculine gender agreement, a feature that is lost later on. Apart from the adjectival possessive constructions, bare unstressed possessives are also attested in the prenominal domain in the earliest texts.

- (6) a. *Venides, Martín Antolínez, el mio fiel vasallo* [Old Spanish]
 you-come, Martín Antolínez, the my loyal vassal
 'You have come, Martín Antolínez, my loyal vassal.'
 (*Cid*, v. 204; Company Company 2005:40)
- b. *et dexo y un su alcalde con pieça de caballeros*
 and he-left there a his mayor with part of knights
 'And he left there one of his mayors with some knights.'
 (*CG*, 560.23b; Company Company 2006:8)
- c. *que vistas las cosas desta tu cárcel, yo dubdava de mi salvación*
 that seen the things from-this prison I doubted of my salvation
 'I was doubtful about my rescue having seen the things from this prison of yours.'
 (*Cárcel*, 92; Company Company 2006:8)

¹¹ Similarly, the [definite article + possessive + noun] configuration is found in historical Romance varieties whose contemporary counterparts still display it, e.g. Old Portuguese, Old Catalan and Old Italian / Florentine, among others (Company Company 2009:780; cf. Labrousse in this volume).

- d. *Mas so çierto que el enperador [...] guardara su onra & su fama*
 but am certain that the emperor will-defend his honour and his reputation
& cada su cosa
 & each his thing
 'But I'm certain that the emperor will watch over his honour, his reputation and
 each of his things.' (*Libro de los estados*, CdE)
- e. [...] *çapatos que dio para la ynfante e para algunas sus criadas*
 [...] shoes that he-gave for the princess and for some her servants
 '[...] for the shoes that he gave to the princess and some of her servants.'
 (*Cuentas de Gonzola de Baeza*, Company Company 2009:769)
- f. *que non finco sy non Noe & su muger & tres sus fijos con sus mujeres*
 that not he-found but not Noah and his wife and three his sons with their wives
 '[...] that he did not find, but Noah, his wife, three of his sons and their wives.'
 (*Crónica de 1344*, Company Company 2009:769)
- g. *et el quedo en su palacio con muchos sus fillos*
 and he stayed in his palace with many his sons
 'And he stayed in his palace with many of his sons.'
 (*Historia troyana*, 1376, Company Company 2009:769)
- (7) *son fradre Karlo* vs *cist meon fradre Karle* [Old French]
 his brother Charles this my brother Charles
 'his brother Charles' 'my brother Charles'
 (*Strasbourg*, Marchello-Nizia et al. 2020:704)

Old French too displays variation between the determiner and adjectival possessives in the prenominal field, as illustrated in (7a); in contemporary French, on the contrary, only the former cases continue to exist (1a) (cf. for similar syntactic patterns in Old Occitan, see Anglade 1921: 248-249; Jensen 1994:116; Paden 1998:440-441, 484; Fernández González 1985:296-298). As regards the adjectival cases, here too, possessive structures with definite and indefinite articles, demonstratives, quantifiers and numerals emerge, as attested for Italian and Old Spanish (6a)-(6f) (Buridant 2019:225).

Notwithstanding the Italian, Old Spanish and Old French data, it is important to note that not all varieties that have adjectival prenominal possessives allow their co-occurrence with **demonstratives, indefinite articles, quantifiers and/or numerals**. Let us consider, for instance, the case of European Portuguese: while definite articles and proximal demonstratives can appear in combination with prenominal possessives (8a),¹² there appears to be variation in the acceptance of indefinite determiners, existential quantifiers, cardinals and distal demonstratives in prenominal possessive constructions (8b), (8c)-(8d), with some authors considering these structures as ungrammatical (Brito & Lopes 2016; Castro 2016) and others (e.g. Miguel 2002; De Andrés Díaz 2013:378) as acceptable by some speakers. Miguel (2002:221) considers the variety whose speakers reject cases like (8b) as the "standard dialect" and the one that, on the contrary, accepts it as a "conservative" one. She further distinguishes between two groups of conservative

¹² Note that in Brazilian Portuguese the definite article is often absent, unlike in its European counterpart.

dialect speakers, to wit those that, in addition to (8a), also use prenominal possessives with indefinite articles and existential quantifiers (8b), and those that also admit cardinal and distal demonstratives in possessive structures, as in *dois teus primos* lit. 'two your cousins' in (8c) and *aquele simpático teu amigo* lit. 'that nice your friend' in (8d). Speakers that reject cases similar to (8b) use the possessives postnominally ([indefinite article / existential quantifier + noun + possessive]) instead, as in (8e) (see also section 1.1.2, examples (13a)-(13d)). As we will see now, there exist some parallels in acceptability of co-occurrence of other elements in the prenominal adjectival possessive configurations in other Romance languages.

- (8) a. *o / este meu livro* [European Portuguese]
the / this my book 'my book / this book of mine'
- b. *#um / #algum meu livro* [European – Brazilian Portuguese]
a / some my book 'a / some book of mine'
- c. *#dois teus primos* [European Portuguese]
two your cousins 'two of your cousins'
- d. *#aquele simpático teu amigo*
that nice your friend 'that nice friend of yours'
- e. *um / algum livro meu* [European – Brazilian Portuguese]
a / some book my 'a / some book of mine'
- (9) a. *o / este meu libro* [Galician]
the / this my book
- b. *o / este libro meu*
the / this book my 'the / this book of mine'
- c. *Viron aqueles carneiros nosos*
they-saw those sheep ours
'They saw those sheep of ours.' (*Val de Verín*, p. 115; Silva Domínguez 2002:187)
- d. *un pino que había no Rodaval, nesa vosa leira que tendes*
a pine that there-was in Rodaval in-that your property that you-have
'[...] a pine tree that was there in Rodaval, in that property of yours.'
(Teo, A Coruña; Silva Domínguez 2002:187)
- e. *e aqueles meus tíos déronme a vida*
and those my uncles gave-me the life '[...] And those uncles of mine gave me life.'
(Lérez, Pontevedra; Silva Domínguez 2002:187)
- f. *Prepárate que ha vir un meu compañeiro verte*
you-get-ready that has see a my partner see-you 'Get ready as a partner of mine
will come to see you.' (*Val de Verín*, p. 120; Silva Domínguez 2002:187)

Similar, but not identical, combination patterns can be observed for Galician. As in European Portuguese (8a), Galician allows the co-occurrence of prenominal possessives with definite articles (9a) ([definite article + possessive + noun]), although there exists variation with the postnominal counterpart for these syntactic contexts, as shown in (9b) ([definite article + noun + possessive]; Silva Domínguez 1993, 2002; Frías Conde 2014:41). However, Silva Domínguez (1993:144-145, 2002:187) observes that in the oral corpus she examines, whenever a determiner is present that is not a definite article, postposition is the preferred position: this distribution is found in practically all cases. For the demonstratives, she illustrates

this with two examples, one containing a proximal demonstrative similar to (9b) and another with a distal one, given in (9c) (Silva Domínguez 1993:145, 2002:187). She also reports three prenominal possessive cases with demonstratives, two of which are given in (9d) and (9e), displaying a proximal and distal demonstrative respectively (cf. with example (8d) for Portuguese).¹³ Similarly, the presence of an indefinite article generally leads to the use of postnominal possessives. A single case with the prenominal possessive configuration, dating from before the mid-1970s, has been found in Silva Domínguez’ study, given in (9f) (Silva Domínguez 2002:187). A diatopic note should be added: data from the *Atlas Lingüístico Galego* (ALGA), collected in the mid-1970s, clearly shows that prenominal configuration is restricted to southern Galicia, more precisely, to the south of Pontevedra and south-west of Ourense provinces, while the postnominal construction is found in the whole Galician territory (Silva Domínguez 2002:188). The presence of quantifiers (e.g. *todo* ‘all’, *algún* ‘some’, *ningún* ‘none’) and numerals always give rise to postnominal possessive uses (Silva Domínguez 1993:148).

- (10) a. *el meu llibre* [Catalan]
the my book ‘my book’
b. *#un / #algun / #aquest meu llibre*
a / some / that my book
c. *un / algun / aquest llibre meu*
a / some / that book my ‘a / some / that book of mine’
d. *quatre / molts llibres seus*
four / many books his ‘four / many of his books’
e. *un / algun meu amic* [Central Catalan]
a / some my friend ‘a / some friend of mine’

As concerns Catalan, although prenominal possessives can co-occur with definite articles (10a), as in European Portuguese (8a) and Galician (9a), there appears to be disagreement in the literature about whether demonstratives, indefinite articles and quantifiers can also do so (cf. for Portuguese above): while some (e.g. Hualde 1992:119) merely mention the existence of constructions with demonstratives and indefinite articles, other sources indicate that such prenominal cases (10b) “sounds odd” and that there exists a clear preference for postnominal configurations, as in (10c)-(10d) (Coba Femenia 1999:66; Saragossà 2000:200-201; translation is ours). The combination of numerals with prenominal possessives is also rejected in favor of the postnominal possessive structures (Saragossà 2000:226). Recent grammars clarify that diatopic variation is at play as prenominal possessive constructions with indefinite articles and quantifiers, such as *algún* ‘some’ or *cap* ‘some, none’, are indeed used in the variety of Girona and surrounding Central Catalan varieties (10e) (GBIEC 2019:197-200; GEIEC 2020). Recall that for Galician too, certain diatopic varieties allow prenominal possessives with preceding indefinite articles

¹³ These examples, recorded by students of the University of Santiago de Compostela, date from the beginning of the 1990s (Silva Domínguez 2002:187).

([indefinite article + possessive + noun]). For Catalan, there is a lexical restriction, though, as this structure can only appear with kinship terms or nouns specifying human relationships ([indefinite article + possessive + kin noun]). As far as we are aware, there are no Catalan nor Galician varieties similar to the European Portuguese ones that allow the whole range of elements in (8a)-(8d). Consequently, the syntactic prenominal possessive distributions of these languages coincide only partially.

- (11) a. *el mio llibru / lo mío libro* [Asturian / Aragonese]
the my book / the my book 'my book'
- b. *un / algún – bell libro mío* [Aragonese]
a / some – some book my 'a / some book of mine'
- c. *aquells / tres llibros míos*
those / three books my 'those / three books of mine'
- d. *un llibru mio* [Asturian]
a book my 'a book of mine'
- e. *munchu dinero to*
many money your 'a lot of your money'
- f. *dos llibrus suyos*
two book his / her / theirs 'two books of him / her / them'
- g. *esti llibru (de) mio*
this book of my
- h. *#esti mio llibru*
this my book 'this book of mine'

Yet, other languages that also display the [definite article + possessive + noun] construction, such as Asturian and Aragonese, (1b) repeated here as (11a), do not license prenominal constructions with indefinite articles, quantifiers, demonstratives or numerals, in which case postnominal possessive are used, as shown in (11b)-(11f) (GLA 2001:321 González Escribano 2012; EFA 2021:116). This said, for Asturian too, there appears to be different acceptability judgments for prenominal possessives with demonstratives: some consider cases such as *esti mio llibru* (10h) to have a literary flavor (GLA 2001:321), whereas others readily accept them (González Escribano 2012:141). Additionally, notice how Asturian also allows the prepositional possessive structures, in which *de* precedes the postnominal possessive, as illustrated with *esti llibru de mio* in (11g) (De Andrés Díaz 2013:385; Lorenzo 2020). As we will see in section 1.1.3, most Romance varieties accept some type of prepositional construction to express possession in the nominal domain.

- (12) a. *mi libro* [Standard Spanish]
my book
- b. **el / *un / *este / *cada mi libro*
- c. ***El mi hermano tien vaca, tiene mucho ganado*** [...] [Asturian Spanish]
The my brother has cow, he-has lots cattle
'My brother has cows, he has a lot of cattle [...].'
(Male, 74 years, Alea / Linares, Ribadesella, Asturias, COSER)

- d. *Mi abuela me dijo que mejor me regrese porque hay muchos que no llegan, pero una mi amiga que está allá dice que me va a ir mejor si me voy.*
 ‘My grandmother told me that it’s better if I go back because many don’t arrive, but one of my friends, who is there, says that I will be better off if I leave.’
 (Pato in this volume:152) [Salvadoran Spanish]
- e. *Sus fantásticas respuestas y altanería doblegaron al fin a las damas quienes, orgullosas de una su abuela española [...]* [Asturian Spanish]
 ‘His fanciful responses and arrogance finally subdued the ladies who, proud of their Spanish grandmother [...].’
 (Cantiga, Gómez Ojea; RAE & ASALE 2009:1348)
- f. *Tan grata nueva la hemos celebrado en esta su casa* [Formal written Spanish]
 ‘We celebrated this pleasant news in this house of him / her /them.’
 (RAE & ASALE 2009:1345)
- g. *Como yo había criado a esta mi hermanita desde que nació [...]*
 ‘As I had raised this little sister of mine since birth [...].’
 (Hablar, Viezzer; RAE & ASALE 2009:1346) [Andean Spanish]

Although we characterized (oral standard) Spanish as a determiner-like possessive language due to examples like (1a) and (2b), repeated here as (12a) and (12b), this description needs to be nuanced a bit more, considering that certain adjectival configurations can (still) be found.

Firstly, the [definite article + possessive + noun] structure, illustrated in (6a) for Old Spanish, appears to have withstood the ravages of time as it continues to be used in rural Asturian Spanish in northern Spain (as in the Asturian language too, see example (1b)), as can be seen in example (12c), which proceeds from the COSER corpus (*Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural*; cf. Fernández-Ordóñez 2011; see Bleortu 2020 for a study examining the interference of Asturian in the Spanish possessive system of La Pola Siero in Asturias). In fact, it is a western Peninsular Spanish feature as, apart from the Leonese territories, it also appears in the west of Castile and Extremadura (Fernández-Ordóñez 2011, 2016:390).

Secondly, while standard European Spanish does not allow the co-occurrence of an indefinite article before the prenominal possessive, as in (12b), such structures are widely found in Central American Spanish, as in El Salvador (12d) and Guatemala, due to contact with indigenous languages (e.g. Mayan languages; see section 2 and Gutiérrez-Rodríguez in this volume for more details on this aspect). These indefinite possessive configurations are said to belong to the regional norm and are thus not restricted to vernacular varieties only (cf. RAE & ASALE 2009:1346-1347; Company Company 2017; Elsig 2017; Pato in this volume, among others). Nieuwenhuijsen’s study (2007:333) appears to corroborate this as this indefinite structure and its postnominal counterpart appear almost as frequently (55%, 116/210 vs. 45%, 94/210, respectively) in the Guatemalan newspapers that she examines. These Central-American Spanish varieties, unlike western Peninsular Spanish (12c), do not allow the [definite article + possessive + noun] construction, possibly due to indigenous language influences (see section 2; Gutiérrez-Rodríguez in this volume:106-108), and appear thus to display the mirror image of European Portuguese (8a)-(8b). Further, the [indefinite article +

possessive + noun] cases have also been attested in Paraguayan and Andean Spanish varieties (Choi 1998:163-164, 167-172; RAE & ASALE 2009:1347). After illustrating the [definite article + possessive + noun] structure with an 19th century example from the novel *Sotileza*, which is set in Santander and written by José María de Pereda (1885), the RAE & ASALE's (2009:1347-1348) grammar also mentions twice that this indefinite possessive schema is found in contemporary northern and north-western varieties of the Iberian Peninsula, while in the 19th and 20th century it was also encountered in other Peninsular Spanish varieties. The most recent example they provide dates from a novel by Carmen Gómez Ojea, which was published at the beginning of the 1980s and is given in (12e). Kinship terms are said to occur most commonly in this indefinite possessive construction, as in (12e) (RAE & ASALE 2009:1348). As we have not been able to locate more recent examples, it remains unclear whether this construction is still in use.¹⁴

Thirdly, the [demonstrative + possessive + noun] combination, although no longer in use in oral European Spanish, can appear in formal written registers, as in (12f) (cf. example (6c) from Old Spanish; RAE & ASALE 2009:1345-1346). It has further been documented in Andean and Paraguayan Spanish (Choi 1998:163-164, 167-172; RAE & ASALE 2009:1346), as shown in (12g).

Table 1. Prenominal adjectival possessive combinations in contemporary Ibero-Romance and Italian

Language	Def. article	Proximal demonstr.	Distal demonstr.	Indef. article	Existent. quant.	Cardinal numeral
European Portuguese	X	X	(X) ₂	(X) ₁₊₂	(X) ₁₊₂	(X) ₂
Galician	X	(X)	(X)	(X)	-	-
Asturian	X	(X)	-	-	-	-
Spanish	Western Penins. Sp.	X	-	-	(X)	-
	Formal written Sp.	-	X	X	-	-
	Andean Sp.	-	X	X	X	-
	Central-Am. Sp.	-	-	-	X	X
Aragonese	X	-	-	-	-	-
Cat.	Standard Catalan	X	(X)	(X)	(X)	-
	Central Catalan	X	?	?	X	X
Standard Italian	X	X	X	X	X	X

(X): some speakers accept this construction

(X)₁₊₂: speakers of conservative varieties 1 and 2 accept this construction

(X)₂: speakers of conservative variety 2 accept this construction

-: not accepted

?: no data encountered

Summarizing briefly, both determiner and adjective possessives are found in Romance prenominal contexts, the latter of which can be stressed or unstressed forms. Further, many Romance languages and varieties display a possessive system that combines various syntactic configurations, oftentimes with special treatment for kinship terms that tend to prefer bare possessives. Additionally, for those languages and varieties that display prenominal adjectival possessives, there is

¹⁴ More specifically, searches in COSER, *Web / Dialects* (Davies 2016), CdE nor Twitter did yield any contemporary indefinite possessive Spanish results for these north-western Spanish areas.

considerable variation in the type of combination that these possessives admit, as illustrated in Table 1.¹⁵ As can be seen, the contemporary lateral Ibero-Romance languages appear to admit the most prenominal adjectival possessive combinations, while the central ones are much more restricted. Note, moreover, that whenever a prenominal adjectival combination is not allowed (-), the postnominal configuration tends to be used instead (see also section 1.1.2).

1.1.2 Postnominal possessives

Many Ibero-Romance languages and varieties that display prenominal possessives also admit postnominal tonic possessives in certain morpho-syntactic environments, as mentioned in section 1.1.1 (e.g. De Andrés 2013:380-383). O’Connor (2003) uses the term *Differential Possessor Expression / Marking* (DPE) to refer to the availability of different structures to express possession. In Portuguese, for instance, the postnominal construction is also attested with definite articles and proximal demonstratives, as illustrated in (13a) (cf. with prenominal examples (8a)). Postnominal configurations are also documented for the combinations with indefinite articles and quantifiers, as shown in (8e) repeated here as (13b), distal demonstratives (13c) and cardinal numerals (13d) (e.g. Miguel 2002:219-220; De Andrés 2013:380-382). Similarly, Galician speakers tend to prefer the postnominal placement after definite articles and demonstratives, as shown in (9b) and (9c) repeated here as (14a) and (14b), indefinite articles (14c) and quantifiers (14d) (e.g. Silva Domínguez 1993, 2002). Comparable preferences have been observed for Catalan (see examples (10c)-(10d)), Asturian and Aragonese ((11b)-(11g); see discussion in 1.1.1; e.g. Áncel Barcos 2007:60; EFA 2021:116). What is more, some Aragonese varieties, as in Agüero, only use the postnominal configurations (e.g. Sánchez Pitarch & Tomás Faci 2005-2006:193).

- (13) a. *o / este livro meu* [Portuguese]
the / this book my ‘my book / this book of mine’
b. *um / algum livro meu*
a / some book my ‘a / some book of mine’
c. *aquele amigo meu*
that friend mine ‘that friend of mine’
d. *dois amigos nossos*
two friends ours ‘two of our friends’
- (14) a. *o / este libro meu* [Galician]
the / this book my ‘the / this book of mine’
b. *Viron aqueles carneiros nosos*
they-saw those sheep ours
‘They saw those sheep of ours.’ (*Val de Verín*, p. 115; Silva Domínguez 2002:187)
c. *E iara dunha tía miña que lle chamaban Presenta*
and it-was of-a aunt mine that CL they-called Presenta
‘And it was from an aunt of mine that called her Presenta.’
(*Goián*, p. 100; Silva Domínguez 1993:145)

¹⁵ French has not been included in Table 1 and 2 as it currently only displays determiner-like possessives. Occitan varieties, on the other hand, have not been incorporated due to a lack of data.

- d. *algun veciño meu* [...]
 some neighbor mine
 ‘some neighbor of mine’ (Artículo, p. 859; Silva Domínguez 2002:183)
- (15) a. *nuestro libro* vs *el libro nuestro* vs *el libro de nosotros* [vernacular Spanish]
 our book the book our the book of us ‘our book’
- b. *el / un / este / aquel / algún / ningún / cada libro mío* [Spanish]
 the / a / this / that / some / none / each book mine
 ‘the / a / this / that / some / no / each book of mine’
- c. *algunos / tres / varios libros míos*
 some / three / various books mine ‘some / three / various books of mine’
- d. **le / *un / *ce / *quelque / *aucun / *chaque livre mon / mien* [French]
 the / a / this / some / none / each book my / mine
 ‘the / a / this / some / no / each book of mine’
- e. **quelques / *trois / *plusieurs livres mes / miens*
 some / three / various books my / mine ‘some / three / various books of mine’
- f. *il mio libro* vs *il libro mio* [Italian]
 the my book the book my ‘my book’
- g. *il / un / questo / quel / qualche / nessun / ciascun libro mio*
 the / a / this / that / some / none / each book my
 ‘the / a / this / that / some / none / each book of mine’
- h. *alcuni / tre / molti libri miei*
 some / three / several books my ‘some / three / several books of mine’

It should further be added that, once again, diatopic and vernacular varieties offer a rich array of morpho-syntactic variation. Although both French and Spanish display determiner possessives (see example (1a) in section 1.1.1), many Spanish varieties, such as Canarian, Andalusian and Cuban Spanish, display postnominal tonic constructions alongside the prenominal clitic ones, as is shown for the definite structures in (15a), unlike French (15d) (e.g. Lorenzo Ramos 1976:96; Almeida & Díaz Alayón 1988:116; Pacheco Carpio & Bouzouita 2017; Aleza-Izquierdo 2016; De Benito Moreno & Bouzouita 2018). Examples (15b)-(15c) illustrate the postnominal combinatorial differences with French possessives (15d)-(15e): as can be seen, Spanish, like Italian (15f)-(15h), allows the co-occurrence of postnominal possessives with determiner-like elements, such as the definite and indefinite article, proximal and distal demonstratives, quantifiers and numerals (cf. the prenominal counterparts in (2a)-(2c) and (3a)-(3c) in section 1.1.1; Van Peteghem 2012). As shown in (15f), DPE is thus also attested for standard Italian as the [definite article + possessive + noun] can alternate with its postnominal counterpart, like in Spanish. Additionally, many Romance vernaculars appear to have three different possession constructions, as prepositional phrases with personal pronouns, such as *de nosotros* ‘of us’ for vernacular Spanish in (15a), are also common (see section 1.1.3 for more details).¹⁶ A summary of the possible postnominal adjectival constructions for Ibero-Romance and (standard) Italian is given in Table 2.

¹⁶ Although some scholars have claimed that certain Spanish geographic varieties prefer the postnominal constructions (e.g. for Canarian Spanish, Catalán 1989:221), recent empirical studies show that this is not the case: as detailed by Bouzouita (in press: Table 1), the prenominal possessive schema tends to predominate in most (if not all) Spanish varieties. Despite the abundant

Table 2. Postnominal adjectival possessive combinations in Ibero-Romance and Italian

Language	Def. article	Proximal demonstr.	Distal demonstr.	Indef. article	Existent. quant.	Cardinal numeral
Portuguese	X	X	X	X	X	X
Galician	X	X	X	X	X	X
Asturian	X	X	X	X	X	X
Spanish	X	X	X	X	X	X
Aragonese	X	X	X	X	X	X
Catalan	X	X	X	X	X	X
Italian	X	X	X	X	X	X

Notwithstanding the postnominal parallelisms between Spanish and Italian, the Italian possessive system displays more flexibility than the Spanish one, as has been clearly demonstrated by Van Peteghem (2012), since combinations with determiner-like elements are allowed both pre- and postnominally, unlike Spanish (see Table 1). All the previous leads Van Peteghem (2012) to conclude that French displays the most grammaticalized possessive system as (i) it has developed a clitic determiner system (see section 1.1.1) and (ii) its strong possessives, such as *mien*, no longer have an adjectival distribution (15d), unlike in Old French (e.g. Buridant 2019:225-226). Italian possessives, on the contrary, are the least grammaticalized of these Romance languages as they kept their adjectival properties (as in Latin), while Spanish appears to occupy an intermediate position.

As regards the Italo-Dalmatian languages, here too, great microvariation is encountered: while the prenominal possessive configuration is characteristic of the northern, Tuscan, Corsican and Gallurese varieties, as well as those spoken in the extreme south of Sicily and Calabria, postnominal constructions are documented in the central-southern and upper-southern varieties and in Sicilian and Sardinian dialects (e.g. Manzini & Savoia 2005; Silvestri 2016:129; Ledgeway 2016:258; Mensching 2017:386; Vincent 2017:753-759), as shown in (16a)-(16b) for Neapolitan and Sardinian. Apart from the adjectival postnominal possessives, the southern varieties of Italy also display enclitic possessives, as exemplified in (16c) for Salentino, in which case no article is present (Ledgeway 2016:258; for more specific details, we refer the reader to De Sisto & Torres-Tamarit and Silvestri in this volume). In Sardinian, on the contrary, the use of the definite article with a postnominal possessive is obligatory (16b), except with kinship nouns, in which case the possessive is omitted for 3rd person referents ([article + kinship term + Ø]) and only a noun (without possessive or article) is used for 1st person reference ([Ø + noun + Ø]), as in *jaju* 'my grandfather' in (16d) (Mensching 2017:386).

microvariation in Spanish vernaculars and diatopic varieties, to date there is a lack of sociolinguistic-dialectological studies that provide (i) accurate quantitative and qualitative descriptions of the morphosyntactic distribution of the possessive constructions for the various varieties, (ii) the sociolinguistic contexts in which they are used, (iii) while also detailing their semantic-pragmatic considerations (Orozco 2010 and Aleza-Izquierdo 2016 are notable exceptions).

- | | | | | |
|------|----|---|------------------|---------------------|
| (16) | a. | <i>o libro mio</i> | | [Neapolitan] |
| | | the book my 'my book' | | |
| | b. | <i>su libru meu / miu</i> | | [Sardinian] |
| | | the book my 'my book' | | |
| | c. | <i>fràtuta</i> | | [Salentino] |
| | | brother 'your brother' | | |
| | d. | <i>su frade / fradi</i> vs <i>jaju</i> | | [Sardinian] |
| | | the brother | grandfather | |
| | | 'his brother' | 'my grandfather' | |
| | e. | <i>babbu méu</i> | | [Sassarese] |
| | | father my | | |
| | f. | <i>mé'babbu</i> | | [Gallurese] |
| | | my father 'my father' | | |
| (17) | a. | <i>carte-a mea</i> | | [Romanian] |
| | | book-the mine 'my book' | | |
| | b. | <i>a mea carte</i> | | [Literary Romanian] |
| | | the my book 'my book' | | |
| | c. | <i>carte-a l-ui / e-i / l-or</i> | | [Romanian] |
| | | book-the him-GEN / her-GEN / them-GEN 'his / her /their book' | | |
| | d. | <i>frate-meu</i> | | |
| | | brother-mine 'my brother' | | |
| | e. | <i>frate-su</i> | | |
| | | brother his 'his brother' | | |

The postnominal possessive schema is also found in Sassarese (16e), an Italo-Dalmatian language of the northwest of Sardinia, while the prenominal construction is attested in Gallurese, spoken in the northeast of the same island (16f) (Maxia 2017:441).

As concerns Daco-Romance, Romanian too exhibits postnominal constructions, as exemplified in (17a)-(17b) (Van Peteghem 2012). Note that, unlike in other Romance languages, the definite articles appear postnominally, as shown for *-a* in (17a), and that the use of these enclitic articles preceding the tonic possessive is obligatory. This said, prenominal possessives can be found in literary registers, as in (17b). Moreover, Romanian still has genuine possessive pronouns, which derive from the Latin dative pronouns and can occur nowadays as adnominal genitive pronouns, as *lui*, *ei* and *lor* in (17c) (or strong dative forms). Van Peteghem (2012) observes that a grammaticalization process appears to be taking place in Romanian as (i) article-less structures can be used with certain kinship terms in informal registers, as in (17d), like in Italian (5f), and (ii) the strong possessive *său* 'his / her' can appear as a clitic *su*, as in (17e).

From the previous we can conclude that various Romance languages, such as Spanish and Italian but also Portuguese, Galician, Catalan, Asturian and most varieties of Aragonese, display DPE as both prenominal and postnominal possessive constructions can appear, although at times morpho-syntactic and lexical constraints can impose the type of possessive structure to be used. Additionally, Romance postnominal possessives configurations can display both tonic and clitic

forms, depending on the variety and the linguistic features of the construction in question.

1.1.3 Prepositional constructions

Now that the various syntactic patterns for the postnominal possessives have been sketched, we will turn our attention to the prepositional constructions within the nominal domain ([noun + preposition + personal pronoun]). Indeed, as mentioned in section 1.1.2 and illustrated in (15a) for vernacular Spanish, certain Romance varieties exhibit a tripartite DPE system.¹⁷

- (18) a. *El treinta de mayo es el cumpleaños de ellos* [Canarian Spanish]
 the 30 of May is the birthday of them
 'The 30th of May is their birthday.' (Almeida & Díaz Alayón 1988:116)
- b. *Pero muchas dicen: "Anda que no ha bebido ese leche de mí; anda que no..."*.
 But many say well that not have drunk that mild of me well that not
 'But many say: "Well, I have not drunk my milk, well no..."
 (Female, 72 years, Jubrique, Malaga, Andalusia, COSER) [Andalusian Spanish]
- c. *la foto de mí* [Spanish]
 the picture of me 'my picture'
- (19) a. *o carro dele / dela* [Brazilian Portuguese]
 the car of-him / of-her 'his / her car'
- b. *lo coche d'ell / d'ella / d'ells / d'ellas* [Aragonese]
 the car of him / of her / of them.MASC /of them.FEM
 'his car / her car / their car / their car / your car / your car'
- c. *a casa del* [Galician]
 the house of-him 'his house'
- d. *una casa de noso*
 a house of us 'our house'
- e. *a casa de vostede / vostedes*
 the house of you.DEF.SG / you.DEF.PL 'your house'
- f. *el fill d'ella / de vostès* [Catalan]
 the son of her / of you.DEF.PL 'her / your son'
- g. *el cotxe de nosaltres / el llibre de vosaltres* [Valencian Catalan]
 the car of us / the book of you.NONDEF.PL 'our car / your book'

Generally speaking, the prepositional schemas appear to be restricted by morpho-syntactic features. For instance, in Canarian Spanish, the construction [preposition *de* + personal pronoun] is limited to the 1st person plural, and 3rd person singular and plural, as illustrated with *de ellos* in (18a) (e.g. Lorenzo Ramos 1976:96; Almeida & Díaz Alayón 1988:116; RAE & ASALE 2009:1355).¹⁸ Although the 1st and 2nd persons singular are significantly less likely to appear in such Spanish configurations, occasional examples can be found, as exemplified by the COSER

¹⁷ Actually, in certain diatopic varieties, e.g. those spoken in Caracas and Mérida (Venezuela), the prepositional constructions have a higher frequency of use than the postnominal ones. See Bouzouita (in press) for a quantitative and qualitative overview of the tripartite DPE systems in Spanish.

¹⁸ In vernacular Spanish, it is also possible to find the prepositional construction with 2nd personal deferential forms (*de usted – de ustedes*).

example in (18b), produced by an elderly female speaker of Jubrique (Malaga, Spain). Similarly, the RAE & ASALE (2009:1356) provide cases, as the one given in (18c), in which the prepositional construction refers to the person that is represented in the picture.¹⁹

As concerns the other Ibero-Romance languages, Brazilian Portuguese exhibits the prepositional structure with non-participant possessors only, as in (19a) (Dubert & Galves 2016:421), as do the Aragonese varieties, exemplified in (19b) (Haensch 2003:102; Saura Rami 2003:146; Lozano Sierra & Saludas Bernad 2005:40; Áncel Barcos 2007:62; Lozano Sierra 2010:96; EFA 2021:117).²⁰ Galician, on the contrary, appears to pattern with the Spanish vernaculars, as shown in (19c)-(19d), although only to express inalienable possession (Frías Conde 2014:40; Dubert & Galves 2016:422). Nonetheless, some authors also mention cases with 2nd person deferential forms, as illustrated in (19e) (e.g. Marcotulio & dos Santos 2018:140).²¹ Likewise, there exist discrepancies between the various descriptions for Catalan: while some authors claim that the prepositional construction cannot be used in contexts with 1st and 2nd non-deferential persons, only with deferential personal pronouns of the 2nd persons and those for the 3rd persons, as in (19f) (Hualde 1992:120), others have observed a decline in the use of postnominal possessives in the Catalan of Valencia in favor of the prepositional constructions, including cases for the 1st and 2nd person plural, as in (19g) (Coba Femenia 1999:33-34, 255). Outside Ibero-Romance, we find this prepositional construction in Sardinian (20a) (Secci 2006:30-31) and Franco-Provençal (20b) (Kristol 2016:359). For the latter, the use of other prepositions, such as *vers* ‘towards’ and *à* ‘to’ has also been observed.²²

As to be expected, these prepositional constructions with personal pronouns are also attested in historical varieties, as in Old Galician-Portuguese, Old Aragonese, Old Catalan, Old French and Old Occitan (e.g. Jensen 1994:92; Coba Femenia 1999:258-267; Marcotulio & dos Santos 2018; Buridant 2019:230; Albesa Pedrola 2020:15).

Interestingly, there exists another prepositional pattern, found in Asturian (21a), Galician (21b), as well as some varieties spoken in southern Italy (21c), in which the preposition *de* is followed by a possessive (and not a personal) pronoun (e.g. Lorenzo 1998:27-28, 2020:5-6; De Andrés Díaz 2013:385; GdG 2016; Silvestri 2016:131, in this volume for more details on Italo- and Daco-Romance).

¹⁹ Examples such as (18c) illustrate that the concept of possessive meaning is a broad one (Porto Dapena 1982). In our view, the existence of such cases, in which the relational aspect is central and not the possessive meaning, might be of importance in later analogical extensions of the tonic possessives to the adverbial and verbal domain.

²⁰ Only EFA (2021:117) mentions the use of the prepositional structures with 2nd deferential possessors in Aragonese (e.g. *lo coche de vusté / de vustés* ‘your car’).

²¹ Marcotulio & dos Santos (2018) demonstrate that prepositional cases with 1st and 2nd persons non-deferential (singular-plural) personal pronouns are attested in medieval Galician-Portuguese.

²² In French, doubling structures (e.g. *son livre a lui* lit. ‘his book to him’) confirm the clitic status of the determiner possessives (Cardinaletti 1998:77).

- | | | | |
|------|----|--|--------------------------------|
| (20) | a. | <i>s'ammigu 'osattro</i> | [Sardinian] |
| | | the-friend of-you ‘your friend’ | |
| | b. | [la vy's ija də mɛ] | [Franco-Provençal] |
| | | the neighbour of me ‘my neighbor’ | |
| (21) | a. | <i>el neñu de mio</i> | [Western and central Asturian] |
| | | the boy of mine ‘my boy’ | |
| | b. | <i>Temos moto de noso</i> | [Galician] |
| | | we-have motorcycle of ours ‘We have our motorcycle.’ | |
| | c. | <i>quiddə lwibbrə du tuva</i> | [Southern Italian] |
| | | that book of yours ‘your book’ | |

In sum, we can conclude that prepositional constructions are, similar to the pre- and postnominal possessives, found throughout Romania. More generally, it is clear that different syntactic strategies (DPE) to express possession within the nominal domain exist alongside each other in the Romance languages.

1.2 Adverbial and verbal domain

Now we will turn our attention to non-nominal uses of tonic possessives, to wit in the adverbial and verbal domain. As shown in (22) and (23), tonic possessives can be documented as complements of locative adverbials, as well as verbs. In both contexts these possessive constructions enter into competition with the normatively sanctioned prepositional structures with personal pronouns. In what follows, we will first describe the Romance adverbial possessive constructions and then sketch a diachronic account on how the use of tonic possessives might have extended from the nominal to the adverbial domain (see also Bertolotti 2014, 2017). Subsequently, we will do the same for the verbal structures.

Although the Spanish adverbial cases (22a) and, to a lesser extent, the Galician ones (22b), have only recently started to be scrutinized from diatopic-sociolinguistic and diachronic perspectives (e.g. Silva Domínguez 1995; Bertolotti 2014, 2017; Salgado & Bouzouita 2017; Marttinen Larsson & Álvarez López 2017, in press; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita 2018, under evaluation; Hoff 2020; Marttinen Larsson under evaluation; Bouzouita et al. 2018, in press), as far as we are aware, no comparable studies exist for other Romance languages, such as Aragonese and Catalan, for which the existence of adverbial constructions with possessives has merely been pointed out (Saura Rami 2003:146; Áncel Barcos 2007:62; GBIEC 2019:201).²³ Consequently, many questions surrounding their exact use remain to be answered. Notwithstanding this, a few points, especially for Spanish, can be raised.

²³ As for Italo-Romance, we have received anecdotal information on the existence of such adverbial possessives in the southern varieties of Italy, such as Calabrian (Primerano p.c.). However, we have not been able to verify this yet empirically. Further, we suspect that Portuguese varieties also admit such uses, in view of the verbal possessives we encountered for Brazilian Portuguese (Bouzouita & Casanova 2017; Bouzouita in prep.).

- (22) a. *detrás mío / mía* vs *detrás de mí* [Andalusian Spanish]
 b. *detrás meu / miña* vs *detrás de min* [Galician]
 c. *darrere meu /*meva* vs *darrere de mi* [Catalan]
 behind mine.MASC / mine.FEM vs behind of me
 ‘behind me’
 d. *adetràs nuestro* vs *adetràs de nusaltes* [Aragonese]
 behind ours.MASC behind of us ‘behind us’
 e. *dezaga suya*
 behind his/hers/theirs.FEM ‘behind him / her /them’

Firstly, the whole range of grammatical persons and number appears to be affected by this change in progress, although the 3rd person ones *suyo / suya* ‘his / hers / theirs / yours.DEF.SING / yours.DEF. PL) are used less frequently, presumably due to the high referential ambiguity of these forms (e.g. Silva Domínguez 1995, in this volume; Bertolotti 2014, 2017; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita 2018; Hoff 2020; Marttinen Larsson & Álvarez López in press; Marttinen Larsson under evaluation). Secondly, all locative adverbials can co-occur with the stressed possessive forms, at least in Spanish, Galician and Catalan (Silva Domínguez 1995, in this volume; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita 2018; GBIEC 2019; Hoff 2020; Marttinen Larsson & Álvarez López in press; Marttinen Larsson under evaluation; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita under evaluation). Thirdly, there appear to be morphological preferences of the possessive: while speakers of Andalusian and Galician Spanish prefer feminine possessives with *-a* (Salgado & Bouzouita 2017; Bouzouita 2020; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita under evaluation; Bouzouita et al. 2018, in press), Latin American Spanish varieties and Catalan Spanish tend towards the use of the masculine *-o* counterpart (Bertolotti 2014, 2017; Marttinen Larsson & Álvarez López 2017, in press; Hoff 2020; Bouzouita 2020). For the bilingual Peninsular areas, the morphological preferences in Spanish appear to be guided by the other Romance languages (Bouzouita 2020; Bouzouita et al. in press): as shown in (22c), standard Catalan allows the use of the masculine possessives with locative adverbials, while rejecting the use of the feminine counterparts (GBIEC 2019:201),²⁴ in contrast to Galician, where structures with the feminine possessives predominate substantially (Silva Domínguez 1995, in this volume).²⁵ It remains unknown whether there exist morphological preferences for Aragonese. This said, both genders have been attested, as shown in (22d)-(22e) (Saura Rami 2003:146; Ánchel Barcos 2007:62). Additionally, unlike Catalan, Spanish (RAE & ASALE 2009:1360) and Aragonese grammars (EFA 2021:117) advise against the various possessive uses with locative adverbials in favor of the prepositional complements.

As regards the genesis of the possessive adverbial constructions in Spanish, Bertolotti (2014, 2017) has proposed that the variation between postnominal

²⁴ Both masculine and feminine possessives are admitted for the non-locative prepositional phrases *en contra* ‘against’, *a favor* ‘in favor’ and *de part* ‘from’ (GBIEC 2019:201).

²⁵ As regards the directionality of this contact-induced phenomenon, Catalan appears to have made use of this possessive construction prior to Spanish (Marttinen Larsson & Álvarez López 2017:88). Similarly, the Galician cases predate the Spanish ones (cf. Silva Domínguez in this volume).

possessives ([noun + possessive]) and nominal prepositional complements ([noun + *de* + personal pronoun]) has led to the analogical extension of the possessive variants to locative adverbial contexts and the reanalysis of these forms, whereby semantically only the relational feature is maintained, while the proper possessive meaning is lost. Moreover, various authors have suggested that the locus of this change could be the (originally masculine) denominal adverbials *alrededor* 'around' and *al lado* 'next' from which the use of possessives extended to the non-denominal adverbials (e.g. Silva Domínguez 1995:7; Gómez Torrego 2006:296; Marttinen Larsson under evaluation). Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita (under evaluation) visualize the analogical extensions of the stressed possessives from the nominal to the adverbial domain as in Table 3.

Table 3. Analogical extensions of tonic possessives from nominal to adverbial domain

Syntactic context	Prepositional complement	Tonic possessive complement
NOMINAL DOMAIN	ARTICLE + NOUN + <i>de</i> + PERS. PRON. <i>El libro de él/ella</i>	ARTICLE + NOUN + POSS. PRON. <i>El libro suyo</i>
ADVERBIAL DOMAIN	DENOM. LOC. ADV. + <i>de</i> + PERS. PRON. <i>Al lado de él/ella</i>	DENOM. LOC. ADV. + POSS. PRON. <i>Al lado suyo</i>
	NON-DENOM. LOC. ADV. + <i>de</i> + PERS. PRON. <i>Delante de él/ella</i>	NON-DENOM. LOC. ADV. + POSS. PRON. <i>Delante suyo</i>

The results brought forward by Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita (under evaluation) also demonstrate that, in Andalusian Spanish, the feminine morphology (as in (22a) *detrás mía*) has become the predominant variant. It is hypothesized that this is due to a gradual extension brought on by analogical snowballing (De Smet 2012:8), whereby phonological processes also played an important role. Elaborating this proposal further into a (hypothetical) timeline of the chain of analogical extensions, shown in Table 4, we suggest that, on the one hand, the non-denominal adverbials ending with the suffix *-o*, such as *debajo* 'under', adopt the masculine possessive complements due to similarity-based generalizations with the denominals ones, such as *al lado*. Following Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita (under evaluation), non-denominal adverbials ending in *-a* (e.g. *cerca* 'near'), on the other, are claimed to adopt the feminine counterparts, due to word-based analogy. Another analogical extension takes place: this time for the non-denominal adverbials with *-e* due to phonological similarities in their pronunciation with those ending with *-a* (/ 'cer.ke 'su.ʝa/ - *delante suya*), as shown in Stage 1 in Table 4. Once these extensions have occurred, they provide the stepping stone for the next one as, presumably due to frequency, the *-a* variant can extend to the non-denominal adverbials ending with *-o*, such as *debajo*, as illustrated in Stage 2 of Table 4. The final extension within the adverbial domain involves the masculine denominal adverbials, that were originally masculine nouns, which also start accepting the feminine possessive variant, as visualized in Stage 3 of the chain of analogical extensions (see Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita under evaluation for more details). It remains to be examined whether

this conceptualization of the changes is valid for other Romance languages too (see Silva Domínguez in this volume for a diachronic proposal for Galician).

Table 4. Chain of analogical extensions of masculine and feminine tonic possessives within the adverbial domain in Andalusian Spanish

Stage	Type of adverbial context		Prepositional complement	Possessive complement		
1	MASC. DENOMINAL		+ <i>de</i> + PERS. PRON.	+ MASC. POSS.	<i>Al lado de él</i>	<i>Al lado suyo</i>
	NON-DENOMINAL	/-o/			<i>Debajo de él</i>	<i>Debajo suyo</i>
		/-e/		<i>Delante de él</i>	+ FEM. POSS.	<i>Delante suya</i>
		/-a/		<i>Cerca de él</i>		<i>/'cer.ke 'su.ja/</i>
2	MASC. DENOMINAL		+ <i>de</i> + PERS. PRON.	+ MASC. POSS.	<i>Al lado de él</i>	<i>Al lado suyo</i>
	NON-DENOMINAL	/-o/			<i>Debajo de él</i>	<i>Debajo suya</i>
		/-e/		<i>Delante de él</i>	+ FEM. POSS.	<i>Delante suya</i>
		/-a/		<i>Cerca de él</i>		<i>/'cer.ke 'su.ja/</i>
3	MASC. DENOMINAL		+ <i>de</i> + PERS. PRON.	+ FEM. POSS.	<i>Al lado de él</i>	<i>Al lado suya</i>
	NON-DENOMINAL	/-o/			<i>Debajo de él</i>	<i>Debajo suya</i>
		/-e/		<i>Delante de él</i>	+ FEM. POSS.	<i>Delante suya</i>
		/-a/		<i>Cerca de él</i>		<i>/'cer.ke 'su.ja/</i>

Although various linguists have claimed that it is impossible to find possessive complements instead of prepositional ones in verbal contexts (e.g. Sarragossà 2000:222; Satorre Grau 1999:22), examples such as (23) demonstrate that they do exist in the Romance world. In fact, they appear in at least three different languages: Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese and Galician.

- (23) a. *Me critica, habla mal mio* [sic], y ni me conoce [Zulian Spanish]
 CL criticizes, talks badly mine and not CL knows
 'He /she criticizes me, talks badly about me and doesn't even know me.'
 (Twitter, female, Dec. 2013, Zulia, Venezuela)
- b. *Ta bueno porq mi hermano pisa Artigas y mi familia se olvida mio*
 is good because my brother steps-on Artigas and my family CL forgets mine
 'It's good because when my brother arrives in Artigas, my family forgets me.'
 (Twitter, female, May 2018, Artigas, Uruguay) [Uruguayan Spanish]
- c. *Se aprovecha mio mi madre* [Entre Ríos Spanish]
 CL takes-advantage mine my mother
 'My mother takes advantage of me [...].'
 (Twitter, male, Sept. 2013, Viale, Entre Ríos, Argentina)
- d. *la verdad cada vez que alguien se aleja mio siento pena pq soy i n v a t i b l e* [sic]
 the truth each time that someone CL moves-away mine I-feel shame because I-am
 unbeatable [Uruguayan Spanish]
 '[...] honestly, each time someone moves away from me I feel shame/sorrow as
 I'm unbeatable.' (Twitter, male, July 2020, Maldonado, Uruguay)
- e. *Tu super-mega-hiper amigüita habla mal tuya a las espaldas* [Galician Spanish]
 your super-mega-hyper little-friend talks badly yours.FEM to the back
 'Your super-mega-hyper little friends talks badly about you behind your back.'
 (Twitter, female, Jan. 2012, A Coruña, Spain)
- f. *Você acha que ele gosta seu* [Rio Grande do Sul Portuguese]
 You think that he likes his
 'You think he likes him.' (Twitter, Jan. 2013, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil)

- g. *Paso túa* [Galician]
I-ignore yours ‘I ignore you.’ (Silva Domínguez 1995:10)

The use of possessive constructions in verbal contexts has not yet received much attention in comparison to the nominal and adverbial cases, although this is slowly changing in recent years. We will briefly summarize scholars’ main findings. Firstly, as regards the diatopic distribution of the verbal possessive construction in Spanish, while Uruguay is without a doubt the focal area of use of such structures (examples (23b) and (23d)), it is also attested in the neighboring provinces of Entre Ríos (23c), Corrientes and Misiones in Argentina, the north-western regions of Venezuela (e.g. Falcón (23a), Zulia, Mérida, Táchira) and Galician-speaking areas in Spain (see Bertolotti 2014, 2017; Bouzouita & Casanova 2017; Bouzouita & Pato 2019; Bouzouita et al. in press; Bouzouita 2020, in prep.). Additionally, it is encountered in Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil (23f) and in Galician (e.g. Silva Domínguez 1995:10; Bouzouita et al. in press). Secondly, as we observed for the adverbial possessive cases in (22), the verbal counterparts also display morphological variation between the masculine and the feminine possessives. This said, unlike in the adverbial counterparts, there appears to be no variation within the same variety at first sight, though more research is needed. Notwithstanding the previous, parallel to the adverbial cases, the use of the feminine suffix appears to be restricted to European varieties, such as Galician (23g) and Galician Spanish (23e). Again, similar to the adverbial domain, for Spanish all grammatical persons and both numbers can appear as possessive complements in verbal contexts (Bouzouita & Casanova in prep.). As regards the range of Spanish verbs that admit possessive complements, there remains many questions about this aspect, though see Casanova (in this volume) for a first attempt to elucidate this important feature.

Concerning the spread of the tonic possessive as verbal arguments, Bertolotti (2014, 2017) proposes that analogical extension is the underlying mechanism of the change both in the adverbial and verbal domain (see Casanova in this volume for a discussion on possible bridging contexts). In our view, deadverbial cases, such as *alejarse* ‘to move away’ and *acercarse* ‘to move close’, could have played a key role in the genesis of these verbal possessive complements as the spread from the nominal to the adverbial domain appears to predate the appearance of verbal cases. Nonetheless, more empirical research is needed to verify this claim.

From all the previous, we can conclude that, indeed, there exist important morpho-syntactic differences between the various Romance possessive constructions. This is especially apparent in the nominal domain, where some possessive are clitic-like determiners (e.g. French and Spanish), others are adjectival (e.g. Italian), and yet others act as pronouns (Romanian). Van Peteghem (2012) proposes that these differences can be interpreted as the result of different grammaticalization paces, whereby all developments involve changes in categorical status: as pronouns are replaced by adjectives, which in turn change into determiners. Notwithstanding these differences, there also exist various striking similarities. To illustrate, it is

remarkable that the verbal possessive constructions are documented not only in various languages (e.g. Galician and Spanish), but also in diatopic varieties that are (physically) far removed from each other (e.g. Zilian Spanish vs. Uruguayan Spanish). Apart from the rich morpho-syntactic variation in the Romance possessive constructions, it is also clear that the current possessive systems are experiencing a series of changes, as evidenced by the spread of tonic possessives to both the adverbial and verbal domain.

Now that a broad comparative overview of the morpho-syntactic differences and similarities in the Romance possessive systems has been sketched, we briefly summarize and critically evaluate the contributions that make up this special issue. As will become apparent, the articles included in this volume cover all domains in which possessive constructions are attested in a large set of Romance varieties: the first studies center on the nominal possessives, while subsequently issues concerning adverbial and verbal cases are addressed.

2. Overview of the papers

The first study of this special issue, by **Mallorie Labrousse** (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona), is concerned with the histories of the Ibero-Romance possessive systems in the nominal domain. More specifically, it deals with the evolution and variation in use between the presence ([article + possessive + noun]) and absence of articles ([∅ + possessive + noun]) in prenominal possessive expressions with kinship terms in the diachrony of Catalan and European Portuguese. In comparison to other nominal contexts in these two languages, kinship terms appear to constitute a linguistic environment that exhibits a lower degree of generalization of the use of the [article + possessive + noun] construction.

In order to elucidate the reasons behind this patterning, the author scrutinizes the diachronic evolution of these possessive structures by examining corpus data from the 13th to the 20th century. Using an idiolectal framework (Barra Jover 2015), she examines the different functions of the two possessive variants in three individual works for each century. The advantage of this approach is that it permits both the inter- and intra-textual examination of the phenomena at hand. In the distributional diachronic analysis, Labrousse finds for both languages that the diffusion of the [article + possessive + noun] construction with kinship terms has been slower than with other types of nouns. It is not until the 20th century that a shift is detected when this environment starts increasing in frequency of use.

Further, the author evaluates qualitatively various hypotheses formulated by other scholars regarding the potential influence of a series of factors, –such as syntactic motivations, the internal definiteness of the possessum, the psychological proximity between the possessor and the possessum, frequency effects, and the markedness of the morpho-syntactic or semantic-pragmatic context–, on the type of possessive construction used.

Firstly, whereas only a limited effect of syntactic factors (such as the use of apostrophe, appositional use of kinship terms or as subject attribute) and the definiteness of the possessum is found in both languages, for neither language there appears to be a psycho-biological influence on the variation. Instead, the possessive structure with an article appears to be used to introduce both members of the nuclear family, as more peripheral ones. The only nominals that present a higher frequency of use of the [article + possessive + noun] construction are those referring to distant family members, both in Portuguese and Catalan.

Contrary to Italian, the use of diminutive forms does not result in an increase of the possessive variant with article in Catalan nor Portuguese. Similarly, the 1st person does not appear to favor the [article + possessive + noun] structure significantly.

Lastly, the possible influence of markedness is scrutinized. Marked grammatical gender of the nominal element (i.e. the feminine) does not influence the variant selection in Portuguese, while Catalan exhibits some opposing diachronic trends, thus making it hard to establish any concrete patterns.

In sum, the earlier mentioned factors do not appear to condition the variation significantly. Thus, both Catalan and European Portuguese appear to manifest free variation between the two possessive constructions when combined with kinship terms. Given the frequency boost experienced by the [article + possessive + noun] construction with kinship terms in the 20th century, Labrousse recommends that future research analyzes synchronic oral data in order to further map out the on-going process of language change.

In the following article, which continues the same historical vein as the previous contribution, **Yoana Ponsoda Alcázar** (ILLA-CSIC) scrutinizes the paradigm of possessive determiners in Old Castilian. Around the end of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th century, vernacular Romance had still not entirely penetrated the written language in Burgos and Palencia. Because of this, Castilian documents from this period are witness of a general coexistence and alternation between various possessive forms, as is duly illustrated by the author: to wit, apart from the Latin possessive and anaphoric genitive forms, Romance possessive variants are equally encountered, as well as hybrid instances, which are superficially Latin, but have also undergone morphological change. Nonetheless, the existing literature for this northern Spanish variety does not acknowledge the existence and use of this wide range of possessive structures, which remains undescribed up until now.

In an effort to address this current gap in knowledge, Ponsoda Alcázar studies data from the *Corpus Histórico del Español Norteño* (CORHEN) with two specific aims in mind. The first concerns the exploration of the grammatical characterization of the Old Castilian possessive system and, more specifically, (i) the overall distribution of the various possessive variants used by each individual amanuensis, i.e. Romance, Latin and hybrid forms, (ii) their syntactic placement, in this case pre- or postnominal position (postnominal being considered more Latin whereas

Romance possessives are typically prenominal), and (iii) gender variability (agreement between the grammatical gender of the noun and the corresponding possessive determiner vs so-called “gender confusions” [e.g. *so fija* ‘his.MASC daughter’]) are scrutinized and illustrated in detail. In addition to providing a grammatical description of the possessives, this research also underlines the importance of possible idiolectal influences in the variation under study on Catalan and European Portuguese (see Labrousse in this volume).

The second aim of this study regards the consideration of the role of individual scribes and authors when examining linguistic variation while recurring to theoretical models of historical sociolinguistics. One such theoretical key concept is ‘layered simultaneity’ (Nevalainen 2015), which refers to the importance of not only to differentiate between idiosyncratic language production of a specific individual in a speech community (the microlevel), but to also consider the context surrounding each individual (the macrolevel) and the social networks between individuals (the intermediate level). Additionally, the document itself is also considered as a potential factor governing the possessive system: namely, the influence of the document structure and the type of code (Latin, Romance or hybrid) employed by the amanuensis. In order to answer the various research questions, the language use of five scribes, active in the current provinces of Burgos and Palencia during the end of the 12th century and the first half of the 13th century, is examined.

As concerns the grammatical characterization of the studied possessive determiners, the author finds that there is considerable intra- and intertextual variation as to the considered syntactic parameters (possessive placement and gender (dis)agreement) and overall distribution of the type of possessives used. In that sense, the characterization of the system highlights a palpable variable dynamic – the different authors demonstrate variable degrees of hybridism, which is reflected not only in the types of possessives that are used (Latin, Romance or pure hybrid forms), but also in their syntactic placement and gender agreement. The individual scribes exhibit significant idiolectal variation, which the author argues to be a key finding: indeed, this illustrates that we need to avoid that generalizations are made for entire dialects when, in fact, the linguistic use of one particular individual and his or her particularities might be the sole basis for such conclusions.

With the contribution of **Edita Gutiérrez-Rodríguez** (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), we shift to the diatopic perspective as this paper centers on the semantic-pragmatic values of the [indefinite article + possessive + noun] construction found in Guatemalan Spanish (cf. example (12d) for Salvadoran Spanish). Earlier descriptions of this indefinite possessive structure conclude that it can convey canonical possession or an emphatic value. The objective of this article is to demonstrate that these two meanings are the basic ones and that other semantic-pragmatic values can be tracked back to these.

Gutiérrez-Rodríguez first reviews studies that examine the origins of this indefinite possessive construction and evaluates the hypothesis whether language

contact with Mayan languages could explain its existence in Guatemalan Spanish. While this structure existed in medieval times (see section 1.1.1. with examples (6a)-(6g)), indigenous influences cannot be discarded as (i) these languages allow the combination of indefinite articles with possession prefixes and (ii) Mayan possessives are used to express relationships that in standard Spanish are conveyed through different linguistic means. The latter can thus explain the semantic-pragmatic extension of the emphatic use of this construction in this diatopic variety. However, as the [indefinite article + possessive + noun] structure is also found in non-bilingual areas of Guatemala and in countries with little presence of indigenous languages, such as El Salvador and Honduras (cf. Pato in this volume for the exact geographic distribution of this phenomenon), this configuration might have arisen due to various reasons.

After detailing the corpus, the author examines the nouns and the possessives of this indefinite possessive configuration. Structures with the canonical possessive meaning appear essentially with the same type of nouns as in Old Spanish, that is, animated relational nouns, which denote social ties, although inanimate nouns can also be found very marginally. The emphatic possessive constructions, on the contrary, display all kinds of nouns: animate and inanimate nouns, as well as countable and non-countable ones. As regards the possessives, both numbers and all grammatical persons are attested, despite a clear preference for the 3rd person (cf. Pato in this volume).

Subsequently, the various semantic-pragmatic values identified in the literature are carefully scrutinized. These include the partitive, iterative, intensifying and discursive meanings (the latter includes pragmatic focus and referential persistence/topic continuation), all of them are said to be associated with one of the two basic meanings of this phenomenon: to wit, the canonical possessive interpretation or the emphatic possessive one. As concerns the former, Gutiérrez-Rodríguez' working hypothesis is that the prenominal possessive's meaning in Guatemalan Spanish, in which the possessive functions as an adjective, is similar to the postnominal adjectival one found in standard Spanish as it increases the intensional content of the structure and helps to delimit its reference. Due to this, these constructions tend to have specific readings, though non-specific ones are also possible. Moreover, the partitive reading is shown to be derived from the indefinite article. Although the [indefinite article + possessive + noun] construction in Guatemalan Spanish seems to behave like its medieval counterpart, its first element is an indefinite article and, therefore, rather than emitting a proper partitive meaning, it is simply undefined. The discursive value of topic continuation can be explained by the fact that an indefinite article can be used to introduce new referents, which can be retaken later on in the discourse.

With respect to the emphatic possessive reading, the possessive should not be regarded as a postnominal adjective or a genitive modifier that contributes to the intensification of the noun, but rather as a kind of evaluative modifier: its values are similar to those of the emphatic possessives in standard Spanish and can take

specific and unspecific readings, as opposed to the canonical possessive constructions, which favor specific interpretations.

Two formal analyses representing these two readings are proposed:

- (24) a. [DP [D un] [AgrP mi_i [Agr^o] [NumP [Num tí_o_j] [NP [N ~~tí_o_j~~ mi_i]]]]]]
 b. [DP [D un] [AgrP mi [Agr^o] [NumP [Num tí_o_j] [NP [N ~~tí_o_j~~]]]]]

While in standard Spanish the prenominal possessive moves to the DP, which explains its incompatibility with the definite or indefinite article, in Guatemalan Spanish, the canonical possessive in (24a) moves to an agreement projection (AgrP) located below D, similar to Catalan, Italian or Portuguese (cf. Silvestri in this volume). Following Eguren (2016, 2018), the possessive in the emphatic reading is not generated as a complement of the noun which then moves, as in (24a), but instead it is generated directly in AgrP, as shown in (24b). Note that the possessive is not co-indexed with an element in the NP, which would explain why it is not interpreted as a genitive complement of the noun and the evaluative interpretation can arise.

Before concluding, the author briefly reflects on the appearance of weak quantifiers (e.g. *algunos mis amigos* ‘some of my friends/some friends of mine’) in these indefinite possessive constructions, which can display both the canonical and emphatic uses.

The following paper by **Enrique Pato** (Université de Montréal) also deals with the indefinite article possessive construction (cf. example (12d); see Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, as well as Silvestri in this volume). The aim of this contribution is twofold. On the one hand, it envisages tracing the exact geographic distribution of this syntactic structure, while, on the other, providing a general grammatical and interpretative description for the different varieties where this construction is attested. In view of this focus, this article perfectly complements the semantic-pragmatic perspective offered by Gutiérrez-Rodríguez’ study.

For the analyses, the author resorts to three theoretical concepts that are tightly interlinked: pleonastic possessives, redundancy and emphasis. Firstly, pleonastic or redundant possessives serve to add interpretational weighting to the structure, i.e. they can be used to underscore not only the possession relation, but also additional semantic-pragmatic properties, which can vary greatly, going from the attribution of typical traits (e.g. *él tenía su risa y su encanto* ‘he had his laugh and his charm’) to highlighting affective nuances (e.g. *se pasea con su camisita* ‘she/he strolls around with her/his (little) shirt’). Secondly, redundancy, which consists in the repetition of lexical or grammatical information, can be regarded as a type of agreement (Bosque 2004), whereby the content repetition is fully expected, as is especially apparent in the plural (e.g. *unos mis primos* ‘one of my cousins’). Thirdly, the concept of emphasis is used to highlight semantic-pragmatic considerations: in the possessive phenomenon at hand, the possessum is zoomed in

on through a syntactically marked construction (cf. Gutiérrez-Rodríguez in this volume).

After the literature review, Pato details the methodology and corpus. The sample size of this study is noteworthy, as more than 900 relevant cases, all from the *CdE: Web / Dialectos* (Davies 2016), have been examined, almost doubling the size of the corpora used in previous studies. Another important feat of this research consists in its pan-Hispanic approach, which enables the author to offer a global yet fine-grained geographic evaluation of the phenomenon at hand, which up until now has been lacking in the literature.

In effect, the geographic analysis of the data reveals that the [indefinite article + possessive + noun] construction can be found in Guatemala, Mexico, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica and Panama, although important differences in frequency of use are observed between these different countries. This indefinite possessive structure predominates overwhelmingly in Guatemala, as more than three quarters of the cases come from this area, followed by El Salvador and Mexico far behind. Guatemala is thus the focal point from which this linguistic phenomenon radiates north- and southwards.

It is further demonstrated that 1st person contexts, especially the singular forms, prevail, followed by the 3rd and the 2nd persons (cf. Salgado & Bouzouita 2017:776-777; Bouzouita & Casanova 2017; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita 2018:17; Bouzouita 2020, in prep., and Casanova in this volume for similar observations in adverbial and verbal possessive contexts). As regards the gender and number of the indefinite possessives, the masculine cases trump the feminine ones, while the singular constructions are by far the biggest cohort. The types of nouns that appear in these indefinite possessive constructions can be classified in five classes, following the Hierarchy of Individuation (Croft 2004): (i) proper names, (ii) nouns with human referents, (iii) nouns referring to animals, (iv) nouns with inanimate tangible referents, and (v) other types of nouns. It should also be remarked that adjectival pronominal modification is possible (e.g. *una mi buena amiga* ‘one of my good friends’), yet infrequent. Interestingly, pseudo-partitives can also appear immediately after the indefinite article and possessive, oftentimes with a plural inanimate noun, as in *un mi par de bolsitas* lit. ‘one pair of my (little) bags’, a fact that remained unnoticed up until now. Finally, various indefinite constructions appear with the diminutive suffix *-ito/-ita* adding an affective connotation to the structure. Interestingly, it has been shown that the presence of a diminutive propagates the use of [article + possessive + noun] in Italian (Penello 2002:338). Postnominal adjectives can also display this appreciative morphology, highlighting thus the emphatic and affective character of these Spanish indefinite possessive constructions. Another grammatical trait is the presence of an adnominal or postnominal restrictive modifier (e.g. *un mí tío de allá* ‘one of my uncles from there’). The author concludes by making semantic-pragmatic considerations, which confirm once again the emphatic and focus interpretation of these possessive constructions.

With **Giuseppina Silvestri**'s (University of California, Los Angeles) paper, which considers indefinite possessive cases (see also Pato in this volume, Gutiérrez Rodríguez in this volume), we switch our focus from the Hispanic varieties to Italo-Romance, more specifically to the southern Italian dialects and to Daco-Romance. Generally speaking, Italo-Romance varieties exhibit different morphosyntactic patterns for the possessives in terms of the semantic-syntactic property of definiteness of the noun phrase (see De Sisto & Torres-Tamarit in this volume). In southern Italian varieties, the functional *de-* and its allomorphs may be followed by a definite article, a strategy that might be deemed as rather peculiar in the context of the morpho-syntax of possessives in Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Franco-Provençal, Sardinian, Asturian and Galician examples (20)-(21)):

- (25) *nu canə r-u miə* [Northern Calabrian, Aieta]
 a.MSG dog.MSG of-the.MSG POSS.1SG.MSG 'a dog of mine'

What this study proves, nonetheless, is that there is an identical strategy in Daco-Romance varieties. More specifically, there is a similar functional element in Romanian that is used to introduce certain possessives or genitive-marked noun phrases when no linearly prior definite noun phrase has been used.

The author firstly presents a general overview of the morphosyntactic patterns of the possessives found in Italo-Romance, which Silvestri categorizes according to two axes of variability: (i) as determined by their syntactic distributions, the possessives are either determiners or adjectives; (ii) in addition to being either adjective-like or determiner-like, they display different phi-feature agreement (gender and number) with the nominal element. Using oral data from native speakers, Silvestri details five main possessive patterns (A-E), which differ in terms of (i) syntactic distributional properties, (ii) the linear position with respect to the head noun, and (iii) the semantic-syntactic properties of the noun. Pattern A corresponds to the [determiner + possessive + noun] structure, found, among others, in standard Italian (cf. examples in (1b)). The second construction B consists of a [noun + possessive], whereby the Determiner Phrase (DP) does not contain a definite determiner, but a specific head noun that precedes the postnominal possessive (e.g. *Francesca mia* 'my Francesca'; *camera mia* 'my room'; see section 1.1.2). Pattern C, contrary to B, displays a prenominal [possessive + noun] without any definite article (e.g. *mio zio* 'my uncle'; cf. examples in (1a) and (5a)-(5i)). In Italo-Romance, this structure tends to be employed with singular kinship nouns (for the use of prenominal possessive expressions with kinship terms in histories of Catalan and European Portuguese, see Labrousse in this volume). Similar to A, pattern D displays a prenominal definite determiner, but unlike A, a postnominal possessive appears: [definite determiner + noun + possessive], as exemplified in *la kamifa meja* lit. 'the shirt my' (Manzini & Savoia 2005:557-8). This configuration is attested in non-standard Italo-Romance varieties, including central and southern dialects, some Sardinian and Sicilian varieties, and in the Gallo-Romance spoken

in Calabria (see also section 1.1.2; examples (16a)-(16b)). Interestingly, however, it is also found in Romanian. Lastly, Pattern E consists of a [noun + enclitic possessive] and is usually found with singular kinship terms and other types of expressions of inalienable possession (e.g. *màuma*, *màmmita* ‘my mom, your mom’ in central Calabrian; cf. (16c); see De Sisto & Torres-Tamarit in this volume more details on enclitic possessives in southern Italian dialects). These phonetically reduced enclitics do not exhibit morphological variation for gender nor number. Similarly to structure D, Pattern E is also documented in Romanian, where it exhibits similar distributional constraints as in southern Italian dialects (cf. (17e)).

After having mapped out the various morphosyntactic possessive constructions attested in Italo-Romance, the focus is shifted to indefinite noun phrases with possessives and, more specifically, “strong” non-enclitic possessives since these demonstrate a particular behavior when they occur in non-definite DPs. In addition, a detailed contrastive analysis between Italo-Romance and Daco-Romance is carried out. Within the Parametric Syntax framework of the noun phrase, Silvestri scrutinizes the genitive structures attested in Romanian and southern Italian dialects. Clear parallels between them are observed, which leads the author to propose a unifying account for these genitive structures as *Linkers* (Den Dikken 2006), which are considered functional elements without semantic meaning, and the result of a pure syntactic derivation. What Silvestri finds is that, in both Italian dialects and Romanian, non-definite DPs leads speakers to add an extra syntactic layer, which is the Linker, as illustrated in (26):

- | | | | | |
|------|----|-------------------------|--|----------------------|
| (26) | a. | [DP[-DEF] N | [Linker [DP _{Gen} Possessive]]] | |
| | b. | [DP[-DEF] o jachetă | [LK a [DP _{Gen} mea ^{+Φagr}]]] | [Romanian] |
| | c. | [DP[-DEF] na giacchetta | [LK d-a [DP _{Gen} mija ^{+/+Φagr}]]] | [Northern Calabrian] |
| | | ‘a jacket of mine’ | | |

In the final part, Silvestri explores the reasons behind this similarity. It is suggested that contact between the Balkans and the south of Italy might have played a crucial role considering that possessives licensed through a Linker also occur in other varieties, such as the Italo-Greek ones spoken in Apulia and southern Calabria, which form a bridge between the Italo- and Daco-Romance varieties. Considering this historical contact context, it is hypothesized that the Linker observed in southern Italian varieties originates from Italo-Greek’s possessive grammar which, in turn, is shared with Romanian, Aromanian and Albanian.

The use of clitic possessives in southern Italian dialects is further explored in the next paper by **Mirella De Sisto** (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia) and **Francesc Torres-Tamarit** (CNRS / Paris 8). These dialects present two possessive variants, a tonic form and a clitic one. The latter attaches to the noun and is typically used to express inalienable possession with kinship terms (cf. Labrouse and Silvestri in this volume; see also section 1.1.2, example (16d) for Salentino):

- (27) *'fratə-mə* [Airola, Benevento]
brother.SG-POSS.ADJ.1SG.M 'my brother'

While the clitic possessive paradigms vary across dialects, they are oftentimes incomplete and, thus, do not include all grammatical persons (cf. Catalan kinship possessives, which only appear in the singular, as in example (4a)). For instance, as the authors outline, Neapolitan, Apulian and north-eastern Campanian dialects often only have clitic forms available for the 1st and 2nd person singular, whereas the dialects found in Salento also have a 3rd person singular clitic form. As De Sisto and Torres-Tamarit state, the use of enclitic possessives should not be possible with proparoxytonic kinship nouns in view of the so-called three-syllable window. The three-syllable window, inherited from Latin and found in most Romance languages, is a prosodic constraint which precludes stress to fall further back than the antepenultimate syllable. Consequently, when possessive clitics are used following a proparoxytonic kinship term, the constraint of the three-syllable window is violated. In the southern Italian context, the general Romance constraint appears to be complied with as enclitic possessives are principally avoided in such environments. Interestingly though, in the dialects of Airola (Benevento) and Boiano (Campobasso), speakers create a repair strategy to avoid violating this constraint by deleting the last unstressed syllable of the host. The aim of De Sisto and Torres-Tamarit's study is to illustrate this repair process attested in the Airola and Boiano dialects. Through the careful analysis of recently collected oral data from these dialectal areas, the authors propose a phonological account for the repairment strategy using Optimality Theory and Prosodic Phonology. They suggest that the studied possessive enclitics are in fact internal clitics, which thus amalgamate with the prosodic word's host noun. The proparoxytonic stress and three-syllable window is explained by their derivation from internally layered ternary feet that require alignment with the right edge of the prosodic word. In light of this, De Sisto and Torres-Tamarit argue that when a possessive enclitic is attached, the most optimal strategy would be to build an internally layered ternary foot and delete the last syllable of the host noun, which in turn yields the exclusion of stress shift in the Airola and Boiano dialects.

The next contribution, written by **Carme Silva Domínguez** (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela) takes us to the use of possessives outside the nominal domain: it focusses on the variation in adverbial locative constructions with the preposition *de / a* followed by a personal pronoun and those with feminine possessives in Galician, as in *diante de min* vs. *diante miña* 'in front of me' respectively (cf. section 1.2, examples (22a)). Various aspects of the grammaticalization process that the possessives have undergone are scrutinized in this study: to wit, (i) the reasons behind the spread of possessives to the adverbial domain, (ii) the genesis of this possessive adverbial structure to verify the claim that it is a contact-induced syntactic change that can be traced back to Spanish, and

(iii) the selection of the feminine possessive variants instead of the masculine / unmarked ones.

Analogy is identified as the mechanism that drives the grammaticalization process under study as syntactic and semantic correspondences between the prepositional structure [*de* + personal pronoun] and the possessive in nominal contexts, as in *A casa del / dela* 'the house of him / her' and *A súa casa* 'his / her house', lead to an extension of use of the possessive, and thus variation with the prepositional complement, in the adverbial domain.

As concerns the verification of the language contact hypothesis, Silva Domínguez starts by reviewing the literature on the adverbial possessive constructions in Spanish and then proceeds to Galician, where no consensus exists on the status of the innovative possessive variant as a contact-induced change. In order to shed light on this issue, the author carries out a qualitative analysis with the dialect data from the ALGA, which was drawn up with information provided by NORM speakers from the 1970s. The results indicate that there is no correlation between the localities in which the possessive variant is observed and the vicinity of urban areas, where language contact with Spanish is more likely to happen than in rural surroundings. In other words, the use of the possessive complement in adverbial locative constructions in Galician does not appear to be due to syntactic interferences from Spanish.

This geolinguistic analysis is followed by a detailed corpus study with the aim to elucidate the chronology of use of the feminine or the masculine possessives. The corpora used are (i) the *Tesouro Informatizado da Lingua Galega* (TILG), a diachronic corpus, and (ii) the *Corpus de Referencia do Galego Actual* (CORGA). Through the comparison of an extensive range of spatial adverbials and their complements, Silva Domínguez is able to determine that the masculine possessive variants start emerging in the mid-19th century with denominal adverbials, such as *ao / de lado* 'next to'. However, the possessive complement is not out of the ordinary in these cases given the nominal base of these adverbials with which the possessives agree. The feminine counterparts, on the contrary, are documented only a century later in these constructions, to wit from the 1950s onwards. The author then turns her attention to non-denominal locative adverbials. Interestingly, for these cases without a nominal base, the situation is reversed as the feminine possessives appear from the 1930s onwards, whereas the masculine counterparts only start appearing fifty years later. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the masculine complement is not attested for all non-denominal locative adverbials, as is the case for *cerca* 'near'.

Silva Domínguez goes on to sketch for each spatial adverbial the historical trajectory of its possessive complement and to analyze the influence of the grammatical person on the type of adverbial complement. The data reveal that the possessive variants starts expanding significantly from the 1980s and that the 1st and 2nd persons appear more frequently with possessive variants than the 3rd persons (singular and plural). The latter is in line with observations made for Spanish

possessive constructions in the adverbial (e.g. Salgado & Bouzouita 2017; Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita 2018; Hoff 2020) and verbal domains (Bouzouita & Casanova 2017; Bouzouita in prep.; Casanova in this volume).

To verify the validity of the previous results, which proceed from corpora consisting of written data, Silva Domínguez also examines the *Corpus Oral do Instituto da Lingua Galega* (CORILGA), an oral corpus. While only feminine possessives are found and the general tendencies previously observed appear to be confirmed, no statistically conclusions can be reached due to the small number of relevant cases. The *Corpus para el Estudio del Español Oral* (ESLORA) is also examined in order to verify whether the Spanish spoken in Galicia shares the same innovative use of the possessives in adverbial contexts. In effect, feminine possessive complements are documented with locative adverbials, even following denominal ones that originate from a masculine noun, although here too no conclusive results can be presented due to the small corpus size. As regards the extra-linguistic factors which seems to influence the variation at hand, the author suggests that only age might be relevant as the possessive constructions tend to appear more frequently in the speech of younger informants.

The hypothesis according to which the use of feminine morphology in the possessive is due to the final vowel of the preceding adverbial is shown to not hold. Therefore, Silva Domínguez proposes a new hypothesis which involves a blended structure. The adverbials *diante* 'in front' and *tras* 'behind' admit a following masculine or feminine possessive without a definite article, as in *tras miña casa* 'behind my.FEM house.FEM'. Additionally, there exist [locative adverbial + personal pronoun] structures without a preposition, as in *tras min* 'behind me'. Consequently, the origin of the feminine possessive in locative adverbials in Galician could be due to the creation of a hybrid structure *tras miña* lit. 'behind mine.FEM', which results from blending [*tras* + personal pronoun] and [*tras* + feminine possessive + noun].

The final paper of this special issue, written by **Vanessa Casanova** (Ghent University) deals, like the previous contribution, with possessive constructions outside nominal contexts. However, unlike the one by Silva Domínguez, which examines possessives in the adverbial domain in Galician, we shift our attention further down the grammaticalization cline to verbal structures in Spanish, where possessive complements (PossC) have been observed instead of prepositional ones (PrepC) with *de* (see discussion in section 1.2 and examples (23)).

On the basis of Twitter data, Casanova tries to answer the question whether only verbs that take PrepC headed by *de* are affected by this variation, or whether there exist PossC for verbs that appear with other prepositions, such as *a* (e.g. *acercarse a* 'to come closer to') or *en* (e.g. *confiar en* 'to trust'). In other words, this paper addresses the theoretical question whether an analogical change can be observed, whereby the PossC is extending its use to other verbs that can appear with prepositions other than *de*, which constitutes the original locus of the possessive

verbal arguments. It is shown that the answer to this question is affirmative and that in effect the use of PossC is spreading to new contexts (*de* > *a*, *en*).

As there is currently no exhaustive description of all the Spanish verbs that appear with PrepC, the author proceeds to compile a list using a variety of sources, identifying a total of 1173 verbs. Given that the phenomenon under study is difficult to document in traditional corpora, Casanova resorts to Twitter to examine said variation. For each verb three manual Twitter searches are carried out, in which the verb appears in the 3rd person singular of the indicative present and is followed by a singular tonic possessive pronoun (*mío*, *tuyo*, *suyo*). Using this methodology, a total of 164 verbs that allow the PossC have been attested. Of the 263 verbs that can only appear with a PrepC introduced by *de*, 74 also allow the PossC, all of which appear with the masculine suffix. Additionally, the PossC construction extends itself also to verbs that can appear with PrepC introduced by *en*. However, no cases were documented whereby the PossC alternates with a prepositional phrase introduced by the preposition *a* that has the status of a direct object.

In the following, Casanova shows that PossC can be documented for *depend*-type verbs ('to depend'), in which the prepositional phrase acts as an internal argument of the verb but that, on the contrary, this variation between PrepC and PossC is not attested for unaccusative verbs that select a minimal clause, like *consistir* 'to consist in' (cf. Demonte 1991). Semantically, the PossC verbs include primarily verbs of sensation (e.g. *arrepentirse* 'to regret'), communication (e.g. *despedirse* 'to say goodbye'), displacement (e.g. *acercarse* 'to get closer'), knowledge, perception, belief (e.g. *confiar* 'to trust') and possession (e.g. *perder* 'to lose'). Casanova thus concludes that most verbs that allow PossC are associated with cognition events. She further observes that the 1st person singular possessive form *mío* is found most frequently for these PossC verbs, followed closely by the 2nd person *tuyo*, and much less commonly by the possessive *suyo*, which can have 3rd person referents but also 2nd person (deferential) ones (cf. Pato in this volume, where the 1st person singular possessive forms also predominate, albeit in the nominal domain; cf. Marttinen Larsson & Bouzouita 2018 for the adverbial and Bouzouita & Casanova 2017, Bouzouita 2020, Bouzouita & Casanova in prep. for the verbal contexts). As regards the PossC verbs that can appear with *en* (e.g. *confiar en* 'to trust'), although not very numerous, they appear to correspond to verbs of attachment or contact (*acostarse en* 'to lay down'), fixation or intense attention (*fijarse en* 'to notice') and belief (*confiar en* 'to trust'). The semantic verb class analyses demonstrate that the PossC appears with those verbs that admit the presence of arguments with personal features. Possessives, like personal pronouns, satisfy this deictic condition. Moreover, as possessive pronouns also express relational content (cf. Porto Dapena 1982), they can therefore substitute both the personal pronoun and preposition of the PrepC.

References

- Albesa Pedrola, Elena (2020), "Construcciones posesivas en el aragonés central y meridional a finales de la Edad Media", *Dialectologia*, 25:1-24.
- ALDC (2001-2018) = Veny i Clar, Joan & Lídia Pons i Griera (2001-2018), *Atlas Lingüístic del Domini Català*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans. Available online: <https://aldc.espais.iec.cat/>. Last consulted: October 19, 2020.
- Aleza-Izquierdo, Milagros (2016), "El uso del posesivo perifrástico en un corpus oral de jóvenes de La Habana (Cuba)", *Zeitschrift Für Romanische Philologie*, 132(1):149-179.
- ALGA= Álvarez Blanco, Rosario (dir.) (1995), *Atlas lingüístico galego. Tomo II: Morfoloxía non verbal*. A Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, Conde de Fenosa.
- Almeida, Manuel & Carmen Díaz Alayón (1988), *El español de Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Litografía A. Romero.
- Ánchel Barcos, Miguel (2007), *El aragonés ansotano. Estudio lingüístico de Ansó y Fago*. Zaragoza: Gara d'Edicions / Institución "Fernando el Católico".
- Anglade, Joseph (1921), *Grammaire de l'ancien provençal. Phonétique et morphologie*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- Barra Jover, Mario (2015), "Método y teoría del cambio lingüístico: argumentos en favor de un 'método idiolectal'", in García Martín, José María (ed.), *Actas del IX Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española (Cádiz 2012)*. Madrid / Frankfurt: Iberoamericana / Vervuert, 1, 263-292.
- Bertolotti, Virginia (2014), "Pronombres posesivos en el español rioplatense: tres casos de reanálisis", *Traslaciones: Revista Latinoamericana de Lectura y Escritura*, 1(1):56-74.
- Bertolotti, Virginia (2017), "Pronombres posesivos y cambios gramaticales en español. Análisis en la variedad rioplatense", in Company Company, Concepción & Norohella Huerta Flores (eds.), *La posesión en la lengua española. Anejos de la Revista de Filología Española*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 303-328.
- Bleorțu, Cristina (2020), "Construcciones híbridas de posesivo en La Pola Siero (Asturias): diferencias sociolingüísticas", *Lletres Asturianes*, 122:99-113.
- Bosque, Ignacio (2004), "Sobre la redundancia y las formas de interpretarla", in Benítez Pérez, Pedro & Raquel Romero Guillemas (eds.), *Actas del I Simposio de didáctica del español para extranjeros: Teoría y práctica*. Río de Janeiro: Instituto Cervantes de Río de Janeiro, 23-50.
- Bouzouita, Miriam (2020), "Posesivos en ámbitos no nominales: ¿Un caso de contacto de lenguas?". Presentation given at *ALPES3: El español en contacto con otras lenguas*, Kandersteg, Universities of Zurich and Lausanne, 2020, January 12-17.
- Bouzouita, Miriam (in press [2021]), "Las estructuras posesivas nominales en español: ¿un universal vernáculo?", in Di Tullio, Ángela & Enrique Pato (eds.),

Universales vernáculos en la gramática del español. Madrid / Frankfurt: Iberoamericana / Vervuert.

- Bouzouita, Miriam (in prep.), “The diatopic distribution of the use of possessive pronouns instead of verbal prepositional phrase complements in Spanish.”
- Bouzouita, Miriam & Vanessa Casanova (2017), ““De los creadores de *al lado mío* llega *él habla suyo*’: El complemento posesivo en el ámbito verbal. Una aproximación diatópica y sociolingüística al fenómeno”. Presentation given at the *XVIII Congreso Internacional de la ALFAL*, Bogotá, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2017, July 24-28.
- Bouzouita, Miriam & Vanessa Casanova (in prep.), “El complemento posesivo en el ámbito verbal: un primer acercamiento sociolingüístico”.
- Bouzouita, Miriam & Enrique Pato (2019), “¿Por qué no gustas de mí, como yo gusto de ti? El verbo *gustar* y su complemento preposicional en español actual”, *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 79:161-186.
- Bouzouita, Miriam, Mónica Castillo Lluch & Enrique Pato (2018), “*Dialectos del español*. Una nueva aplicación para conocer la variación actual y el cambio en las variedades del español”, *Dialectología*, 20:61-83.
- Bouzouita, Miriam, Mónica Castillo Lluch & Enrique Pato (in press [2021]), “*Dialectos del español* : une application pour l’étude de la variation linguistique dans le monde hispanophone”, in Avanzi, Mathieu, Nicholas LoVecchio, Alice Millour & André Thibault (eds.), *Nouveaux regards sur la variation dialectale – New ways of analyzing dialectal variation*. Strasbourg: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.
- Brito, Ana Maria & Ruth E. V. Lopes (2016), “The structure of DPs”, in Wetzels, Leo, João Costa & Sergio Menuzzi (eds.), *The handbook of Portuguese linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 254-274.
- Buridant, Claude (2019), *Grammaire du français médiéval (XI^e –XIV^e siècles)*. Strasbourg: Société de Linguistique Romane / Éditions de linguistique et de philologie.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1998), “On the deficient / strong opposition in possessive systems”, in Alexiadou, Artemis & Chris Wilder (eds.), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17-53.
- Carrera, Aitor (2009), *Elements bàsics de llengua occitana*. Generalitat de Catalunya. Available online: <https://llengua.gencat.cat/permalink/bd3c58fe-5382-11e4-8f3f-000c29cdf219>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Casalicchio, Jan & Patrizia Cordin (2020), *Grammar of central Trentino: A Romance dialect from north-east Italy*. Leiden: Brill.
- Casanova, Vanessa (in this volume), “El uso del complemento posesivo verbal por el complemento de régimen preposicional en español actual”, in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance, *Moderna språk*, 114(3):264-301.

- Castro, Ana (2016), "Possessivos e artigo definido expletivo em PE e PB", *Revista Veredas*, 10(1/2). Available online: <https://periodicos.ufjf.br/index.php/veredas/article/view/25231>.
- Catalán, Diego (1989 [1964]), "El español en Tenerife y en la Romanía Nova", in Catalán, Diego, *El español: orígenes de su diversidad*. Madrid: Paraninfo, 202-232.
- CdE = Davies, Mark (2001), *Corpus del español: Genre / Historical*. Provo (UT): Brigham Young University. Available online: www.corpusdelespanol.org. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Choi, Jinny Kyungjin (1998), *Languages in contact. A morphosyntactic analysis of Paraguayan Spanish from a historical and sociolinguistic perspective*. PhD dissertation. Georgetown University.
- Coba Femenia, Joan (1999), *El adjectius possessius: Teoria i problemes d'ús*. PhD dissertation. Universitat de València.
- Company Company, Concepción (2005), "Determinantes al servicio del héroe. Artículo + posesivo en el Cantar de mio Cid", *La Corónica*, 33(2):29-50.
- Company Company, Concepción (2006), "Gramaticalización y frecuencia de uso: Los paradójicos sintagmas con artículo + posesivo del español medieval", *Revista de Historia de la Lengua Española*, 1:5-30.
- Company Company, Concepción (2009), "Artículo + posesivo + sustantivo y estructuras afines", in Company Company, Concepción (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Segunda parte: La frase nominal*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México / Fondo de Cultura Económica, vol. 2.1, 759-880.
- Company Company, Concepción (2017), "El posesivo átono con artículo definido y con artículo indefinido. Similitudes y diferencias", en Company Company, Concepción & Norohella Huerta Flores (eds.), *La posesión en la lengua española*. Madrid: CSIC, 133-175.
- CORGA = Centro Ramón Piñero para a investigación en humanidades, *Corpus de Referencia do Galego Actual (CORGA) [3.2]*. Available online: <http://www.cirp.gal/corga/>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- CORHEN = Torrens Álvarez, María Jesús (dir.), 2016-present. *Corpus histórico del español norteño*. Available online: www.corhen.es. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- CORILGA = Regueira Fernández, Xosé Luis (dir.), *Corpus oral informatizado da lingua galega*. Santiago de Compostela-Vigo: Instituto da Lingua Galega / Atlantic-Universidade de Vigo. Available online: <http://ilg.usc.es/corilga/>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- COSER = Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés (dir.) (2005-), *Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural*. Available online: www.corpusrural.es. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Croft, William (2004), *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Davies, Mark (2016), *Corpus del español: Web / Dialectos*. Provo (UT): Brigham Young University. Available online: www.corpusdelespanol.org. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- De Andrés Díaz, Ramón (2013), *Gramática comparada de las lenguas ibéricas*. Gijón: TREA.
- De Benito Moreno, Carlota & Miriam Bouzouita (2018), "Nominal possessive constructions in Andalusian Spanish". Presentation given at *Possessive Constructions in Romance (PossRom2018)*, Ghent University, 2018, June 29.
- Demonte, Violeta (1991), "La realización sintáctica de los argumentos: El caso de los verbos preposicionales", in Demonte, Violeta (ed.) *Detrás de la palabra: Estudios de gramática del español*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 69-115.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2006), *Relators and Linkers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- De Sisto, Mirella & Francesc Torres-Tamarit (in this volume), "The prosodification of possessive enclitics in Airola and Boiano", in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):198-225.
- De Smet, Hendrik (2012), *Spreading Patterns: Diffusional Change in the English System of Complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dubert, Francisco & Charlotte Galves (2016), "Galician and Portuguese", in Ledgeway, Adam & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 411-446.
- EFA 2021 = Estudio de Filología Aragonesa (2021), *Gramática básica de l'aragonés*. Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Eguren, Luis (2016), "The Spanish doubled possessive construction from a cross-linguistic perspective", *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 9(2): 243-273.
- Eguren, Luis (2018), "Evaluative prenominal possessives in Spanish", *Borealis*, 7(1):1-26.
- Elsig, Martin (2017), "New insights into an old form: A variationist analysis of the pleonastic possessive in Guatemalan Spanish", *Language Variation and Change*, 29(2):157-186.
- ESLORA = Vázquez Rozas, V. (dir.), *Corpus para el estudio del español oral*. Santiago: Universidade de Santiago. Available online: <http://eslora.usc.es>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Fernández González, José Ramón (1985), *Gramática histórica provenzal*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés (2011), *La lengua de Castilla y la formación del español*. Madrid: Real Academia Española.
- Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés (2016), "Dialectos del español peninsular", en Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier (ed.), *Enciclopedia de la lingüística hispánica*. London: Routledge, 387-404.
- Frías Conde, Xavier (2012), "O comportamento sintático dos possessivos nas línguas românicas", *Revista de Filología Románica*, 29(1):59-74.

- Frías Conde, Xavier (2014), *Compendio de gramática galega básica*. Madrid: UNED.
- GBIEC 2019 = Institut d'Estudis Catalans (2019), *Gramàtica bàsica i d'ús de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- GdG 2016 = Departamento de Galego IES Fontexería (2016), *Guia do Galego*. Online tool: <https://www.edu.xunta.gal/centros/iesfontexeria/aulavirtual/mod/page/view.php?id=3302>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- GEIEC 2020 = Institut d'Estudis Catalans (2020), *Gramàtica essencial de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans. Available online: <https://geiec.iec.cat/portada.asp>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Gómez Torrego, Leonardo (2006), *Hablar y escribir correctamente. Gramática normativa del español actual*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- González Escribano, José Luis (2012), "La estructura de la 'frase nominal' en asturiano", *Lletres Asturianes*, 106:125-161.
- GLA 2001 = Academia de la Llingua Asturiana (2001), *Gramática de la Llingua Asturiana*. Oviedo: Academia de la Llingua Asturiana.
- Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, Edita (in this volume), "La construcción <artículo indefinido + posesivo + sustantivo> en el español de Guatemala", in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):103-140.
- Haensch, Günther (2003 [1960]), *Las hablas de la Alta Ribagorza*. Zaragoza: Ainas.
- Haiman, John & Paola Benincà (1992), *The Rhaeto-Romance languages*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Hoff, Mark (2020) "Cerca mío/a or cerca de mí? A variationist analysis of Spanish locative + possessive on Twitter", *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 13(1):51-78.
- Hualde, José Ignacio (1992), *Catalan*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Iliescu, Maria (1972), *Le friulan (à partir des dialectes parlés en Roumanie)*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jensen, Frede (1994), *Syntaxe de l'ancien occitan*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kristol, Andres (2016), "Francoprovençal", in Ledgeway, Adam & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 350-362.
- Labrousse, Mallorie (2018), *Étude diachronique et comparée de l'alternance [article + possessif + nom] / [possessif + nom] en catalan, espagnol et portugais, du 13^e au 20^e siècle*. PhD dissertation. Université Paris 8.
- Labrousse, Mallorie (in this volume), "Parallélismes et dissymétries dans l'évolution de l'alternance <article + possessif + nom> / <possessif + nom> avec les termes de parenté en catalan et en portugais européen", in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):45-77.

- Ledgeway, Adam (2011), “Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change”, in Maiden, Martin, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Romance languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 1, 382-471.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2016), “The dialects of southern Italy”, in Ledgeway, Adam & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 246-269.
- Lorenzo, Guillermo (1998), “Possessive Constructions in the dialects of Asturian. A micro-parametric approach”, *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 6:23-39.
- Lorenzo, Guillermo (2020), “Generalized cliticization and agreement asymmetries in Asturian possessive DPs”, *Isogloss*, 6(1):1-25.
- Lorenzo Ramos, Antonio (1976), *El habla de los Silos*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Caja General de Ahorros de Santa Cruz de Tenerife.
- Lozano Sierra, Chabier (2010), *Aspectos lingüísticos de Tella: Aragonés de Sobrarbe (Huesca)*. Zaragoza: Gara d’Edicions / Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza / Institución “Fernando el Católico”.
- Lozano Sierra, Chabier & Ángel Saludas Bernad (2005), *Aspectos morfosintácticos del belsetán (aragonés del valle de Bielsa)*. Zaragoza: Ainas.
- Lyons, Christopher (1985), “A possessive parameter”, *Sheffield Working Papers in Language and Linguistics*, 2:98-104.
- Marchello-Nizia, Christiane, Bernard Combettes, Sophie Prévost & Tobias Scheer (2020, eds), *Grande grammaire historique du français*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Manzini, Maria-Rita & Leonardo Savoia (2005), *I dialetti italiani e romance. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Marcotulio, Leonardo & Cláudio dos Santos (2018), “Sobre construções analíticas com leitura possessiva no galego-português medieval”, *Estudos de Lingüística Galega*, I:139-153.
- Marttinen Larsson, Matti (under evaluation), “Modelling incipient probabilistic grammar change in real time: The grammaticalisation of possessive pronouns in European Spanish locative adverbial constructions”.
- Marttinen Larsson, Matti & Laura Álvarez López (2017), “‘Delante suyo’ vs. ‘delante de él’: el uso de las locuciones adverbiales locativas desde una perspectiva diacrónica y diatópica”, *Signo y seña*, 31(1):85-104.
- Marttinen Larsson, Matti & Laura Álvarez López (in press), “El uso de los adverbios locativos con pronombres posesivos en el español uruguayo: un análisis diacrónico y probabilístico”, *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*.
- Marttinen Larsson, Matti & Miriam Bouzouita (2018), “Encima de mí vs. encima mío: un análisis variacionista de las construcciones adverbiales locativas con complementos preposicionales y posesivos en Twitter”, *Moderna språk* 112(1):1-39.

- Marttinen Larsson, Matti & Miriam Bouzouita (under evaluation), "Feminine morphology in possessive complements of adverbial constructions in Andalusian varieties".
- Maxia, Mauro (2017), "Il gallurese e il sassarese", in Blasco Ferrer, Eduardo, Peter Koch & Daniela Marzo (eds.), *Manuale di linguistica sarda*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 431-445.
- Mensching, Guido (2017), "Morfosintassi: sincronia", in Blasco Ferrer, Eduardo, Peter Koch & Daniela Marzo (eds.), *Manuale di linguistica sarda*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 376-396.
- Miguel, Matilde (2002), "Possessive pronouns in European Portuguese and Old French", *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, 1:215-240.
- Nevalainen, Terttu (2015), "What are historical sociolinguistics?", *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 1(2):243-269.
- Nichols, Johanna (1992), *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Nieuwenhuijsen, Dorien (2007), "Un amigo suyo se enfrenta con un su amigo. El uso de dos construcciones posesivas en dos periódicos de Guatemala y México", *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, LV(2):321-350.
- O'Connor, M. Catherine (2003), "Differential Possessor Expression: Are pair-wise comparison ever required?", in Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG03 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 347-366.
- Olivieri, Michèle & Patrick Sauzet (2016), "Southern Gallo-Romance (Occitan)", in Ledgeway, Adam & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 319-349.
- Orozco, Rafael (2010), "Variation in the expression of nominal possession in Costeño Spanish", *Spanish in Context*, 7(2):194-220.
- Pacheco Carpio, Carmen & Miriam Bouzouita (2017), "El uso de los pronombres posesivos en el habla juvenil de La Habana: un análisis variacionista", in Ruiz Miyares, Leonel, María Rosa Álvarez Silva & Alex Muñoz Alvarado (eds.), *Nuevos Estudios sobre Comunicación Social*. Santiago de Cuba: Ediciones Centro de Lingüística Aplicada, vol. 1, 52-56.
- Paden, William D. (1998), *An introduction to Old Occitan*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Pato, Enrique (in this volume), "Posesivos pleonásticos, redundancia y énfasis: De nuevo sobre la construcción *una mi amiga* en las variedades mexicano-centroamericanas", in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):141-160.
- Penello, Nicoletta (2002), "Possessivi e nomi di parentela in alcune varietà italiane antiche e moderne", *Verbum*, IV(2):327-348.
- Pescarini, Diego (2020), "Nominal syntax (and morphology) at the Ligurian / Occitan border". Presentation given at the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (SLE 2020), WS 8: *Contact and the architecture of*

- language faculty, 26 August-1 September 2020, Available online: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03094935>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Ponsoda Alcázar, Yoana (in this volume), "Los posesivos del castellano norteño medieval: la importancia de los escribanos", in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):78-102.
- Porto Dapena, José-Álvaro (1982), "Los posesivos personales del español: intento de descripción funcional", *Dicenda: Cuadernos de Filología Hispánica*, 26.1:55-108.
- RAE & ASALE 2009 = Real Academia Española & Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2009), *Nueva gramática de la lengua española, vol. I-II*. Madrid: Santillana.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1977), *Le gascon : Études de philologie pyrénéenne*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Rull i Muruzábal, Xavier (2020), "Aixo és típic teu. L'expansió dels poessius com a forma de genitiu dels pronoms personals", *Llengua & Literatura*, 30:29-49.
- Salgado, Hugo & Miriam Bouzouita (2017), "El uso de las construcciones adverbiales locativas con pronombre posesivo en el español peninsular: un primer acercamiento diatópico", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 133(3):766-794.
- Salvi, Giampaolo (2016), "Ladin", in Ledgeway, Adam & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 152-168.
- Sánchez Pitarch, Fernando & Guillermo Tomás Faci (2005-2006), "Breve descripción del aragonés de Agüero", *Archivo de Filología Aragonesa*, 61-62:185-218.
- Saragossà, Abelard (2000), "Els adjectius possessius: Naturalesa teòrica i aplicació a la normativa i al català col·loquial", *Llengua & Literatura*, 11:199-280.
- Satorre Grau, Francisco Javier (1999), *Los posesivos en español*. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Saura Rami, José Antonio (2003), *Elementos de fonética y morfosintaxis benasquesas*. Zaragoza: Gara d'Edicions / Institución "Fernando el Católico".
- Schoorlemmer, Maaïke (1998), "Possessors, articles and definiteness", in Alexiadou & Chris Wilders (eds.), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 55-86.
- Secci, Martina (2006), *Sardinian. Possessive constructions and adnominal adjectives*. Master dissertation. Università Ca'Foscari.
- Silva Domínguez, Carme (1993), "A combinatoria do posesivo na frase nominal", *Cadernos de lingua*, 8:135-151.
- Silva Domínguez, Carme (1995), "As estruturas adverbiais do tipo de *diante miña*", *Cadernos de lingua*, 11:5-21.

- Silva Domínguez, Carme (2002), “A perda da serie reducida feminina do posesivo en textos notariais galegos e portugueses da época medieval: cronoloxía e pautas no proceso de difusión da innovación”, *Verba*, 29:153-188.
- Silva Domínguez, Carme (in this volume), “El posesivo en construcciones de valor locativo de la lengua gallega: innovación lingüística e interferencia a partir del análisis de corpus contemporáneos”, in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):226-263.
- Silvestri, Giuseppina (2016), “Possessivi e partitivi nei dialetti italo-romanzi dell'Area Lausberg”, *Lingua italiana: Storia, struttura, testi*, 12:127-142.
- Silvestri, Giuseppina (in this volume), “Possessives in indefinite nominal phrases: A comparison between Italo-Romance and Daco-Romance”, in Bouzouita, Miriam & Matti Marttinen Larsson (eds.), Special issue on possessive constructions in Romance. *Moderna språk*, 114(3):161-197.
- TILG = Santamarina, Antón (dir.), Ernesto González Seoane & María Álvarez de la Granja, *Tesouro informatizado da lingua galega (Versión 4.1)*. Santiago de Compostela: Instituto da Lingua Galega. Available online: <http://ilg.usc.gal/TILG/>. Last consulted: October 15, 2020.
- Van Peteghem, Marleen (2012), “Possessives and grammaticalization in Romance”, *Folia Linguistica*, 46.2:605-634.
- Vincent, Nigel (2017), “Determination and quantification”, in Dufter, Andreas & Elisabeth Stark (eds.), *Manual of Romance morphosyntax and syntax*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter, 727-770.