MDPI

Article

Explorations in Aromanian Morpho-Syntax: NPs, Prepositional Contexts and Infinitives

Leonardo Maria Savoia * and Benedetta Baldi *

Department of Humanities and Philosophy, University of Florence, Via della Pergola 60, 50121 Florence, Italy
* Correspondence: leonardomaria.savoia@unifi.it (L.M.S.); benedetta.baldi@unifi.it (B.B.)

Abstract: The main topic of this article is the relationship between morphosyntactic contexts and nominal inflections in Aromanian varieties of southern Albania. These varieties have a specialized inflection in the plural definite and feminine singular nouns, associated with genitive, dative, and prepositional contexts, where it is preceded by a Possessive Introducer. We present a detailed picture of the microvariation that characterizes the different systems. The broad syncretism that emerges suggests a rethinking of the syntactic status of inflections and the notion of Case. Our approach assumes that morphology is based on Merge within the syntactic computation and that sub-word elements are provided with interpretable content. This theoretical model will also guide us in the study of prepositions and their distribution.

Keywords: nominal inflections; case; oblique; prepositions; Merge; Aromanian

1. Introduction

This article focuses on the morphosyntax of nouns and prepositional phrases in the varieties of Aromanian spoken in southern Albania, which include the variety of Myzeqeja (Musachia), Rëmën, and that of the Gjirokastër and Korça areas, Fërshërot.[1] In general, Aromanian shows the features of heritage languages, insofar as its transmission and use involve family members, friends, or the village circle, and is influenced by contact with Albanian, the official language. In North Macedonia and Albania, Aromanian is assigned the status of a linguistic minority with the legal forms of protection. Stoica (2021) provides an important sociolinguistic investigation based on a number of oral histories collected through interviews with Aromanian informants of the region of Korça. Her research highlights the relevant identity factors that regulate the use of Aromanian, such as indexicality, the role of gender, local occasioning, in particular contact and borrowings, and positioning, understood as the confrontation with other groups of speakers. The image that is drawn is that of an identity language subject to the typical mechanisms of minority non-standardized varieties in situations of contact and social competition.

The discussion is based on data collected in an extensive field research with native speakers during several field surveys in the Aromanian communities in southern Albania, the last of which was on 4–8 July 2023.[2] The exact variety of the examples is noted for each set of data through the name of the town or village from which the informant comes. The focus of our analysis is the distribution of case exponents of nouns in relation to syntactic contexts. What emerges is that the exponents of the case cover different interpretations and contexts and show a pervasive syncretism. As for the noun morphology, Aromanian has a paradigm of post-nominal exponents, traditionally treated as enclitic articles (Capidan 1932; Caragiu Marioțeanu 1975, 2006), which, in addition to definiteness and gender/noun class properties, distinguish the direct and oblique case in plural definite nouns and, in the singular, in a subset of nouns, as in (1a,b). Comparatively, Daco-Romanian separates the direct case, for subject and object, and the indirect case, for the beneficiary and other oblique contexts (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013), as in (2a) for the direct form and (2b) for the

oblique. In Aromanian, obliques, occurring in possession and locative contexts, must be introduced by the so-called PI (Possessive Introducer), unlike Daco-Romanian. This difference is highlighted by the comparison between Daco-Romanian (in standard writing) and Aromanian datives in (3a) and genitives in (3b). We note that in what follows enclitic exponents are identified with inflectional morphemes. There are many factors that argue for the inflectional status of enclitic articles, as discussed and motivated by Ledgeway (2017) for Daco-Romanian. Indeed, these elements cannot be separated from the stem, and, in addition to or independently from definiteness, express gender, number and case, as the nominal paradigms of Latin and, although with considerable differences, of the other Romance languages. Moreover, enclitics can combine with specialized definiteness elements in pre-nominal position. Aromanian and Daco-Romanian are very similar to Albanian, where post-posed inflections realize gender, number, case (and definiteness), with similar phenomena of syncretism and category overlappings.

(1) **Aromanian (Libofshë)**

    a.   fitʃor-**ʎ-i**   vs.   **o** fitʃor-**ʎ-u**
           boy-Def-pl   PI boy-Def-Obl
           'The boys'   'To/of the boys'

    b.   məjɛr-**a**   vs.   **a li** məjɛr-**i**
           woman-fsg.Def   PI woman-Obl
           'The woman'   'To/of the woman'

(2) **Daco-Romanian**

    a.   băjat-**ul**   vs.   băjat-**ul-ui**
           boy-Def   boy-Def-Obl
           'The boy'   'To/of the boy'

    b.   fat-**a**   vs.   fet-**ei**
           girl-Def   girl-Obl
           'The girl'   'To/of the girl'

(3)   a. *Dative contexts*

Daco-Romanian		**Aromanian (Libofshë)**		
l am dat om-**ul-ui**/femei-**i**		i	o ded	**o** bərbat-**u**	/a li fɛt-**i**
it I.have given man-Def-Obl/oman-Obl		to.him/her	it I.gave	PI man-msg	/PI girl-Obl
'I have given it to the man/to the woman'		'I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl'			

b. Genitive contexts

Daco-Romanian		**Aromanian (Libofshë)**		
Carte-**a**	om-**ul-ui**/femi-**i**	mən-a	**o** fətʃor-**u**	/a li	fɛt-**i**
Book-fsg.Def	man-Def-Obl/ woman-Obl	hand-fsg	PI boy-msg/PI	girl-Obl	
'The book of the man/of the woman'		'The hand of the boy/of the woman'			

The system of full pronouns distinguishes nominative/accusative and oblique; object clitics (OCls), in turn, show distinct forms of accusative and dative. Possessives follow the head noun with which they agree, and are preceded by the PI *a*, as in (4)

(4)   **Libofshë**

    libr-a   a   mɛ-u/a ta-u   /a   nɔst(ər)
    book-fsg   PI   my.fsg/PI your.fsg /   PI   our
    'My/your/our book'

Interestingly, simple prepositions, including the elementary relator *di* 'of, by', introduce direct (nominative/accusative) forms. The locative prepositions *tu, kət, a, ɣa/la* 'at, to' are sensitive to the referential ranking of the place, according to animacy/ human properties of the referent, like in other Romance languages. In complex PPs, the lexical item specifying the place, the Axial Part in the sense of Svenonius (2006), is followed by *di* (the part–whole relation operator) followed by the noun in the direct form, or alternatively by

the PI followed by the oblique form of the noun, as illustrated by the comparison between (5a) and (5b).

(5) **Libofshë**

a. dəninti   **di** fitʃor-ʎ-**i**/mujɛr-**l**-**i**   b. dəninti   **o** fitʃor-ʎ-**u**   /**o** mujɛr-ʎ-**u**
    before   of boy-DEF-PL/woman-DEF-PL   before   PI boy-DEF-OBL   /PI women-DEF-OBL
    'Before the boys/the women'   'Before the boys/the women'

Finally, the analysis of prepositions leads us to address the contexts where the relators *di* 'of' and *ti* 'for' introduce the infinitival sentences, as in (6a) and (6b), respectively.

(6) **Këllëz**

a. mbuˈʁi   **di**   luk-a-ʁi
    stopped.1SG   of   work-TV-Inf
    'I stopped working'
b. ei   ar   vin-i-tə   **ti**   vid-ɛ-ʁi   mini
    they   have come-PP   for   see-TV-INF   me
    'They have come to see me'

The central topic of the article is the oblique context, which in Aromanian dialects is introduced by the Possessive Introducer (PI), as seen in (5). In genitive, dative, and complex locative prepositions, nouns show a specialized inflection (Capidan 1932; Caragiu Marioțeanu 1975, 2006; Poçi 2009). Caragiu Marioțeanu (1975, p. 237) assimilates these constructs to those of other Romance languages where dative and genitive require a prepositional introducer, although, in Aromanian, nouns can actually display a specialized inflection, unlike other Romance varieties. This particular morphology, which we descriptively label *case*, provides a test benchmark for the nature of this category, its role in syntax, and its relationship with the other inflectional properties. Such a behavior differs from the original conditions witnessed in ancient texts, as illustrated in Pană Dindelegan et al. (2019) and Maiden et al. (2021), in which datives and genitives are not introduced by the PI.

Theoretically, our analysis follows the strong minimalist approach to morphosyntax based on the Merge operation, as defined in Chomsky (2019, 2021). Functional morphemes are endowed with interpretable content. As a consequence, syncretism must be traceable to the semantic properties of the elements involved. From this perspective, the Aromanian data discussed in this paper provide a relevant test bench for this theoretical approach. If our hypothesis on the nature of nominal inflection is (sufficiently) adequate, the distribution of case/number and definiteness exponents can find a possible explanation. In this sense, this article can contribute to deepening the relation between inflectional properties of nouns and syntactic organization, a link traditionally disregarded as unessential or possibly assigned to an ancillary morphological component, such as DM.

The article is organized as follows: The data regarding the nominal paradigms of Rëmën and Fërshërot are detailed in Section 2. Section 3 compares the inflectional systems schematized in single tables, from which some interesting types of syncretism emerge. Section 4 illustrates the possessive constructs, where the preposition *di* and the PI alternate, and Section 4.1 the pronominal systems, the possessive elements included. Section 5 is devoted to the description of prepositional contexts. Sections 6 and 6.1 examine the case properties. Section 7 outlines an analysis of the infinitives introduced by *di/ti*. The examples from Aromanian dialects are reported in a broad IPA transcription.

2. The Nominal System: A Comparison between Dialects

As a first step, let us consider the nominal paradigms. The data have been collected through field research in Myzeqeja, in Libofshë, L, and Divjakë, D-Rëmën[3], and in the regions of Gjirokastër (Këllez, K) and Korça (Plasë, P)-Fërshërot. The Aromanian data differentiate the direct form, occurring in nominative or accusative contexts, from the oblique form. The latter shows a specialized inflection only in a subset of nouns and, needs to be

introduced by the PI. In what follows, we collate the systems of direct and oblique definite and indefinite forms, in the singular and in the plural. We begin with the dialects of Libofshë and Divjakë (Muzakea), in (7)–(14), and proceed with Fërshërot, (15)–(18), and Vlleht of Këllëz, (19)–(22).

The data of Libofshë in (7a,b) and those of Divjakë in (11a,b) illustrate the singular direct forms. (a) exemplifies the definite form, with the so-called enclitic article, while (b) exemplifies the indefinite form preceded by the indefinite article *un/unə* 'a'. (8a-b) for Libofshë and (12a,b) for Divjakë illustrate the same alternation in plural contexts. The oblique contexts, for definite and indefinite forms, are provided in (9a,b) and (13a,b) for the singular and in (10a,b) and (14a,b) for the plural for Libofshë and Divjakë, respectively. Genitive and dative contexts are introduced by the PI (cf. Capidan 1932; Caragiu Marioţeanu 1975, 2006). In some Aromanian varieties, this morphological element combines with a morpheme agreeing with the embedded noun, as in Rëmën of Libofshë and Divjakë. In the glosses, the inflectional exponents have the following descriptive labels: *-u* = MSG/OBL, *-a* = FSG, *-ʎ/l-* = DEF, *-i* = PL/SG/OBL, *-ur-* = OBL.PL. The nature of the inflections will be reconsidered in subsequent sections as the discussion progresses.

(7) **Libofshë**

a.	ari vənit	/ am	vədzut	fitʃor-**u**		/bərbat-**u**	/fɛt-**a**
	(s)he.has come	/I.have	seen	boy-MSG.DEF		/man-MSG.DEF	/girl- FSG.DEF

'The boy/man/girl has come', 'I have seen the boy/the man/the girl'

b.	ari vənit	/am	vədzut	un fitʃor	/un bərbat	/unə fɛt-**ə**
	(s)he.has come	/I.have	seen	a boy	/a man	/a girl-FSG

'A boy/man/girl has come', 'I have seen a boy/a man/girl'

(8) **Libofshë**

a.	arə	vənit	/am	vədzut	fitʃor-**ʎ-i**	/bərbats(-**ʎ**)-i)	/fɛt(ə)-**l-i**
	they.have come		/I.have seen		boy-DEF-PL	/man-PL	/girl-DEF-PL

'The boys/men/girls have come', 'I have seen the boys/the men/the girls'

b.	arə	vənit	/am	vədzut	Mults	fitʃor-**i**	/bərbats	/mult fɛt-**i**
	they.have come		/I.have seen		many.PL boy(-PL)		/man.PL	/many girl-PL

'Many boys/many men/many girls have come'/'I have seen many boys/many men/many girls'

(9) **Libofshë**

a.	i	o	ded	**o** fitʃor-**u**	/**o** bərbat-**u**	/**a li** fɛt-**i**
	to.him/her	it	I.gave	PI boy-MSG	/PI man-MSG	/PI girl-OBL

'I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl'

b.	i	o	ded	**o** un fitʃor	/**o un** bərbat	/**a (li)** un fɛt-**i**
	to.him/her	it	I.gave	PI a boy	/PI a man	/PI a girl-OBL

'I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl'

(10) **Libofshë**

a.	i	o	ded	**o** fitʃor-**ʎ-u**	/**o** bərbats-/**ur/j-u** /PI men.PL-DEF.OBL.PL	/**o** fɛt-**ʎ-u** /PI girl-PL-OBL
	to.them	it	I.gave	PI boy-DEF-OBL		

'I gave it to the boys/the men/the girls'

b.	i	o	ded	**o** ts-**uɔr** fitʃor(-**ʎ**)-**i** PI that-DEF.OBL.PL boy-DEF-PL	/**o** doi bərbats /PI two man.PL	/**o** mult fɛt-**i** /PI many girl-PL
	to.them	it	I.gave			

'I gave it to these boys/to two men/to many girls'

(11) **Divjakë**

a.	vini	/vədzui	fətʃor-**u**	/bərbat-**u**	/fɛt-**a**
	(s)he.came	/I saw	boy-MSG.DEF	/man-MSG.DEF	/girl- FSG.DEF

'The boy/the man/the girl came', 'I saw the boy/the man/the girl'

b.	vini	/vədzui	un fitʃor	/un bərbat	/unə fɛt-**ə**
	(s)he.came	/I saw	a boy	/a man	/a girl-FSG

'A boy/a man/a girl came', 'I saw a boy/a man/a girl'

(12) **Divjakë**

a.	'vinərə	/vədzui	fətʃor-**je**	/bərbats-**je**	/fɛtə-**l-i**
	they.came	/I.saw	boy-PL.DEF	/man-PL.DEF	/girl-DEF-PL

'The boys/the men/the girls came', 'I saw the boys/the men/the girls'

b.	'vinərə	/vədzui	ndoi fitʃor	/ndoi bərbats	/ndau fɛt-**i**
	they.came	/I.saw	some.M boy	/some.M man.PL	/some.F girl-PL

'Some boys/some men/some girls came'/'I saw some boys/some men/some girls'

(13) **Divjakë**

a.	i	u	dau	**o** fətʃor-**u**	/**o** bərbat-**u** /PI man-MSG.DEF	/**a li**/**a** ts-**jei**	fɛt-**i**
	to.him/her	it	I.give	PI boy-MSG.DEF		/PI that-FSG.OBL	girl-OBL

'I give it to the boy/to the man/to the girl'

b.	i	u	dau	**o** un fitʃor	/**o** un bərbat	/**a li** un fɛt-**ə**
	to.him/her	it	I.gave	PI a boy	/PI a man	/PI a girl-FSG

'I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl'

(14) **Divjakë**

a.	ɣ	u	dau	**o** fətʃor-**əɣ-u**	/**o** bərbats-**əɣ-u**	/**o** fɛt-**əɣ-u**
	to.them	it	I.give	PI boy-DEF.PL-OBL	/PI man-DEF.PL-OBL	/PI girl- DEF.PL-OBL

'I give it to the boys/to the men/to the girls'

b.	ɣ	u	dau	**o** mults fətʃor(**-ʎ**)-**i**	/**o** mults bərbats	/**o** mult-**i**	fɛt-**i**
	to.them	it	I.give	PI many.PL boy-DEF-PL	/PI many.PL men	/PI many-PL	girl-PL

'I gave it to these boys/to two men/to many girls'

Fërshërot varieties have a similar distribution, as illustrated by the data below, where in turn the definite forms are in (a) and the indefinite ones in (b). (15a,b) and (16a,b) illustrate the singular and plural direct forms, and (17a,b) and (18a,b) the singular and plural oblique forms for the Korça-Plasë speaker. (19a,b), (20a,b), (21a,b), and (22a,b) provide the corresponding examples for the variety of Këllëz. The plural oblique selects a specialized morphology, *-or* in Korça-Plasë and *-u* in Këllëz (cf. Poçi 2009). The feminine has the exponent *-i* in the plural and the singular oblique. The result is that in the singular *-i* is doubled in definite forms, as in (17a) and (21a); additionally, it is inserted as the plural in definite forms, as in (16a,b) and (20a,b). Definite singular forms insert *-u* in the masculine and *-a* in the feminine singular, in (15a) and (19a), while in the plural, the exponent *-l-* occurs, palatalized in *-j-* in the masculine, in (16a) and (20a). Unlike Rëmën, in Fërshërot, the indefinite article has the oblique inflection *-ui* in the masculine and *-ei* in the feminine, which combines with the simple stem of masculine nouns or the inflected oblique of feminine nouns, as in (17b) and (21b).

(15) **Korça-Plasë**

a.	vini	/vidzui	fətʃor-**u**	/bərbat-**u**	/fjat-**a**
	(s)he came	/I.saw	boy-MSG.DEF	/man-FSG.DEF	/girl-FSG.DEF

'The boy/the man/the girl came', 'I saw the boy/the man/the girl'

b.	vini	/vidzui	un fitʃor		/un bərbat	/unə fjat-**ə**
	(s)he came	/I.saw	a	boy	/ a man	/a girl-FSG

'A boy/a man/a girl came', 'I saw a boy/a man/a girl'

(16) **Korça-Plasë**

a.	'vinərə	/vidzui	fətʃor-**jə**	/bərbats-**jə**	/fɛt-**i-l-i**
	they.came	/I.saw	boy- PL.DEF	/man- PL.DEF	/girl-PL-DEF-PL

'The boys/the men/the girls came', 'I saw the boys/the men/the girls

b.	'vinərə	/vidzui	mults fitʃor	/mults bərbats	/mult-**i** fɛt-**i**
	they.came	/I.saw	many.PL boy	/many man.PL	/many.PL girl-PL

'Many boys/many men/many girls came'/'I saw many boys/many men/many girls'

(17) **Korça-Plasë**

a. i   det   **a (ɫ)** fitʃor-**u**   **/a** bərbat-**u**   **/a** fɛt-**i-i**

to.him/her   I.gave   PI boy-MSG.DEF   /PI man-MSG.DEF   /PI girl-SG-OBL

'I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl'

b. i   det   **a un-ui** fitʃor   **/a un-ui** bərbat   **/a un-ei** fɛt-**i**/fjat-**i**

to.him/her   I.gave   PI Art-OBL.MSG boy   /PI Art-OBL.MSG man   /PI Art-OBL.FSG girl-OBL

'I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl'

(18) **Korça-Plasë**

a. lə   det   **a**   fitʃor-**l-or**   **/a** bərbat**s-l-or**   **/a** fɛt-**i-l-or**

to.them   I.gave   PI   boy-DEF-PL.OBL   /PI men-DEF-PL.OBL   /PI girl-PL-DEF-PL.OBL

'I gave it to the boys/to the men/to the girls'

b. lə   det   **a**   doi fitʃor-**l-or**   **/a** doi bərbat**s-l-or**   **/a** dau fɛt-**i-l-or**

to.them   I.gave   PI   two boy-DEF-PL.OBL   /PI two man-DEF-PL.OBL /PI two girl-PL- DEF-PL.OBL

'I gave it to two boys/to two men/to two girls'

(19) **Këllëz**

a. vini   /vədzui   fətʃoʁ-**u**   /burbat-**u**   /fjat-**a**

(s)he came   /I.saw   boy-MSG.DEF   /man-MSG.DEF   /girl-FSG.DEF

'The boy/the man/the girl came', 'I saw the boy/the man/the girl'

b. vini   /vədzui   un   fitʃor   /un bərbat   /unə fjat-**e**

(s)he came   /I.saw   a   boy   / a man   /a girl-FSG

'A boy/a man/a girl came', 'I saw a boy/a man/a girl'

(20) **Këllëz**

a. ˈvinərə   /vədzui   fətʃoʁ-**je**   /bərbat**s-je**   /fɛt-**i-l-i**

they.came   /I.saw   boy-DEF.PL   /man-DEF.PL   /girl-PL-DEF-PL

'The boys/the men/the girls came', 'I saw the boys/the men/the girls'

b. ˈvinərə   /vidzui   mults fitʃoʁ   /ndoi bərbat**s**   /ndau fɛt-**i**

they.came   /I.saw boy   many.PL boy(s)   /some man.PL   /some girl-PL

'Many boys/some men/some girls came'/'I saw many boys/some men/some girls'

(21) **Këllëz**

a. i   u   ded   **a** fitʃoʁ-**u**   **/a** bəʁbat-**u**   **/a** fɛt-**i-i**

to.him/her it   I.gave   PI boy-MSG.DEF   /PI man-MSG.DEF   /PI girl-SG-OBL

'I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl'

b. i   u   ded   **a un-ui** fitʃor   **/a un-ui** bərbat   **/a un-ei** fɛt-**i**

to.him/her it   I.gave   PI Art-OBL.MSG boy   /PI Art-OBL.MSG man   /PI Art-OBL.FSG girl-OBL

'I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl'

(22) **Këllëz**

a. i   u   det   **a**   fitʃoʁ-**l-u**   /a bərbat**sə-l-u**   /a fɛt-**ə-l-u**

to.them it   I.gave   PI   boy-PL-OBL   /PI men- PL-OBL   /PI girl- PL-OBL

'I gave it to the boys/to the men/to the girls'

b. i   u   det   **a**   doi fitʃoʁ-**l-u**   **/a tsə-l-oʁ** bərbat**s-l-u**   **/a** dau fɛt-**ə-l-oʁ**

to.them it   I.gave   PI   two boy-PL-OBL   /PI those-PL-OBL   /PI two girl-PL-OBL

man-PL-OBL

'I gave it to two boys/to those men/to two girls'

      In the noun class deriving from the third declination of Latin (class III), a different paradigm is realized. Indeed, in this class, -*i* occurs also in masculine stems. For the sake of brevity, this class is exemplified in (23)–(26) for Libofshë and in (27)–(30) for Korça-Plasë.

(23) **Libofshë**

a. ari vənit   /am vədzut   məjɛr-**a**   /kɛn-**l-i**

(s)he.has come   /I.have seen   woman- SG.DEF   /dog-DEF-SG.

'The woman/the dog has come', 'I have seen the woman/the dog'

b. ari vənit   /am vədzut   **unə** məjɛr-**i**   **/un** kɛn-**i**

(s)he.has come   /I.have seen   a woman-SG   /a dog-SG

(24)　**Libofshë**
　　a.　arə vənit　　　　　　　/am vədzut　　　　　məjɛr-**l-i**　　　　　　/kɛɲ-**ʎ-i**
　　　　they.have come　　　/I.have seen　　　　woman-Def-pl　　　　/dog-Def-pl
　　　　'The women/the dogs have come', 'I have seen the women/the dogs'
　　b.　arə vənit　　　　　　　/am vədzut　　　　mult məjer-**i**　　　　/mul**ts** kɛɲ
　　　　they.have come　　　/I.have seen　　　　many woman-pl　　　　/many.pl dog.pl
　　　　'Many women/dogs have come', 'I have seen many women/dogs'

(25)　**Libofshë**
　　a.　i　　　　　　　　o　　　　　　　　ded　　　　　**a li** məjɛr-**i**　　　　/**o** kɛn-**l-i**
　　　　to.him/her　　　it　　　　　　I.gave　　　PI woman-Obl　　　　/PI dog-Def-Obl
　　　　'I gave it to the woman/to the dog'
　　b.　i　　　　　　　　o　　　　　　　　ded　　　　　**a/o** un məjɛr-**i**　　/**o** un kɛn-**i**
　　　　to.him/her　　　it　　　　　　I.gave　　　PI a woman-Obl　　　/PI a dog-Obl
　　　　'I gave it to a woman/to a dog'

(26)　**Libofshë**
　　a.　i　　　　　　　　o　　　　　　　　ded　　　　　**o** məjɛr-**l**/**ʎ-u**　　　/**o** kɛɲ-**l**/**ʎ-u**
　　　　to.them　　　　it　　　　　　I.gave　　　PI woman-Def-Obl　　/PI dog-Def-Obl
　　　　'I gave it to the women/to the dogs'
　　b.　i　　　　　　　　o　　　　　　　　ded　　　　　**o** dau məjɛr-**i**　　　/**o** mul**ts** kɛɲ-**i**
　　　　to.them　　　　it　　　　　　I.gave　　　PI two woman-pl　　　/PI many.pl dogs
　　　　'I gave it to two women/to many dogs'

(27)　**Korça-Plasë**
　　a.　vini　　　　　　　　/vidzui　　　　　　mujɛr-**i-a**　　　　　/kɛnə-**l-i**
　　　　(s)he.came　　　/I.saw　　　　　　woman-sg-fsg.Def　　/dog- Def-sg
　　　　'The woman/the dog has come', 'I have seen the woman/the dog'
　　b.　vini　　　　　　　　/vidzui　　　　　　**unə** mujɛr-**i**　　　/**un** kɛn-**i**
　　　　(s)he.came　　　/I.saw　　　　　　a woman-sg　　　　/a dog-sg
　　　　'A woman/a dog has come', 'I have seen a woman/a dog'

(28)　**Korça-Plasë**
　　a.　'vinərə　　　　　　　/vidzui　　　　　　mujɛr-**i**/**ə-l-i**　　　/kɛɲ-**jə**
　　　　they.came　　　　/I.saw　　　　　　woman-pl-Def-pl　　/dog.pl-Def.pl
　　　　'The women/the dogs came', 'I saw the women/the dogs'
　　b.　'vinərə　　　　　　　/vidzui　　　　　　mult-**i** mujɛr-**i**　　/mul**ts** kɛɲ
　　　　they.came　　　　/I.saw　　　　　　many-pl woman-pl　　/many-pl dog.pl
　　　　'Many women/many dogs came'/'I saw many women/many dogs'

(29)　**Korça-Plasë**
　　a.　i　　　　　det　　　　　**a li** mujɛr-**i**　　　　　/**a** ɬ kɛn-**i-l-i**
　　　　to.him/her　　I.gave　　PI woman-Obl　　　　　/PI dog- sg-Def-Obl
　　　　'I gave it to the woman/to the dog'
　　b.　i　　　　　det　　　　　**a** un-**ei** mujɛr-**i**　　　/**a** un-**ui** kɛn-**i**
　　　　to.him/her　　I.gave　　PI Art-Obl.fsg woman-Obl　/PI Art-Obl.msg dog-Obl
　　　　'I gave it to a woman/to a dog'

(30)　**Korça-Plasë**
　　a.　i　　　　　det　　　　　**a** mujɛr-**l-or**　　　　　/**a** kɛɲ-**l-or**
　　　　to.them　　I.gave　　PI woman-Def-Obl.pl　　/PI dog- Def-Obl.pl
　　　　'I gave it to the women/to the dogs'
　　b.　i　　　　　det　　　　　**a** mult-i mujɛr-**l-or**　　/**a**　　mul**ts**　　kɛɲ-**l-or**
　　　　to.them　　I.gave　　PI many-pl woman- Def-Obl.pl　/PI　　many.pl　dog-Def-Obl.pl
　　　　'I gave it to many women/to many dogs'

　　　　　　　　In the class in (23)–(30), *-i* characterizes the indefinite singular direct and indirect forms, in (23b)/(25b) and (27b)/(29b). The inflection *-l-i* appears in the masculine singular in (23a) and (27a).

　　　　　　　　We synthesize the data concerning the distribution of inflections in the following tables. Table (31) summarizes the examples in (7)–(14) of Rëmën, where inflections are linked to syntactic contexts, descriptively indicated by case labels; Pal = palatalization of the final C. (31a) illustrates definite contexts, (31b) the indefinite contexts, and (31c) PI alternants.

(31) **Rëmën (Libofshë/Divjakë)**

		MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
a.	*Definite paradigm*				
	Nom/Acc contexts	-u	-a	(Pal/ʎ)-i	(-l/ʎ)-i
	Dat/Gen contexts	-u	-i	-ʎ-u/(Pal)-ur-u/-ɣ-u	-r-u/ʎ/l-u/-ɣ-u
b.	*Indefinite paradigm*	MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
	Nom/Acc contexts	∅	-ə	Pal/(-i)	-i
	Dat/Gen contexts	∅	-i	∅/Pal/i	-i
c.	PI: o/ ⌐⌐ __ N$_{MSG}$, ali/__ N$_{FSG}$, o/__ N$_{PL}$				

Table (32) summarizes the data in (9)–(22) of Fërshërot, highlighting, again, the distribution of the exponent *-i* in the feminine singular, as in (32b). (32c) provides the PI paradigm.

(32) **Fërshërot (Korça-Plasë, Këllëz)**

		MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
a.	*Definite paradigm*				
	Nom/Acc contexts	-u	-a	-je	i/ə-l-i
	Dat/Gen contexts	-u	-l-i	-l-or/l-u	-i-l-or /-l-u
b.	*Indefinite paradigm*	MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
	Nom/Acc contexts	∅	-ə/-e	Pal/∅	-i
	Dat/Gen contexts	∅	-i	-l-or/-l-u	-i-l-or/-i-l-u
c.	PI: a(li)/__ N$_{FSG}$, a(ɬ)/⌐⌐__ N$_{MSG}$, a				

Finally, (33) summarizes the examples in (23)–(26) for Rëmën and (34) those in (27)–(30) for Fërshërot; G/K indicate the variety regarding the morphology of class III nouns.

(33) **Rëmën**

		MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
a.	*Definite paradigm*				
	Nom/Acc contexts	l-i	-a	(Pal)-ʎ-i	-l-i
	Dat/Gen contexts	-l-i	-i	(Pal)-l/ʎ-u	-l/ʎ-u
b.	*Indefinite paradigm*	MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
	Nom/Acc contexts	-i	-i	(Pal)(-i)	-i
	Dat/Gen contexts	-i	-i	(Pal)-i	-i
c.	PI: o/⌐⌐ __ N$_{MSG}$, ali/__ N$_{FSG}$, o /__ N$_{PL}$				

(34) **Fërshërot**

		MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL	
a.	*Definite paradigm*					
	Nom/Acc contexts	-l-i	-i-a	(Pal)-je	-i/ə-l-i	Korça-Plasë
		-l-i	-a	(Pal)-je	-l-i/-ɛ	Këllëz
	Dat/Gen contexts	-i-l-i	-i	(Pal)-l-or	-l-or	Korça-Plasë
		-i-l-i	-i	(Pal)-l-u	-l-u	Këllëz
b.	*Indefinite paradigm*	MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL	
	Nom/Acc contexts	-i	-i	(Pal)	-i	Korça-Plasë
		-i	-i	(Pal)	-i	Këllëz
	Dat/Gen contexts	-i	-i	(Pal)-l-or	-l-or	Korça-Plasë
		-i	-i	-l-u	-i-l-u	Këllëz
c.	PI: a(li)/__ N$_{FSG}$, a(ɬ)/ ⌐⌐__ N$_{MSG}$, a					

An extensive syncretism is shown by the preceding data, which affects both the distinction between direct and oblique, and that between definite and indefinite. In fact, the definite direct contexts show the enclitic definite exponents *-u* or *-l-i* for the masculine singular and, in the feminine singular, the definite exponent *-a*, as in (a). The indefinite masculine singular forms have no exponent except for *-i* in the class III nouns, while in the feminine, the indefinite exponents *-ə* in (31b) and (32b), *-e* in (32b), and *-i* in (33b)/(34b) are inserted. In the oblique, the singular oblique, definite or indefinite, has the inflection *-i* in all classes. In the definite plural direct contexts in (31a), and (32a), both masculine and feminine nouns present a specialized plural inflection, *-ʎ/l-* (from Latin demonstrative **ille* 'that'), which can be associated with definiteness. In some dialects, the inflection *-je* occurs, cf. (34a). The masculine nouns show the palatalization of the final obstruent

or nasal, as for instance in the case of *bərbat/bərbats* 'man/men', *mult/mults* 'much/many', *kɛn/kɛɲ* 'dog/dogs', etc. In indefinite contexts, the feminine plural has *-i*, an exponent that we also find in masculine nouns, as in (31b).

In the plural, definite oblique contexts show a specialized inflection in which *-u* combines with the plural formative *-ʎ-*, *-r-*, in (31a) and (33a), in the Libofshë dialect, and *-ɣ-* in (31a), in the Divjakë dialect; in Fërshërot, we find *-l-or* in (32a) and (34a), and *-l-u* in (32a). In indefinite context, the simple form of plural emerges, (cf. Pană Dindelegan 2013; Pană Dindelegan et al. 2019). In all contexts, the realization of the oblique morphology is associated with the PI preceding the DP, namely *o* for the masculine singular and the plural and *a li* for the feminine singular, regardless of the definite or indefinite nature of the DP, in Rëmën varieties in (31c)/(33c). In Fërshërot, PIs are *a* and variably *a li* before the singular feminine and *a ł/a* before masculines, as in (32c)/(34c).

3. Pronoun Systems

In the Aromanian pronominal paradigms, the nominative and accusative of the first and second singular coincide in the original accusative form. In (35a), we classify these forms as direct. The oblique forms, specifically the dative in (35b,c), are preceded by the introducer PI.

(35) **Libofshë**

		1sg	2sg	3sg	3pl	1pl	2pl
a.	*direct*	mini	tini	eu/ia	eʎ/eli	noi	voi
		I/me	you	(s)he/him/her	they/them	we/us	you
b.	*dative*	a ɲia	a tsea	o ɣui/a jei	o ɣorə	a nau	a vau
		PI me	PI you	PI him/her	PI them	PI us	PI you
c.	ɲ/ts	u	ar datə	a ɲ-ia	/a ts-ea		
	to.me/you	it	have.3PL given	PI me-OBL	/PI you-OBL		
	'They gave it to me/to you'						

A similar system characterizes Fërshërot, with the difference that the third person elements also include the forms *nɛs*ₘ/*nɛs-ɛ*ꜰ/*nɛʃ*/*nɛs-i* 'he/she/theyₘ/theyꜰ', as shown by the data from Korça-Plasëan in (36). (36a) illustrates the direct forms and (32b)–(32c) the oblique (dative) forms.

(36) **Korça-Plasë**

		1sg	2sg	3sg	3pl	1pl	2pl
a.	*direct*	mini	tini	ɛl/ia//nɛs/nɛʃe	ei/eli//nɛʃ/nɛs-i	noi	voi
		I/me	you	(s)he/him/her	they/them	we/us	you
b.	*dative*	a ɲia	a teja	a lui/a je	a lor	a nau	a vau
		PI me	PI you	PI him/her	PI them	PI us	PI you
c.		mi /ts	da	a	ɲ-ia		
		to.me/you (it)	give.3SG	PI	me- OBL		

In some dialects, *nɛs* is restricted to prepositional contexts, as we will see in Section 4.1.

Possessive Constructs

In genitive contexts, the possessor is introduced by the noun with the oblique inflection preceded by the PI, like in dative, as in (37a) and (38a) for nominal contexts and (37b) and (38b) for predicative occurrences, respectively from Libofshë and Divjakë.

(37) **Libofshë**

a.	mən-a	**o**	fitʃor-**u**	/**a li**	fɛt-**i**
	hand-ꜰsɢ	PI	boy-ᴍsɢ	/PI	girl-Oʙʟ

'The hand of the boy/of the girl'

a'.	kɔd-**a**	**o**	kɛn-**l**-**i**	/**o**	un	kɛn-**i**
	tail-Dᴇꜰ.sɢ	PI	dog-Dᴇꜰ-Oʙʟ	/PI	a	dog-Oʙʟ

'The tail of the dog/of a dog'

b.	aist esti	**o**	fitʃor-**ʎ-u**	/**o**	məjɛr-**ʎ-u**
	this is	PI	boy-Dᴇꜰ-Oʙʟ	/PI	woman-Dᴇꜰ-Oʙʟ

'This is of the boys/of the women'

(38) **Divjakë**

a.	mən-a	**o**	fətʃor-**u**	/	**a li**	fɛt-**i**
	hand-ꜰsɢ	PI	boy-ᴍsɢ	/	PI	girl-Oʙʟ

'The hand of the boy/of the woman'

b.	məɲə-**l**-**i**	**o**	fətʃorə-ɣ-**u**	/**o**	fɛtə-ɣ-**u**
	hand-Dᴇꜰ-ᴘʟ	PI	boy-Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Oʙʟ	/PI	girl-Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Oʙʟ

'The hands of the boys/of the girls'

Fërshërot shows the same distribution, as in (39a,b) and (40a,b), where genitive contexts are exemplified.

(39) **Korça-Plasë**

a.	mən-a	**a/aɬ**	fitʃor-**u**	/**a li**	fɛt-**i-ji**	/**a li** mujɛr-**i**	/**a un-ei** mujɛr-**i**
	hand-ꜰsɢ	PI	boy-ᴍsɢ	/PI	girl-sɢ-Oʙʟ	/PI woman-Oʙʟ	/PI a-Oʙʟwoman-Oʙʟ

'The hand of the boy/of the girl/of the woman/of a woman'

b.	məɲə-**l**-**i**	**a** (mults(-**l-or**)) fitʃor-**l-or**	/**a**	(mult-**i**) fɛt-**i-l-or**
	hand-Dᴇꜰ-ᴘʟ	PI (many (Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Oʙʟ))boy-Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Oʙʟ	/PI	many-ᴘʟ girl-ᴘʟ-Dᴇꜰ-Oʙʟ

'The hands of the boys/of the girls'

(40) **Këllëz**

a.	mən-a	**a**	fitʃoʁ-**u**	/**a**	fɛt-**i-ji**	/**a un-ui** fitʃoʁ-**u**	/**a un-ei** fɛt-**i**
	hand-ꜰsɢ	PI	boy-ᴍsɢ	/PI	girl-sɢ-Oʙʟ	/PI a-Oʙʟ boy-ᴍsɢ	/PI a-Oʙʟ girl-Oʙʟ

'The hand of the boy/of the girl/of a boy/of a girl'

b.	məɲ-**l**-**i**	**a tsə-l-oʁ** fitʃor-**l-u**	/**a** fɛtə-**l-u**
	hand-Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Cʟᴀss	PI those-Oʙʟ boy-Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Oʙʟ/PI	girl-Dᴇꜰ.ᴘʟ-Oʙʟ

'The hands of the boys/of the girls'

The genitive of first and second person is the possessive element, as illustrated for Libofshë in (41a,b) for the feminine and masculine singular and in (41a',b') for the feminine and masculine plural (Baldi and Savoia 2021). These forms agree with the noun designating the possessum, the head noun of DP, or the subject in predicative contexts. The agreement inflection is indicated in the glosses and includes both the change in the lexical base, as *mɛ-* feminine vs. *ɲe-* masculine, and the nominal exponents, such as, for instance, *-l/ʎ-* for the plural. The third person possessors are lexicalized by the oblique forms of third person pronouns, so that dative and genitive coincide in the same forms, *o ɣui/a jei/o ɣorə* 'of him/her/them' in (41c), exactly as in nominal structures (Manzini and Savoia 2018; Baldi and Savoia 2021). In (42a-b'), the data of Korça-Plasë are provided. The examples in (43) illustrate the possessives in predicative contexts. The PI *a* precedes the possessive in all contexts, differently from Daco-Romanian where PI occurs only in indefinite contexts (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013).

(41) **Libofshë**

a.	libr-a	a	mɛ-u	/a	ta-u	/a	nɔst(ər)
	book-FSG	PI	my.FSG	/PI	your.FSG	/PI	our
	'My/your/our book'						
a'.	libr-ə	a	mɛ-l-i	/a	ta-l-i	/a	nɔst-i
	books-FPL	PI	my-FPL	/PI	your-FPL	/PI	our-FPL
	'My/your books'						
b.	kɛn-l-i	a	ɲe-u	/a	to-u	/a	nɔstər
	dog-DEF.M	PI	my.MSG	/PI	your.MSG	/PI	our
	'My/your/our dog'						
b'.	kɛɲ-l-i	a	ɲe-ʎ-i	/a	to-ʎ-i	/a	nɔst-i
	dog.PL-DEF.M	PI	my-MPL	/PI	your- MPL	/PI	our-PL
	'My/your/our dogs'						
c.	sɔr-a	o	ɣu-i	/a	je-i	/o	ɣ-ɔrə
	sister.DEF.FSG	PI	him-OBL	/PI	her-OBL	/PI	them-PL.OBL
	'His/her/their sister'						

(42) **Korça-Plasë**

a.	mɛn-a	a	mia	/a	ta	/a	je	/a	lui
	hand-FSG	PI	my.FSG	/PI	your.FSG	/PI	she.OBL	/PI	he.OBL
	'My/your/his/their/our book'								
a'.	mɛɲ-l-i	a	mɛ-l-i	/a	tɛ-l-i	/a	lu-i		
	hand-FPL	PI	my-PL	/PI	your-PL	/PI	he-OBL		
	'My/your/his hands'								
b.	fitʃor-u	a	mɛ-ɫ	/a	tɛ-ɫ			/a	lui
	boy.MSG	PI	my.MSG	/PI	your.MSG			/PI	he.OBL
	'My/your/his son'								
b'.	fitʃor-je	a	mɛ-i	/a	tɛ-i	/a	vøst		
	boy.MPL	PI	my.PL	/PI	your.PL	/PI	your.PL		
	'My/your sons'								

(43) **Libofshë**

a.	atsɛu	esti	a	mɛ-u	/a	ta-u
	that.FSG	is	PI	my.FSG	/PI	your.FSG
	'It is mine/yours'					
a'.	atseu	esti	a	ɲe-u	/a	to-u
	that.MSG	is	PI	my.MSG	/PI	your.MSG
	'It is mine/yours'					

Këllëz

a.	aist	e	a	ɲe-l	/a	te-l	/a	lu-i
	that.MSG	is	PI	my.MSG	/PI	your.MSG	/PI	he-OBL
	'That is mine/yours/his'							
a'.	aist-ɛ	e	a	mj-a	/ a	t-a	/a	lu-i
	that-FSG	is	PI	my-FSG	/ PI	your-FSG	/PI	he-OBL
	'That is mine/yours/his'							

It is of note that the inflectional part of the possessive includes the definiteness element *-l-* that we find in nominal paradigms. In Rëmën, the original *-l* has been velarized into *-u* in the final position, as in (41a,b)/(42a,b), while in the masculine plural, it palatalizes in *-ʎ*. Fërshërot shows the realization *-ɫ*, cf. (43a,a')[4].

On a par with Daco-Romanian, enclitic possessives characterize kinship terms, as illustrated in (44) for Libofshë and (45) for Këllez. (44a,b) and (45a) attest the possibility of duplicating the possessive element by means of the postnominal form. The enclitic form is reduced and is followed by the definite inflection; the lexical base may in turn include the gender/noun class inflection, as in the example in (45b). The enclitic incorporates the nominal inflection, as shown by all the examples in (44) and (45).

(44) **Libofshë**

a.
am	vədzut	frat-ɲ-u	a/o	ɲeu
have.1ˢᵗ	seen	brother-my-DEF.MSG	PI	my.MSG

'I have seen my brother'

b.
frat-ɲ-i	a	ɲe-ʎ
brother-my-DEF.MPL	PI	my-MPL

'My brothers'

c.
məjɛr-m-a
wife-my-DEF.FSG

'My wife'

(45) **Këllëz**

a.
tat-u-t-u	(a te-l)
father-MSG-your-DEF.MSG	(PI your-MSG)

'your father'

b.
nipot-u-ɲ-u
nephew-def. MSG-my-DEF-MSG

'My nephew'

c.
i	ɔ-m	datə	a	buʁbat-ɲ-u
to.him/her	It-I.have	given	PI	man-my-MSG

'I have given it to my husband'

The occurrence of *a* in dative and genitive recalls the fact that Romance languages also have inherent possession datives as in Italian *Ho lavato i capelli a Maria*, lit.: 'I have washed the hair to Mary', i.e., 'I washed Mary's hair'. Moreover, in Southern Italian dialects, *a* can also introduce the possessor (Rohlfs 1954, § 640; cf. Manzini and Savoia 2011; Baldi and Savoia 2021), as in (46) for a North-Apulian variety:

(46) **Castelluccio (Foggia, Apulia)**

ε	ffiɟɟə	a mme	/a essə
(s)he.is	son	to me	/to her

'(s)he is my/her son'

Southern Italian dialects also provide examples of possessive structures introduced by *di* comparable with the possessives introduced by *a* in Aromanian and Daco-Romanian, as, for example, in the Calabrian variety of Morano in (47).

(47) **Morano (Calabria)**

kwiss-u	jɛ	ɖɖ-	u	mej-u/toj-u/soj-u/noʃʃ-u
this-MSG	is	of	MSG	my-MSG/your-MSG/his-MSG/our-MSG

'This is mine/yours/his/her'

As discussed in Baldi and Savoia (2021), exactly as in Daco-Romanian, the structures *Prep + article + possessive* show the agreement with the head noun.

4. Prepositional Contexts

Prepositional contexts contribute to circumscribing the distribution of nominal and pronominal forms; moreover, they provide evidence for a more adequate hypothesis on the status of the PI and other prepositions. An important point with respect to the case system of Aromanian is that oblique morphology of nouns is only selected in PI *o/a/ali* contexts, which cover possession and dative[5]. In the contexts introduced by the lexical prepositions, the direct morphology is realized, as shown by the data in (48a,b)–(51a,b) with the prepositions *a* 'at', *ɣa/ja/la* 'at, to', <u>*tu*</u> 'in', *ti* 'for', *ku* 'with', etc. In particular, simple state-in or motion prepositions manifest a human/animacy split between low and high-ranked referents, as in (48a)–(51a). Low-ranked referents, in (48b)–(51b), are associated with the locative *a* 'at, to', *tu* 'at, in', and, variably, *la* 'to', whereas high-ranked referents, namely humans and first/second person pronouns, in (48a)–(51a), are introduced by the locative *ɣa/la* 'at/to'. The element *kət* 'at, to' is admitted with both kinds of referents.

(48)   **Libofshë**

    a.   *High-ranked referents*

esti		**ɣa/kət**	mini		/noi/atseu	
be.3ʳᵈ		at	me		/us /him-msɢ	

         'He stays at my/our/his place'

    a'.

atseu nɛdzi	**ɣa**	fɛt-**a** a mɛ-**u**	/fitʃor-**u**	
that.msɢ goes	to	girl-fsɢ PI my.fsɢ	/boy-msɢ	

         'He goes to my/to his daughter'

    a''.

eu ini	**ɣa**	mini	/tini	/noi/atse-u	/atsɛ-u
he comes	to	me	/you	/us /him.msɢ/	her.fsɢ

         'He comes to me/you/us/them/him'

    b.   *Low-ranked referents*

atseu	ini	**a**	kas-ə
that.msɢ	comes	to	home

         'He comes home'

    b'.

esti	**a/kət/tu**	kas-ə
be.3sɢ	at /in	home

         '(S)he is at/in (the) home'

    b''.

mini	va s	nɛg	**tu**	ðom-ə
I	wilPrt	go	to/in	room

         'I will go to my room'

atse-u ini	**tu**	krəvat	/local	/bəsɛrk-ə
that-msɢ comes	to	bed	/bar	/church-fsɢ

         'He comes to bed/bar/the church'

(49)   **Divjakë**

    a.   *High-ranked referents*

mini	viɲ	**ja**	tini	/atse-u
I	come	to	you	/he-msɢ

         'I come to you/to him'

    b.   *Low-ranked referents*

ɛsku	**a**	kasə	/**tu**	makin-ə
I.am	at/in	house-fsɢ	/in	car-fsɢ

         'I am at home/in the car'

(50)   **Korça-Plasë**

    a.   *High-ranked referents*

mini	nɛk	**la**	sɔr-**a**	a mi'a	/nɛs
I	go	to	sister-fsɢ	PI my-fsɢ	/he.msɢ

         'I go to my sister/to my brother/to him'

    b.   *Low-ranked referents*

mini	est/neg	**a**	kas-ə
I	am/go	at/to	home-sɢ

         'I am at home/I go home'

    b'.

mini est	**tu**	krivat-**i**
I am	in	bed-msɢ

         'I am in bed'

(51)   **Këllëz**

    a.   *High ranked referents*

ɛl	u	s	nage	**la**	mini	/nɛs	/a'tsa fjat-ə
that.msɢ	will	Prt	goes	at	me	/he.msɢ	/that girl-fsɢ

         'He will go to me/him/that girl'

    b.   *Low ranked referents*

ɛl nɛdzi	**a**	kas-ə
he went	to	house-fsɢ

         'He went home'

    b'.

ɛl nɛdzi	**la**	kɛmp	/kɛmp-**u**	**a** l-**ui**
he went	to	field	/field-msɢ	PI he-Oʙʟ

         'He went to the field/to his field'

    b''.

ɛl nɛdzi	**tu**	ðom-ə	/ hɔʁ-**a**	**a** nɔst-ə
he went	to/in	house-fsɢ	/ village	PI our

         'I went to the room/to our village'

Other simple prepositions exclude the animacy split, as in the case of comitative in (52a)–(54a), instrumental in (54a'), temporal elements in (52b), and benefactive element in (52c)–(54c). (54d) illustrates the preposition *piʃti* 'on'. It is interesting to note that some informants of Libofshë alternate **di** with **ti** in benefactive contexts, as in (52c)

(52) **Libofshë**

a.

ku	mini	/atseu	/atsɛu	/noi
with	me	/him-MSG	/her.FSG	/us

'With me/him/her/us'

vini	**ku**	tini	/mini/	məjɛr-i/	fitʃor-u
he.comes	with	you	/me	/woman-FSG/	boy-MSG

'He comes with me/you/the woman/the boy'

a'.

ku	kətsut-u
with	knife-MSG

'With the knife'

b.

dup	mini	/atseu	/mujɛr-**a**
after	me	/him.MSG	/woman-FSG

'After me/him/the woman'

c.

o fakə	**ti/di**	atseu
it I.do	for/of	that.MSG

'I do it for him'

(53) **Divjakë**

a.

haidi	**ku**	mini
come	with	me

'Come with me!'

a'.

mini	nɛg	**fɛrə**	fitʃor	/fitʃor-je
I	go	without	(the) boy	/the boys

'I go without the boy/the boys'

b.

u fets	**ti**	tini	/fɛt-**a**	/fətʃor-**u**	/bərbats-**je**
it I.made	for	you	/girl-FSG	/ boy-MSG	/man-MPL

'I made it for you/the girl/the boy/the men'

b'.

aist esti	**ti**	bərbat-**u**	/məjɛr-**ɛ**
that is	for	man-MSG	/woman-FSG

'(S)he comes with the boy/a boy'

(54) **Korça-Plasë**

a.

jiɲ	**ku**	fitʃor-**u**	/fjat-**a**
I.come	with	boy-MSG	/girl-FSG

'I come with the boy/the girl'

a'.

nɛg	**ku**	el	/ia	/nɛs
I.go	with	he	/she	/he.MSG

'I go with him/her/him'

c.

u fak	**ti**	fitʃor(-**u** a mɛ-l)	/tini
it I.make	for	boy(-MSG my-MSG)	/you

'I make for the boy/for my boy/for you'

d.

piʃti	(aiʃtə) mɛn-ə	/(aiʃt) fitʃor
on	this hand	/this boy

'On (this) hand/on (this) boy'

With locative and benefactive prepositions, the noun can occur in the indefinite form, as in particular for the low-ranked referents in (50b)–(53b), except for when the noun is followed by the possessive or preceded by the demonstrative, for instance in (54c), in addition to personal pronouns. This structure is attested both in old and current Romanian (cf. Stan 2016, p. 305); it is also present in Albanian, where prepositions can select the indefinite form of the noun.[6]

4.1. The Introducer Di

The prepositional introducer ***di*** covers relational, agentive, and sentential occurrences. Let us consider first the different kinds of possession relation. We see that *di* 'of' is in

complementary distribution with the PI both in possessive contexts, where the PI with the oblique alternates with the preposition *di* followed by the direct form of the noun (Savoia et al. 2020). The latter possibility is attested in old Romanian (cf. Nedelcu 2013, p. 56). In possessive contexts, *di* generally combines with the indefinite form of the noun, giving rise to a reading indicating a generic or typical possession, as in the examples in (55)–(57), where *di+N* is compared with *PI+definite N*.

(55) **Libofshë**

mən-a	**di**	mujer-ə	/**a li** mujɛr-i
hand-FSG	of	woman-FSG	/PI woman-OBL

'The hand of (the) woman'

kas-a	**di**	mujɛr-l-i	/**a li** mujɛr-i
house-FSG	of	woman-FPL	/PI woman-OBL

'The house of the woman'

(56) **Korça-Plasë**

mɛn-a	**di**	aist fitʃor	/**a** ɬ	fitʃor-u
hand-FSG	of	this boy-MSG	/PI	boy-MSG

'The hand of that boy/of the boy'

kuad-a	**di**	kɛn-i	/**a** ɬ	kɛn-i-l-i
tail-FSG	of	dog-MSG	/PI	dog-OBL

'The tail of the dog'

(57) **Këllëz**

unə mən-ə	**di**	fjat-ə	/**di**	mujɛr-i
one hand	of	girl-FSG	/of	woman-FSG

'One hand of girl/of woman'

mən-a	**a**	fɛtə-ji	/**a**	mujɛʁ-i
hand-fsg	PI	girl-OBL	/PI	woman-OBL

'The hand of the girl/of the woman'

Complex prepositions, encompassing locative, temporal, and instrumental meanings, include a lexical item specifying place, direction, and time in relation to the discourse (the Axial part), and the DP associated with the point of reference, i.e., the whole of which the axial expression is a part. The DP is introduced either as an oblique preceded by the PI, as in (58a)–(61a), or, alternatively, by the preposition *di* followed by the noun in *direct form*, as in (58b)–(61b). In these constructs, pronominal referents are realized as feminine possessives, in (a.iii), alternating with *di* 'of' followed by the pronoun, in (b.iii).

(58) **Libofshë**

a. i.	dəninti	**o**	fitʃor-ʎ-**u**	/**o**	mujɛʁ-ʎ-**u**
	before	PI	boy-DEF-OBL	/PI	women-DEF-OBL
b. i.	dəninti	**di**	fitʃor-ʎ-**i**	/**di**	mujɛr-**l-i**
	before	of	boy- DEF-PL	/of	woman-DEF-PL

'Before the boys/the women'

a.ii.	dəninti	**o**	fɛt-ʎ-**u**
	before	PI	girl-DEF-OBL
b.ii.	dəninti	**di**	fɛt-ʎ-**i**
	before	**of**	girl-DEF-PL

'Before the girls'

a.iii.	dən poi	**a**	mɛ-u
	after	PI	my-FSG
b.iii.	dən poi	**di**	mini
	after	of	me

(59) **Divjakë**

a.i.	u bag	dənintə	**o** fətʃɔr-u
	it I.put	before	PI boy-MSG
b.i.	u bag	dənintə	**di** fitʃor
	it I.put	before	of boy
	'I put it before the boy'		
a. iii.	dənintə	a ta-u	
	before	PI your.FSG	
	'before you'		

(60) **Korça-Plasë**

a.iii.	tini əʃti	dininti	**a** miˈa	
	you are	before	PI me-FSG	
b. iii.	tini əʃti	dininti	**di** mini	/**di** nɛs
	you are	before	of me	/of him
	'You are before me'			

(61) **Këllëz**

a.i.	dəm poi	**a li** karrig-i	/**a** miˈa
	behind	PI chair-FSG	/PI my-FSG
	'Behind the chair/me'		
b.i.	dəninti	**di** karrig-i	/**di** mini
	before	of chair-FSG	/of me
	'Before the chair /me'		
a.iii.	dəninti	**a** nɔst-**ɛ**	
	before	PI our-FSG	
b.iii.	dəninti	**di** noi	
	before	of us	
	'Before us'		

The distribution of the third person element *nɛs* varies according to the dialect. Thus, while in Korça-Plasëan it occurs both in prepositional contexts, in (62a), and direct ones, in (62b,c), in the Këllëz dialect, it occurs only in prepositional contexts, as in (63)

(62) **Korça-Plasë**

a.	el	jin	**la/ku**	mini/nɛs
	he	come.3PS	at/with	me/him
	'He comes to/with me/him'			
b.	ar	vini-tə	ei/eli/**nɛʃ** /**nɛs-i**	
	have.3ps	come-PP	they.M/F	
	'They have come'			
c.	ar	vidzu-t	el/ia/nɛs /nɛs-ɛ	
	have.3ps	see-PP	he /she/he/she	
	'(S)he has seen him/her'			

(63) **Këllëz**

ku, **ti**, **di**, **la**	nɛs/nɛsɛ/nɛʃ/nɛsi
with, for, of, at	him/her/them
'With, for, of, at him, her, them'	

Finally, *di* introduces locative, (64a), material, (64b), and agentive, (64c)–(65c) specifications. Some informants alternate *di* and *ti* in benefactive contexts, as in (64d) (cf. [Nedelcu 2016](#)).

(64) **Libofshë**

a	ɛsti		**di**	kal-i	
	it.is		in	street-FSG	
	'It is in the street'				
b.	aist	esti	**di**	dʒam	
	this	is	of	glass	
	'This is glass'				
c.	aist kəmiʃ-li	səntə ɣa-tə	**di**	ia	
	these shirt-FPL	be.3PL wash-PP	by	she.FSG	
	'These shirts are washed by her'				
d.	mini	u	fakə	**di/ti**	ia
	I	it	make.1SG	of/for	she
	'I make it for her'				

(65) **Divjakë**

c.	aist	esti	fap-tə	**di**	mini/fɛtʃor-i/fɛt-a
	that	is	make-PP	of	me/boy-MSG/girl-FSG
	'That is made by me/the boy/the girl'				

(66) **Korça-Plasë**

b.	aistɛ	esti	**di**	lɛmn
	this-FSG	is	of	wood
	'This is (of) wood'			
b'.	dɔ	bukɛts	**di**	pɛn-**i**
	two	pieces	of	bread-MSG
	'Two pieces of bread'			
c.	kəmeʃə-l-i	sən la-**t-i**	**di**	nɛs/tini
	shirt-FPL	are wash-PP-PL	by	he/you
	'The shirts are washed by him/you'			

In Fërshërot, complex prepositions combining *di* with the locative *la* are attested (cf. Maiden et al. 2021), both in locative structures, as in (67a), and in agentive structures, as in (67b).

(67) **Këllëz**

a.	ɛl	vini	**di**	**la**	tini
	he	comes	of	to	you
	'He comes to you'				

Korça-Plasë

b.	Aist lukur	esti	fap-tə	**di la**	fitʃor-**u**
	this work	is	make-PP	of to	boy-MSG
	'This work is been by the boy'				

Indefinite DPs admit *di* to be inserted before PI and the following possessive, with the usual agreement with the head noun, as in (68a). The structure appears also in Daco-Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin and Nedelcu 2013), as in (68b).

(68) **Këllëz**

a.	un	fitʃoʁ	**d**	**a**	ɲe-l
	a.MSG	son	of	PI	my-MSG
	'A son of mine'				
	(Dobrovie-Sorin and Nedelcu 2013, p. 341)				
b.	un	elev	de-al		meu
	a	pupil(M)	de-al.MSG		my.MSG
	'A pupil of mine'				

As regards these constructs, Dobrovie-Sorin and Nedelcu (2013, p. 341) note that 'The semantic effect triggered by the presence of *de* preceding the genitive is not partitivity,

but rather 'anti-uniqueness''. So, *di* specifies a partitive-like reading over the possessive structure introduced by PI.

5. Theoretical Framework

The data we have presented crucially concern the workspace of DP or P+DP, and imply inflectional properties. Inflected words are yielded by Merge, which takes roots and affixes, i.e., sub-word elements, and combines them into a complex syntactic object. This procedure encompasses the 'head raising', the classic movement of the head, i.e., the mechanism that combines nominal or verbal heads with affixes in the cartographic approach. Chomsky's most recent papers (Chomsky 2019, 2020, 2021) criticize the head movement as a genuine syntactic rule on the basis of the Probe-Goal φ-feature matching in affixation. Chomsky (2019, p. 268) notes that 'head raising is problematic insofar as it does not entail semantic effects and, structurally, it is counter-cyclic', and proposes 'simply to drop the condition that Internal Merge (Movement) has to be triggered, so it's free, like External Merge'.[7] As to the syntactic nature of morphology, Chomsky (2021, pp. 30, 36 ff.) assumes that Merge creates complex words via amalgamation of morphemes. Thus, in inflected verbs, the amalgamation yields complex forms such as [INFL [v, Root]], which realize the properties of the C/T Phase. The idea that inflection of the verb can satisfy in T the features of v is discussed by Chomsky (2021, pp. 30, 36 ff.), who notes that 'The first step in a derivation must select two items from the lexicon, presumably a root R and a categorizer CT, forming {CT, R}, which undergoes amalgamation under externalization, possibly inducing ordering effects […]. With head movement eliminated, v need no longer be at the edge of the vP phase but can be within the domains of PIC and Transfer, which can be unified. EA is interpreted at the next phase'.

In keeping with this conceptualization of the morphology–syntax relationship, the traditional head movement involving post-nominal articles and the gender/number/case inflection in NPs can in turn be seen as a type of amalgamation. The category-less root of nouns is interpreted as a predicate with one open argument place, which is ultimately bound by a D/Q operator (Higginbotham 1985). It is natural to assume that nominal specifications such as gender, and number (and classifiers) apply to and restrict the argument of the Root (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2018).

Categorizers such as *v*, *n* can be conceptualized as the bundles of φ-features entering into the agreement operations (Manzini 2021; Savoia and Baldi 2022, 2023). In this model, heads (inflections, roots, prepositions) are amalgamated based on the content properties and selection constraints of these lexical elements. As for gender, in DM approaches, such as that of Kramer (2015), it coincides with the noun class. In fact, gender seems rather to be a property encoded in nouns, governing the selection of the exponents of the agreement. Its relation to semantic content can emerge; for example, in many Romance languages, *-a* seems to imply interpretive properties, as discussed in Manzini et al. (2020). We will not address this issue, as it is not relevant to the phenomena we deal with.

As is well-known, some current morphological approaches identify morphology as an autonomous component. In Distributed Morphology, sub-word elements (affixes and clitics) are 'dissociated morphemes', which convey information 'separated from the original locus of that information in the phrase marker' (Embick and Noyer 2001, p. 557) and involve post-syntactic rules of Local dislocation (Embick and Noyer 2001). Thus, agreement and case morphemes are not represented in syntax but are added post-syntactically 'during Morphology' through the Late-insertion mechanism.[8] We adopt a different model, in which morphological operations are part of the syntactic computation and there is no specialized component for the morphological structure of words (Manzini and Savoia 2011; Manzini et al. 2020; see also Collins and Kayne 2021; Marantz 2001). Lexical elements, including morphemes, are endowed with interpretive content. This hypothesis excludes powerful tools such as Late insertion (Halle and Marantz 1993) and the manipulation of terminal nodes with which Distributed Morphology deals with complex phenomena such as

syncretism.[9] The agreement in sentence and within the DP is accounted for as the manifestation of the identity between referential feature sets corresponding to the same arguments.

Elementary Relators

Genitives, datives, and locatives in many natural languages are realized by the same cases or adpositions, i.e., non-spatial obliques, giving rise to a syncretic semantic space. This also applies to Aromanian, in which genitives and datives share the same syntactic construct where the PI combines with the possessor/recipient. Moreover, we saw that *di* 'of' can replace the possessive construct both in possession and in locative contexts. In keeping with Franco and Manzini (2017), we pursue the idea that prepositions are instantiations of the basic relation part–whole, i.e., inclusion [⊆], in the sense discussed in Belvin and Den Dikken (1997, p. 170), according to which 'entities have various zones associated with them, such that an object or eventuality may be included in a zone associated with an entity without being physically contained in that entity… The type of zones which may be associated with an entity will vary with the entity'.

Hence, possession on a par with location can be understood as a type of 'zonal inclusion' (Manzini and Savoia 2011, 2018). The crucial example is provided by *di*, which includes apparently diverse readings as illustrated in Section 4.1. Moreover, it can combine with different types of lexical elements of which it realizes the relationship with some type of possessor/whole, as in the complex prepositions in (58)–(61). On the basis of such a distribution, *di* can be analyzed as the elementary operator [⊆], as in (69) (Savoia et al. 2020), where it interprets the relation involved in oblique contexts as the inclusion of a part in a whole.

(69)   di: ⊆

In the terms of this proposal, *di*, and in general prepositions, are predicates introducing a relation between the argument they select and another argument/event. In the derivation in (70), R is the lexical root and φ is an abbreviation for nominal features, here definite plural. The axial element, namely the locative noun, merges with (70a), yielding the complex construct in (70b), associated with the syntactic domain in (70c), where the locative extends the event of *v*.

(70) a.   < di$_⊆$, [$_φ$ [$_R$ fitʃor]-ʎ-i]] > →   [$_P$ di$_⊆$ [$_φ$ [$_R$ fitʃor]-ʎ-i]]]
      b.   < dəninti $_N$, [$_P$ di$_⊆$ [$_φ$ [$_R$ fitʃor]-ʎ-i]]] > →   [$_{DP}$ də ɟɔs [$_{PP⊆}$ di [$_φ$ [$_R$ fitʃor]-ʎ-i]]]   'before the boys', in (54b.i)
      c. v….   Locative N   P D$_φ$ N
                       dəninti   di$_{/⊆}$ fitʃor-ʎ-i

The idea, discussed by Savoia et al. (2020), is that in the complex PPs, the locative item (Axial Part) is associated with a 'possessor'; more precisely, its 'zonal inclusion' fixed by the noun, in (70) *fitʃorʎi* 'the boys'. According to Franco and Manzini (2017), the motion or state-in interpretation is derived from the type of locative event introduced by the verb in conjunction with the locative noun. This is confirmed by the fact that the same prepositions can occur with different verbs. Moreover, prepositions are selected by different place nouns, specifically, as noticed, as regards their animacy properties, as illustrated in (48)–(51). We may think that simple prepositions specialized for locative reading realize a spatial restriction on the elementary relator as in (71a). The sequence *di la* (cf. (67)) supports this analysis, as it provides an analytical representation of (67a) in which the relator is realized independently of locative specification, as in (71b). We note that *di la* someway recalls the Italian preposition *da,* arguably deriving from *di+ad/ab* (Rohlfs 1954, § 833).

(71) a.   **la/ja/ɣa**: [[place part of] ⊆]
      b.   **di la**: [⊆ [[animate place part of] ⊆]]

The DOM effect, contrasting *ɣa/la/kət* and *a/tu*, can be attributed to the lexical properties of these prepositions, selecting the animacy/deicticity (first/second person) of the complement. In fact, natural languages tend to conceptualize highly ranked (animate) referents as atomic individuals with a surrounding 'inclusion zone', as opposed to extended surfaces, locations, and objects in the space introduced by prepositions such as *tu*. The human/animacy split in locative prepositions characterizes many languages and is very clear in Romance languages (Luraghi 2011), where it affects both simple and complex prepositions. For instance, in Romance languages, there are different ways of introducing animate locations, such as *chez* in French, *da* in Italian, and *ddu* 'where' in Southern Italian varieties. In the terms of a functionalist explanation, Luraghi (2011, p. 210) attributes the split to the fact that human beings are not typical 'landmarks of local expressions' because they are mobile and exclude the spatial coincidence with other entities. Thus, specialized spatial elements are required. Franco et al. (2021, p. 163) note that

> […] the ontology of natural languages treats them as atomic individuals, as opposed to extended surfaces, unless some appropriate specifications are added. In Romance there are at least three different ways of introducing animate locations. One is through a (dedicated) AxPart, such as French *chez*; another strategy is the wh- pronoun for *where*, […].

In Aromanian, the split separates the human/animate locative *la* from *a/tu*, referring to specific places and surfaces.

The examples in (64)–(66) highlight the ability of *di* to introduce the substance in (b), the part of a whole in (b'), and the agent in passives, as in (c). While the part of a set is a relationship easily traceable to (67), the other two readings require some consideration. In the case of the substance, such as *di dʒam* 'of glass', we can still treat the mass noun, here *dʒam*, as the whole of which *aist* 'this' is a part. In this framework, other uses of *di*, such as alternating with *ti* in (66d), can be traced back to the interaction between the elementary relator and the lexical meaning of the verb.

The agentive is only apparently more problematic insofar as the causative reading is added by the passive structure, substantially by the past participle, which, as is usual in Romance languages, has an unaccusative interpretation, whereby the PP agrees with the Internal Argument of the verb. For example, in Italian, the agent is introduced by the locative preposition *da* 'by/at/to', as in *questo è stato fatto da lui* 'this has been made by him' vs. *Gianni è da lui* 'John is at his house/with him'. We can think that the simple relator is sufficient to introduce an argument selected by the PP, as in (72), which is interpreted as the Causer in v. As regards the derivation of passive structures, we can think that the PP is inserted within the vP, as a realization of VP. In the PP, the verbal root is expanded by the Thematic Vowel, a morpheme that introduces an argumental variable bound associated with the Internal Argument (see Savoia and Baldi 2022, for this analysis), and by the formative *-t-*, associated with aspectual properties. The DP, introduced as the possessor of the event, fulfills the agent role of v, while the agreement of the PP identifies the IA, as in (72d) for *kəmeʃə-l-i sən la-t-i di nɛs* 'the shirts are washed by him' (cf. (66c)). The derivation combines the root and the agreement morphology, as in (72a,b,c).

(72) a. $< l\text{-}, a_{TV} > \rightarrow$ $[la_x]$
      b. $< l\text{-}a, t_{PP} > \rightarrow$ $[[la]\ t_{PP}]$
      c. $< l\text{-}a\text{-}t, i_{PL} > \rightarrow$ $[_\varphi\ [lat]\ i]$

      d. … v_φ PastParticiple   Prep   DP/Causer
                              l-a-t-i$_{IA}$ $\subseteq$ nɛs$_\varphi$

At this point, we must take into account the PIs, trying to provide a hypothesis compatible with its alternation with *di* and, in general, with its ability to introduce dative and genitive interpretations. The introducers of oblique contexts are etymologically related to the Daco-Romanian so-called possessive articles *al/a/ai/ale* preceding genitive DPs (Dobrovie-

Sorin and Giurgea 2013). In Daco-Romanian, possessive articles only occur in genitives, while datives are realized by the case morphology or by the preposition *la* (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013; Pană Dindelegan et al. 2019). According to some analyses, PIs combine the nominal invariable base *a* with the definite article, whereby *al* is essentially an agreement head, taking a genitive in Spec (Giurgea 2012; Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013). Cornilescu (1995, pp. 126–27) treats *al* as a case D marker. Another explanation assumes that *al* includes the preposition *a* with the enclitic article (cf. Grosu 1994; Cornilescu and Nicolae 2011). Actually, the invariable form *a* is attested in Old Romanian. Hence, if *a* corresponds to the Latin preposition *ad*, this explains why in Old Romanian *a* was also admitted with datives (Pană Dindelegan 2016).

Our data show that *a* can introduce both dative and genitive, as in (3)–(4), (7)–(8), and (37)–(40); moreover, *a* can realize a locative reading in contexts where the noun of place is indefinite, as *a kasə* 'in the house'. The partial agreement with the possessor, alternating *a l/a ɫ/o* with the masculines and plural and *a li* with the feminine can be seen as the combination of *a* with the definiteness base *l-* from the Latin **ille*, on which Romance articles are generally based. If we are on the right track, the structure of datives and genitives is something like (73).

(73) **a** (article) noun-Oblique

The fact that *a* is associated with the part–whole reading of genitives, datives, and complex locatives leads to the conclusion that its content is similar to that of *di* 'of'. We, hence, assume that in (73), *a* is a specialized realization of the elementary relation [⊆], followed by the definite article, when requested, and by a fully quantificationally specified form of the noun. As a result, *di* and *a* tend to be in complementary distribution, save for deictics, first/second person pronouns, and demonstratives, where the selection restrictions are vacuously applied, as suggested by the *Elsewhere* order in (74a,b). A crucial point is that *a* selects fully determined or quantified nouns, excluding simple indefinites, associated with *di*, cf. (55)–(57). Moreover, *a* requires a specialized inflection, the oblique.

(74) a. **a** = [[⊆] (locative)]/__ (deictic/Q) [[N] definite inflection]
      b. **di** = [⊆]/___ (deictic) N

This analysis can be also applied to other basic prepositions, such as **ti** 'for', which attributes the quality 'beneficiary' to the recipient/possessor, [[⊆], (beneficiary)].

The third person pronouns *nɛs/nɛs-ɛ/nɛʃ/nɛs-i* are typical of Aromanian, as noted by Capidan (1932) and Caragiu Marioțeanu (1975). In some varieties, for example, the Fërshërot of Këllëz, this form is limited only to prepositional contexts (Poçi 2009, p. 130), as illustrated in particular in (62a) and (63). In other varieties, for example in the dialect of Korça-Plasë, it also occurs as a subject or a direct object, as in (62b,c). Etymology helps us to account for the distributional restrictions of *nɛs*. Rosetti (1986, p. 336) explains these forms as derived from the combination of Latin *ipse* 'he', with a preceding preposition with a final nasal, such as *in* 'in', *con* 'with'. Thus, we can decompose *n-ɛs* into a prefixed prepositional element *n* followed by the third person morpheme, something like [n_⊆ [ɛs $_{3ps}$]], where the initial *n-* introduces the part–whole relator. In some dialects, this lexical property operates in limiting the occurrence of *nɛs* to prepositional contexts, as suggested in (70′).

(70′) *n-ɛs* ←→ Preposition __

Some varieties associate a pre-posed article with *a*, at least in some contexts. More precisely, in a subset of the relevant contexts of *a*, the articles l_{MSG} and $l\text{-}i_{FSG}$ must or may be inserted, agreeing with the following noun, as suggested in (75a,a′). In these dialects, *a* is replaced by *o* before nouns (Rëmën) or by *a ɫ* before masculine nouns (Fërshërot). Thus, (74a) must be rewritten as in (75), where the alternants (a,b,c) are assigned to their contexts.

(75) a. **li** ⟵⟶ a __ [FSG
    b. **ł** ⟵⟶ a __ [MSG
    c. **o** = [⊆] /__ [MSG/PL

(74) highlights the difference between the two elementary operators. The operator *di* is in itself able to introduce the inclusion relation, whereby it generally allows possessors to be realized as indefinite. The lexical content of the verb and the possessor are sufficient to identify the referent, exactly like in Italian PPs of the type *sono in casa* 'They are at home', where the reference is based on the lexical content of the noun *casa* 'house' and the verb 'to be' (in relation to the universe of discourse) (cf. Longobardi 1995, 1996). Manzini and Savoia (2011) discuss some cases in Albanian where the locative relation is determined without the definiteness elements of the noun.

The operator associated with *a* can be thought of as weak, in the sense that it needs to be accompanied by the referential tools of DP to lead to a correct interpretation. In the locative context as *a kasə* 'at/to (the) house', the lexical restriction [locative] specifies the relation; in oblique contexts, quantificational or deictic specifications and/or the specialized case inflection are necessary, as we will see in more detail in Section 6.

6. The Morpho-Syntax of the Case

The exponent *-i* in the class III nouns covers three fundamental readings: the indefinite singular, Nom/Acc and Oblique, in (33b) and (34b), the definite singular in Nom/Acc and Oblique, in (33a) and (34a), and variably, the definite and indefinite plural, in (33) and (34), with exclusion of the definite plural Oblique in (33a) and (34a), where the formatives *-l/ʎ-u/-l-or* occur. In the literature, *-i* in the feminine singular is considered as the only exponent of the case associated with indefinite forms (Maiden et al. 2021, 75 ff.), whereas the case is generally expressed by the definiteness enclitic element. These data could suggest that the specialized oblique exponent *-i* of the singular is not so much gender-based as linked to the morpho-phonological properties of the inflectional system.

As to plurality, in keeping with Chierchia (1998a, 1998b) and Manzini and Savoia (2014, 2018), we can think of plurality as a subset relationship of sets of individuals. The sub-set-of relation can be traced to the operator [⊆], by its conceptual similarity with the part–whole relationship. This property can be also connected with the oblique (genitive/dative), the content of which can be identified with the primitive operator [⊆] (Manzini and Savoia 2014). It is reasonable, indeed, to assume that genitive and dative have the same semantic properties as the oblique introducers *of*, *to*. The analysis of the inflectional system of Latin and its complex syncretism case/plural, specifically on the exponents *-i* and *-s*, leads Manzini and Savoia (2010, 2014) to conclude that plural and oblique can be traced back to specialized readings of the same predicate [⊆], as suggested in (76a,b):

(76) a. PL = [⊆]/R __
As a property of the noun, plurality isolates a subset of the set of all things to which the noun (its Root) can be predicated (Chierchia 1998a, 1998b)
    b. Dative = [⊆]/__DP
In genitive/dative contexts, the inclusion is read as subset-of-possessor relationship, and its scope is either sentential, applying to the internal argument of the verb, or, in genitives, DP-internal. (Manzini and Savoia 2014, p. 422)

Thus, we must conclude that inflectional exponents associated with the part–whole relation can be specialized for one or another reading, or, possibly for both. We will express this in terms of the selection constraints in (83), although we imagine that a more sophisticated semantic representation is possible.

6.1. Inflections, Case, and Oblique Constructs

Coming to the notion of case, we know that this feature, a classic category of the cartographic model, has a spurious status in the sense that it is nothing but a manifestation of the agreement; inherent cases put other descriptive problems interacting with prepositions and the morpho-syntactic organization of the sentence. It is no accident that Chomsky

(2021, p. 16) concludes that 'Case doesn't enter into semantic interpretation' and is part of externalization. Actually, the distribution of nominal inflections and the syncretism exemplified in Section 2, suggest that what is called case must be identified with nominal properties such as number, definiteness or syntactic operators.

Thus, if we take the sentence *i o ded o bərbats-ur-u* 'I gave it to the men' (cf. (4a), **L**), the free application of Merge (Chomsky 2019, 2021) yields the amalgamation between the root and the definite inflection, marked by *-ur-*, in (77a), characterized as DEF, PL, with which *-u$_\subseteq$* is combined, yielding the complex noun in (77b).

(77) a. $< [_R$ bərbats], -ur$_{DEF,PL}> \rightarrow [_\varphi$ [bərbats]-ur]
b. $< [_\varphi$ bərbats] -ur], -u$_\subseteq > \rightarrow [_\subseteq [_\varphi$ [bərbats]-ur-]u]

The occurrence of the oblique inflection requires the introducer, here *o* (cf. (31)), as in (78a); the insertion of sub-word elements depends on subcategorization restrictions such as in (78b) and (78c). Merge is based on the agreement between the syntactic features, including $\subseteq$, both within the noun and DP.

(78) a. $< o_{\subseteq,}, [_\subseteq$ [bərbats]-ur-u] $> \rightarrow [_{PP}$ o$_\subseteq [_{\subseteq,}$ [bərbats]-ur-u]]
b. -ur$_{DEF,\subseteq} \longleftrightarrow$ R$_M$ __
c. -u$_\subseteq \longleftrightarrow$ PI [[$_{DEF.\subseteq}$] __]

The inflected noun realizes the referential properties associated with D in the DP, i.e., the class, definiteness, and number specifications applying to the noun, (79), within the Phase DP (hypothesizing that there is one), without assuming head-raising. The alternant *o* realizes the preposition that connects the noun to the event in the role of the beneficiary.

(79) v…. P/PI D$_\varphi$ N
o$_{\varphi/\subseteq}$ bərbats-ur-u$_{DEF.M /\subseteq,}$

D has been characterized in different ways; in particular, it has been assigned the case feature K and, among other hypotheses, the Definiteness, a prototypical property of determiners (Giusti Forthcoming). However, we follow a very different path, identifying the case with the referential features of nouns. In the type of syntactic structures discussed here, a fundamental role is played by the part–whole operator and by agreement (class, definiteness) morphology. We see that in terms of a usual morphological mechanism in languages, the relevant relation is duplicated both on the preposition and on the noun, here the operator [$\subseteq$]. The analysis in (78b,c) assumes that the latter property is also duplicated within the noun: indeed, both *-ur* and *-u* contribute to externalizing the oblique.

Genitival contexts present *a+possessive*, as illustrated in (80) for (42a'), *mɛɲ-l-i a mɛ-l-i* 'my hands' G, where the part–whole reading has a lexical realization by the possessive element in (80a), in addition to the preposition *a*, as in (80b). In these contexts, the simple preposition *a* occurs in all varieties, as in the constraint in (74a), where the deictic reference of first and second person is able to fully meet the referential requirements in the context of *a*. Hence, the possessive satisfies the referential properties associated with D in the Phase of DP, as in (80c).

(80) a. [[[mɛ$_\subseteq$]-l$_{DEF.F}$] i $_\subseteq$]
b. $< a_{\subseteq,}$, [[[mɛ$_\subseteq$]-l$_{DEF.F}$] i $_\subseteq$] $> \rightarrow$ [a$_\subseteq$ [[mɛ$_\subseteq$]-l$_{DEF.F}$ i $_\subseteq$]
c. N…. P/PI D$_\varphi$ N
a$_{\varphi/\subseteq}$ mɛli$_{\subseteq,FSG}$

In datives, the same result with the first/second person pronouns appears. Interestingly, they have a specialized inflection for the oblique, as in (81a,b) for … *a ɲ-ia* 'to me' (cf. (32b)).

(81) a. $< a_\subseteq,, [[\text{ɲ}_{1SG}]\, ia_\subseteq]> \rightarrow$ $[\, a_\subseteq\, [\text{ɲia}_\subseteq]]$

    b. $\text{v}....$ P/PI D_φ N

                $a_{\varphi/\subseteq}$ $\text{ɲia}_\subseteq$

The nature of the specialized inflections in oblique contexts remains to be better understood. For the sake of clarity, we repeat the paradigm of the nouns *mujɛʁ-* 'woman' and *kɛn-* 'dog' of class III for the Fërshërot of Këllëz, in (82). Note that *un-* is the indefinite article, *ndau/ndoi* are the feminine and masculine indefinite quantifier 'some', and *dau/doi* are the numeral 'two'.

(82)   **Këllëz**

singular   *plural*

		FSG	MSG		FPL	MPL
direct definite	a.	mujɛʁ-**a**	kɛn-**i/ə-l-i**	a′.	mujɛʁ-**l-i**	kɛɲ-**je**
direct indefinite	b.	**unə** mujɛʁ-**i**	**un** kɛn-**i**	b′.	ndau mujɛʁ	ndoi kɛɲ
oblique definite	c.	**a li** mujɛʁ-**i**	**a** kɛn-**i/ə-l-i**	c′.	**a** mujɛʁə-**l-u**	a kɛɲ-**l-u**
oblique indefinite	d.	**a** un-**ei** mujɛʁ-**i**	**a** un-**ui** kɛn-**i**	d′.	**a** dau mujɛʁ-**l-u**	**a** doi kɛɲə-**l-u**

Our idea is that no traditional case specification is externalized by the exponents in (82) and that nominal inflections belong to very elementary semantic primitives associated with referentiality. The paradigms show such a high degree of syncretism that there is no clearly specialized morpheme for oblique contexts, maybe except for *–or*, in (69). The oblique plural *l-u*, *r-u*, and *ʎ-u*, however, include, in turn, the exponent *-u* that occurs in the definite masculine singular, as in (72) and (73). Thus, apart from *-a*, for the definite singular feminine in direct contexts, and the liquid bases, *-l/ʎ/r-*, for definiteness, the other inflections encompass diverse interpretations. We obtain a set of selection constraints *Elsewhere* ordered and descriptively labeled as in (83).

(83)   *Class III*

         $-i_{\{SG/PL/OBL\}} \longleftrightarrow N_{CLASS}/\underline{\quad}$

         $-a_{DEF} \longleftrightarrow N(i)_{SG,\,F}]\underline{\quad}$

         $-je_{DEF} \longleftrightarrow{}_{PL/M}]\,\underline{\quad}$

         $-l_{DEF}\text{-} \longleftrightarrow (i)_{\{M,\,PL\}}]\,\underline{\quad}$

         $-or/\text{-}u_{OBL,\,DEF} \longleftrightarrow N_{PL,}\,\underline{\quad}$

In the first class, in (72) and (73), *-i* is associated with the oblique in the feminine singular and, in Rëmën, also characterizes indefinite feminine plurals. In (74)–(69), the definite masculines assume the exponent *-l-i* in the singular and differ from the feminine, which only introduces *-i*. A natural hypothesis is to relate the syncretism of *-i* (singular/plural, direct/indirect forms) to its functional content, as in (84a), and its distribution to (84b).

(84) a.   -i = subset-of-relation/$\subseteq$

     b. $i_\subseteq \longleftrightarrow R\,\underline{\quad}$ or l $\underline{\quad}$

Something like that may apply to *-u*, which covers the plural in obliques and the definiteness in the masculine singular of the type *fitʃor-u* 'the boy' in (67). Interestingly, Manzini and Savoia (2010, p. 422), dealing with the transition from the Latin case system to Romance nominal systems, characterize the standard Daco-Romanian inflection *-i*, oblique singular and the nominative plural (masculine), as 'essentially like Latin *-i*, as a Q element […] it will have the plural reading when taking scope over the words - or the possessive (dative/genitive) reading when taking sentential scope'. The idea that plural and oblique rely on the same conceptual content, adopted by us in many works on the Romance inflection (Manzini et al. 2020), can account for the data discussed in this article.

Both *-u* and *-i* can introduce plurality, as in the plural oblique, and the reference to a singularity, as *-i* in the paradigms in (75) and (70), and *-u* in definite masculine singular. This pattern is not exceptional: just think of the syncretism in Latin case inflections, analyzed in Halle and Vaux (1997), where, for instance, *-i* realizes the masculine plural

and the genitive and dative singular, and similarly, *-e* (<**ai*) feminine plural and genitive and dative singular, and so on. Also, in Italian, *-i*, typically associated with the plural, can characterize the third singular person pronouns, cf. *egl-i/lu-i/le-i* 'he/she' *colu-i* 'he', and, in addition, the dative *gl-i* 'to him/her/them', the oblique including also the genitive, *a/di cu-i* 'to/of which', *altru-i* 'of others'. What we mean is that if plurality coincides with the sub-set relation, a subset including a single individual is admitted (Chierchia 1998a, 1998b). Usually, languages have the singular for this, but there are uses of the generic plural that admit a singular interpretation, such as *They are knocking at the door. (It's Peter.)* or *How many came? Just one* (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2014, p. 222). Thus, we conclude that the part–whole relationship can satisfy the definite singular reference, as suggested in (85).

(85) a. [kɛn- (i-l) [-i$_\subseteq$]]   'dogs/the dogs'
      b. $\exists$ x $\subseteq$ {dog}
      'an x such that x is a subset of the set of individuals with the property *dog*'

We have seen that even the specialized oblique inflection of person pronouns in (31) and (32), and of plural nouns, such as *-l-or* in (67) and (69), are not able to license the part–whole relationship alone, but they must be combined with the prepositional element *a* (cf, (31c) and (32c)). *a* can combine with forms non-specialized for the oblique, such as *a fitʃor-u/a un fitʃor* 'to/of the boy/a boy', in (3a,b), and **a li** mujɛr-**i** 'to/of Art woman' in (25a) (L). However, *a* is compatible with the specialized oblique form, if available, as in the plural and in the singular, cf.*a li fɛt-i* 'to/of the girl', **a un-ei** fɛt-**i** 'to/of one-Obl girl' in (17a,b) (G), etc. In other words, -i$_\subseteq$/-u$_\subseteq$/-or$_\subseteq$ do not have the strength to introduce the part–whole interpretation over DPs, unlike the preposition *di* 'of' or *a*. We may express this restriction by assuming that the specialized forms require *a*, as suggested in (86).

(86) -ur$_\subseteq$- $\longleftrightarrow$ *a* (Art) Q [N __

Thus, a plural oblique such as (87a) cannot license a dative reading on DPs. It is, now, only a plural allomorph selected in the PIs contexts, as (86). Only merging with the preposition *a* gives rise to the oblique interpretation, as in (87b), and its externalization, in (87c).

(87) a. [$_\subseteq$[bərbats]-ur-u]]
      b. < a$_\subseteq$, [$_\subseteq$[bərbats]-ur-u]] > $\rightarrow$ [a$_\subseteq$ [$_\subseteq$,[bərbats]-ur-u]]]
      c. v….   P   D$_\varphi$ N
                a$_\subseteq$ bərbats-ur-u$_\subseteq$

6.2. Object Clitics

Like in most Romance languages, Aromanian can express the internal argument by a set of object clitics that distinguish accusative, in (88a), and dative, in (88b), both in the first/second person and third person elements. In our data, the third person singular accusative has two phonological alternants, *u* vs. *o*. The reflexive is illustrated in (88c). The object clitics occur in the pre-verbal position except for the imperative, where they are enclitic; in the clusters, in (88d), the order is *accusative+dative*. In the plural, we find different alternants, *ʎ-u*, *ɣ-u* and *l-u* (cf. Poçi 2009, p. 131), as illustrated in (88e).

In the dialect of Korça-Plasë, the third person accusative can not be realized in the cluster with the third person dative, as in (88f, f'), a possibility that is, however, attested in the object clitic systems of the Southern Italian clitics (Manzini and Savoia 2005, § 4.6).

(88) **Libofshë**

a. accusative

eu	mi	/ti	/u	/ni	/vi	/li	vɛd-i
he	me	/you	/her/him	/us	/you	/them	see-3SG

'He sees me/you/her/him/us/you/them'

b. dative

	ɲi	/tsi	/i	/na	/u		da	libr-a
	to.me	/to.you	/to.3PS	/to.us	/to.you		give.3SG	book-FSG

'He gives the book to me/you/him/her/us/you/them'

c. reflexive

eu	z	ɣa					/ s	apun-i
he		himself wash.3SG					/ himself	sit-3SG

'He washes himself/he sits down'

d. clusters

ɲ	u/ts	u/i	u/n	u/v	u		da
to.me	it/to.you	it/to.3PS	it/to.us	it/to.you	it		give.3SG

'He gives it to me/you/him/her/us/you/them'

Divjakë

e. clusters

ɣ	u	dau		**o**	fətʃorə-ɣ-u		/**o** fɛtə-ɣ-u
to.them	it	give.1SG		PI	boy-PL-OBL		/PI girl-PL-OBL

'I give it to the boys/the girls'

Korça-Plasë

f. (clusters)

nɛs	i		da	**a**		lui
he	to.him (it)		give.3SG	PI		him

'He gives it to him'

f'.

nɛs	mi		da	**a**	ɲia
he	to.me (it)		give.3SG	PI	me

'He gives it to me'

The clitics paradigm highlights the overlapping between the third plural and dative forms on *(-)i*. This pattern, shown by many Italian varieties and by Albanian, argues for a common interpretive property underlying the dative and plural. As to the dative forms, it is natural to analyze them as combining the part–whole relator with the root, as [[ɲ$_{1SG}$] i$_\subseteq$] 'to me'. The stressed pronoun requires the explicit relator *a*, as in (75).

Aromanian shows clitic doubling limited to contexts where the personal pronoun is the object, as in (89a,b), or the dative, in (89c). This construct is variable in old Romanian (Pană Dindelegan 2016) but generalized in standard Daco-Romanian (Pană Dindelegan 2013; Rîpeanu Reinheimer et al. 2013). In our data, clitic doubling is systematic only with first and second person pronouns, differently from the third person, as in (89a'), where it is optional. The clitic cluster *dative+accusative* is instead required anywhere, as in the examples in Section 2.

(89) **Korça-Plasë**

a.

mi/ti	ved-i	(**pi**)	mini/tini
me/you	see-3SG	Prep	me/you

'(S)he sees me/you'

a'.

nɛs	(u)	ved-i	atsɛl
he	(her)	see-3SG	her

'He sees her'

c.

nɛs	mi	da	**a**	ɲia/tsi
he	to.me (it)	give.3SG	PI	me/to.you

'He gives it to me/

li	da	tuti	**a**	je
them (to her)	give.3SG	all	PI	her

'He gives them all to her'

Libofshë

b.

ti	vəˈdzu-r	tini
you	see.PAST-3PL	you

'They saw you'

nə	arə	vəˈdz-u-t		noi
us	have.3PL	see-TV-PP		us

'They have seen us'

c.	tsə		am	gr-i-t	**a**	tse-a	
	you		have.1SG	call-TV-PP	PI	you-OBL	
	'I have called you'						
d.	n	u	da	**a**	nau		
	us	it	give.3SG	PI	us		
	'(S)he gives it to us'						

Divjakë

a.	atsatseu	ni	ved-i	**pi**	noi	/mi	ved-i
	that	us	see-3SG	Prep	me	/me	see-3SG
	'That one sees us/me'						
c.	(jə)		gresk-u	**o**	ɣui		
	to.him		call-1SG	PI	him-OBL		
	'I call him'						
d.	ts	u	da	**a**	tse-ja		
	you	it	give.3SG	PI	you-OBL		
	'(S)he gives it to you'						

Along with doubling, DOM can also turn out, as in (84a), whereby the first and second person objects are variably introduced by the specialized preposition *pi* (< **per*), recalling the DOM present in Daco-Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1990) and attested in Spanish (Jaeggli 1981) and Southern Italian dialects (Manzini and Savoia 2005). As is well-known, in the GB and cartographic literature, Clitic doubling questions the movement theory of object clitics, specifically the usual complementarity between object NPs and OCls. Resuming Kayne's generalization whereby doubling occurs only if the object NP is preceded by a preposition, Jaeggli (1981, p. 20) concludes that OCls absorb the verb's government, not allowing for a complement NP; the latter can be still saved by a preposition that assigns it the case. Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) notes that this analysis does not work for indirect object doubling in Daco-Romanian because morphological datives would be different from PPs; her idea is that datives are inherently case-marked and, therefore, escape the verb's government—interestingly, in Aromanian, datives require a prepositional element. Obviously, these problems depend on a cartographic concept of syntactic relations, and indeed, (89a) shows that doubling a direct object is possible and usual, therefore weakening Kayne's generalization.

In our model, inflections have interpretive content, like any other lexical element, and Merge applies freely. In this line, clitics can be thought of as a specialized realization of the agreement properties of T/v (cf. also Roberts 2010), and therefore as part of the inflected verb in T, as suggested in (90a) for the cluster *i u/o*, and (90b) (from (89a)) for the doubling of person pronouns.

(90)　a.　i o ded o fitʃor-u 'I gave it to the boy' (from (3a))

	C	Dat$_\varphi$	Acc$_\varphi$	T		v	V	PP
		i$_\varphi$	u$_\varphi$	ded				o fitʃor-u
b.	C			T	v	V	(PP)	N
		mi$_\varphi$	ved-i				pi	mini$_\varphi$

In this light, doubling is only a type of externalization[10], where an argument has more realizations that agree, namely sharing referential features. Finally, the distribution of *pi* manifests a DOM reading, in which high-ranked accusatives, regularly first/second person, must be interpreted as a sort of dative/possessor of the event, here lexicalized by *pi*.[11]

6.3. The Domain of the DP

In (64a), we have seen that *a*, at least in a subset of oblique contexts, requires a defined article: in the examples, the glosses are *'to/of Art'*. The occurrence of the pre-posed article is compatible with both the definite form of the noun in (91a) and the quantified DP, as in (91b):

(91)   **Libofshë**

a.   **a**   **li**   fɛt-**i**   **/a (li)**   **un**   fɛt-**i**   **/ o** fitʃor-**u**   (from (3a,b))

to/of   Art   girl-⊆   /to/of Art   a   girl-⊆   / to/of+Art boy-MSG

'To/of the girl/a girl/a boy'

Kortça-Plasë

b.   **a**   ł   kɛn-**i-l-i**   (from (29a))

to/of Art   dog-⊆-Def-⊆

'To/of the dog'

Thus, in DPs, the pre-posed article introduces a specific and gender/noun class reading, as in (92)

(92)   v….   P   D$_\varphi$ Q   N

a$_\subseteq$ li   (un)   fɛt-i$_\subseteq$

'To/of a girl'

The distribution of the oblique inflections in the workspace of the DP shows that the noun can lack the definiteness morphology, as in the examples in (91a), and the pre-posed article can realize it. In Aromanian, DPs can variably realize complete inflectional morphology on the only element on the left, be it the noun or a modifier. In the case of oblique inflection, the examples in (93a,a') and (95a) show that the demonstrative preceding the noun takes on the inflectional marks of oblique, while the noun occurs in the indefinite form, plural in (93a) and singular in (93a') and (95a). With modifiers such as *alant* 'other' that can precede or follow the noun, the latter lacks the inflection of the oblique when following the modifier. This is exemplified in (94b) and (95b), where the oblique is realized on the

(93)   **Libofshë**

a.   **o**   məjer-**ʎ-u**   **/o**   ts-**uor**   məjer-**i**

to/of.Art   woman-PL-⊆   /to/of.Art   those-PL-⊆   woman-⊆

'To/of the women/those women'

a'.   **o**   fitʃor-**u**   **/o**   ts-**ui**   fitʃor

to/of.Art   boy-MSG/⊆   /to/of.Art   that.MSG-⊆   boy

'to/of the/that boy'

b.   i   ɔ-m   da-tə   **o**   fitʃor-**ʎ-u**   ɣants   **/o**   ɣants   fitʃor-**ʎ-i**

to.her/him   It-.have   give-PP   to.Art   boy-PL-⊆   other.PL   /to.Art   other.PL   boy-PL-PL

'I have give it to the other boys'

(94)   **Këllëz**

b.   **a**   fɛt-**i-i**   alant-**ɛ**   **/a**   **l**   alant-**ei**   fjat-**ɛ**

to/of   girl-⊆-DEF-⊆   other-FSG   /to/of   Art   other-⊆   girl-FSG

'to/of the other girl'

(95)   **Korça-Plasë**

a.   lu   ded   **a**   fitʃor-**u**   **/a**   iʃt-**ui**   fitʃor

it   I.gave   to   boy-⊆   /to   this-⊆   boy

'I gave to the boy/this boy'

b.   lu   ded   **a**   fitʃor-**u**   alent   **/a**   alent-**ui**   fitʃor

it   I.gave   to   boy-⊆   other   /to   other-⊆   boy

'I gave it to the other boy'

Some speakers variably preserve oblique plural inflection on the noun even if preceded by demonstratives and other modifiers, as in (96) (cf. (4b) and (22b)). 'Polydefinite' structures already occur in old Romanian as documented by Stan (2016, p. 304), and are usual in Albanian[12].

(96) **Korça-Plasë**

a	alents-**l-or**	/iʃt-**or**	fitʃor-**l-or**
to/of	other-PL-⊆	/this-PL-⊆	boy-PL-⊆

'To/of the other/these boys

We may expect some type of morpho-syntactic split between functional and lexical elements in the domain of the DP. Asymmetric distribution of plural and other referential features in languages can be related to the fact that they are preferably attached to the element responsible for the semantic interpretation, that is, the determiner or the modifier, introducing the referential properties (cf. Costa and Silva 2002; Manzini et al. 2020). For the sake of precision, we assume that the structure of DPs is [Determiner [Modifier [Quantifier [Noun]]]]. Obviously, inflectional elements are merged with the modifier/quantifier or the noun root, as suggested in (97a) and (97b). In (93)–(95), an example of complementary distribution is shown, whereby the classic area of D is the privileged anchor for the agreement inflections, as in (97a) for the order *modifier-noun* and (97b) for the opposite order.

(97) a.
…	P	D_φ	Q	N	
	$a_\subseteq$		alent-ui$_{MSG\subseteq}$	fitʃor	

b.
…	P	D_φ		N	Q
	$a_\subseteq$			fitʃor-u$_{MSG\subseteq}$	alent

The DP requires the identification between the argument slots of the noun and its modifiers, which, in Aromanian, are ultimately satisfied by the specifications of the noun, represented in (98a,b) by the post-nominal definite and oblique inflection. If we assimilate the workspace of the DP to a Phase, as already suggested, we see that the amalgam *lexical item+oblique inflection -ui/-u$_{MSG\subseteq}$* can satisfy the features of D, relating the noun to the sentence (the event). It is interesting to note that possessives and adjectives, which follow the noun, do not mark oblique, but agree in gender and number, as in (98a) for possessives and (98b) for postnominal adjectives.

(98) **Libofshë**

a.
i	ɔ-m	da-tə	**o**	kɛɲ-**l-u**	**a**	ɲe-**ʎ**
to.her/him	It-I.have	give-PP	to.Art	dog- PL-⊆	to	my-PL

'I have given it to my dogs'

b.
i	o	ded	**a**	**li**	sɔr-**i**	atsɛ	mar-**a**
to.her	it	I.gave	to	Art	sister-⊆	that.FSG	elder/big-FSG

'I gave it to the elder sister'

c. < atsɛ(u)$_{FSG}$, [mar-a$_{FSG}$] > → [$_\varphi$ atsɛ [$_\varphi$ mar-a]]

It should be noted that the more conservative uses insert a demonstrative element between the noun and the adjective as a sort of linker, as in (98b) (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2018), that is, a sort of D that agrees with the head noun. If so, in (98d), Merge combines the demonstrative with the following adjective based on the referential features of the noun with which they agree (cf. Manzini 2021).

A special case is the encliticization of the possessive on the noun, as in (46)-(45). Generally, the definite inflection of the noun is not realized; more precisely, the possessive is adjacent to the root, as in (99a), and the inflectional elements are merged to this sequence, yielding the complex form, as in (99b).

(99) a. < [$_R$ frat], ɲ$_{2SG\subseteq}$ > → [$_\subseteq$ [frat] ɲ]   *frat-ɲ-u* 'my brother' (cf. (46a))

b. < [$_\subseteq$ [frat] ɲ], u$_{MSG}$ > à[$_\varphi$ [$_\subseteq$ [frat] ɲ] u$_{MSG}$]

c. ɲ ←→ R __

We assume that enclitic elements are part of the inflectional structure of the word, within which they are inserted on the basis of selection constraints of the type in (99c) (for this approach to enclisis, cf. Savoia and Baldi 2023). We note that the inflectional mark

that is introduced, here –*u*, does not correspond to the class of the noun, in (99) the class III, nor to the inflectional system of the possessive. We may find forms in which inflection precedes and follows the possessive, as in *tat-u-t-u* 'tour father' in (43a), as we can expect if enclitics are inflectional heads.

7. *di/ti* + **Infinitive**

Aromanian varieties retain the full form of the infinitive, i.e., with the inflection *-VT-ri* (where TV = thematic vowel), as generally in the other Romance languages, and correspond to Early Romanian more closely than Daco-Romanian. Thus, the contact with Tosk Albanian, a infinitive-less language, did not influence the development of Aromanian syntax. In Early Romanian, *-re* infinitives were introduced by *a*, and *de* could precede. In the cartographic approach applied by Hill (2013a, 2013b) based on Rizzi's (1997) model of the left periphery, the elements *a* and *de* are identified with the position Fin; where the two co-occur, the Fin position is split into two, with *de* in the higher Fin and *a* in the lower. Naturally, we agree with Hill and Rizzi that the sentence introducers are connected with the finiteness of the sentence. Nevertheless, we do not follow the implied conclusion that elements like Aromanian *ti/di* are associated with the double categorization P and C (Fin).

The infinitive occurs in canonical control contexts, either by an antecedent or so-called arbitrary control, in alternation with the finite sentences introduced by complementizers such as *kə/ta* and *tsi*. Control environments include complements of aspectual, modal, and attitude verbs, as well as infinitival relatives. The infinitive is introduced by the prepositions *ti* 'for' or *di* 'of', unlike old Romanian, where the infinitive is selected by the preposition *a* (Pană Dindelegan 2016); moreover, it generally excludes the object clitic, both in pre- and post-verbal positions. The examples illustrate the following contexts: (100a) aspectual verbs, (100b) order/request verbs, (94c) motion verbs + infinitive, (100d) implicit relatives, (100e) causatives, and (100f) prepositions. In (100), the corresponding structures with the inflected verb are exemplified where the complementizer *tsi* is followed by the modal introducer *s* and the inflected verb agreeing with an argument of the matrix sentence.

(100) **Libofshë**

a.
mbəˈri[13]	**di/ti**	mək-a-ri	/durm-ε-ri	/cεpt-a-ri
I.stopped	of/for	eat	/sleep	/comb one's hair

'I finished eating/sleeping/combing my hair'

b.
tsə	dzεʃ	**di**	(nu)	fətsεri
to. you	I.said	of	Neg	to.do

'I told you (not) to do it'

b′.
tsə	dzεʃ	**di**	ɣ-a-ri	aist
to. you	I.tell	of	wash-TV-INF	this

'I told you to wash this'

c.
am	vən-i-t	**di/ti**	vəd-ε-ri	(ia/tini)	/ ɣ-a-ri
I.have	come-PP	of/for	see-TV-INF	her/you	/ wash-TV-INF

'I have come to see her/you/wash (myself)'

d.
esti	unə	kəmiʃ-a	**di**	ɣ-a-ri
be.3SG	a	shirt-FSG	of	wash-TV-INF

'It is a shirt to be washed'

e.
i	o	fεts	pən-a	**di**	mək-a-ri
to.him/her	it	made.1SG	bread-FSG	of	eat-TV-INF

'I made him/her the bread to eat'

Divjakë

c.

vin	**ti**	vəd-ɛ-ri	(atseu)
came.1SG	for	see-TV-INF	(him)

'I came to see him'

d.

esti	pənə	**ti**	mək-a-ri
be.3SG	bread	for	e at-TV-INF

'There is some bread to eat'

f.

dəninti	**ti**	vəd-ɛ-ri	ia
before	for	see-TV-INF	her

'Before seeing her'

Këllëz

a.

mbuˈʁi	**di**	luk-a-ʁi work-TV-Inf
stopped.1SG	of	

'I stopped working'

c.

ei	ar	vin-i-tə	**ti**	vid-ɛ-ʁi	mini
they	have	come-PP	for	see-TV-INF	me

'They have come to see me'

d.

ɛsti	unə	libʁ-ɛ	**ti**	(ni) kənt-a-ʁi
be.3SG	a	book-FSG	for	(not) read-TV-INF

'It is a book (not) to read'

Korça-Plasë

a.

mbitiˈsii	**di**	tʃit-ɛ-ri read-TV-INF	(kart-i-a) book-FSG
stopped.1SG	of		

'I stopped reading the book'

c.

vin	**ti**	vid-ɛ-ri
came.1sg	for	see-TV-INF

'I came to see you'

d.

ɛsti	unə	kart-i	**ti**	tʃit-ɛ-ri
be.3SG	a	book-FSG	for	read-TV-INF

'It is a book to read'

(101) **Libofshë**

b.

tsə	dzɛʃ		**tsi** (nu)	s	u	fats
to. you	I.said		that (Neg)	Prt	it	do.2SG

'I told you (not) to do it'

Divjakë

d.

esti	pənə		**tsi**	s	məˈkə-m
be.3SG	bread		that	Prt	eat-1PL

'There is some bread to eat'

c.

ei	ar	vin-i-tə	**ta**	s	mi	vjad-ə
they	have	come-PP	that	Prt	me	see-SUBJ.3PL

'They have come to see me'

Këllëz

c.

vin	**ta**		**s**	ti	ved
came.1sg	Prt		Prt	you	see.1SG

'I came to see you'

We note that the elements that introduce infinitives in Romance are oblique markers. [Manzini and Savoia](2018, sect. 1.4) explain these structures recalling that the standard minimalist Case licensing via Agree only applies to direct cases; however, this would be problematic, because 'CPs cannot enter into Agree relations with v, I probes because of their lack of phi-features' (p. 198). However, obliques and P embedding do not involve the Agree relation. These considerations lead to the conclusion that Romance languages, given the impossibility of licensing sentential constituents via Agree, avoid this problem

by introducing these sentences with the prepositions 'of' (genitive), 'to/for' (dative), or 'with' (instrumental).

The interpretation of control contexts can be traced to the ability of the infinitive to introduce a variable corresponding to the EPP argument of the sentence, triggering the control by a higher argument. This hypothesis is inspired by the predication theory of control, whereby infinitives realize a property and do not correspond to a clause; in other words, they are VP, a sort of nominalized verbal form, as proposed in Chierchia (1984). The infinitive preserves its ability to license an object, exactly as other nominal forms of the verb. We can associate the variable bound by an argument of the matrix sentence with the specialized morphology of these forms, more precisely the TV (cf. Savoia and Baldi 2022) as in (102a,b).

(102)   a. $< \gamma_R, a_{TV/x} > \rightarrow [[\gamma] a_{TV}]$
      b. $< [[\gamma] a_{TV}], ri_{INF} > \rightarrow [[\gamma\text{-}a_{TV}]\text{-}ri_{INF}]$

Be that as it may, the role of an argument variable in control contexts is independently supported by languages such as Aromanian and Albanian, in which the embedded verb can occur in finite form, as in the example in (100b,d), where the particle *tsi* introduces the subjunctive. Manzini and Savoia (2018, p. 292) propose that the Prts *tə* of Albanian and *tsi* of Aromanian correspond to a variable specifying the subject of the embedded sentence. This analysis is also supported by the lexical nature of the introducers: for instance, *tsi* is the wh- element 'what', in itself a nominal variable (N), in (103).

(103)	tsə	dzεʃ	[**tsi**	**s**	u		fats	'tsə dzεʃ **tsi s** u fats' (in (94b))
	T	v $_\varphi$	V	Prt/N	[…		T	v
	tsə	dzεʃ		tsi$_x$	s	u	fats	

While the Prt is necessary to enable control in finite sentences, non-finite sentences have a variable EPP argument anyway, making the Prt redundant. On the basis of the analysis of prepositional contexts in Section 5, we conclude that the relational content [⊆] of *di/ti* is available to establish the relationship between the matrix and the dependent events, as in (104).

(104)	tsə dzεʃ/am vənit	[$_\subseteq$ **di/ti** [$_v$ [[ɣ-a $_{TV}$]-ri $_{INF}$] aist					
	T	v $_\varphi$	V	Prep	[…	VP	DP
	tsə$_\varphi$ dzεʃ			di$_\subseteq$		[[ɣ-a$_x$]-ri $_{INF}$]	aist

The gist of this proposal is that the embedded infinitive is treated as the inclusion zone or the beneficiary of the matrix event, exactly like the head noun of genitives or benefactives. In other words, the epistemic, 'tell', or motion verbs are depicted as associated with the semantic space of the embedded event.

8. Conclusions

Aromanian's nominal inflection shows some types of syncretism, which we have associated with interpretive properties such as definiteness, gender (masculine and feminine), number, and part–whole relation (possessee–possessor). The hypothesis that the case corresponds to bundles of nominal or other semantic features allows us to bring to light the relationship between oblique and plural as realizations of similar semantic properties. A set of selection constraints expresses the distribution of the inflectional morphemes in various contexts. This also applies to the specialized oblique forms, introduced by the PI, analyzed as the preposition *a*, possibly followed by the definiteness element *-l(i)*. In oblique contexts, the nominal inflection specialized for oblique contexts is not able to introduce the inclusion relation on its own and the preposition is necessary. The analysis of *di* and other

elementary relators has suggested a common elementary interpretation, also applied in the case of dependent infinitives.

We adopt a morphosyntactic approach inspired by the proposals discussed by Chomsky (2019, 2021) in the direction of a syntax based on the free application of Merge (IM and EM). In this framework, complex words are yielded by merging fully interpretable subword elements within the syntactic computation and are a possible realization of the Phases.

Notes

[1] Caragiu Marioțeanu (1975, 2006) and Capidan (1932) have provided important studies on grammatical aspects of Aromanian varieties and their geographical diffusion. As to the origin of Aromanian and its place in the continuum of Romance languages, briefly discussed also in Stoica (2021), the detailed survey of Caragiu Marioțeanu (1975, 2006) clarifies the status of Aromanian, characterizing it as the native Romance variety that develops from the vulgar Latin spoken in the Southern Balkans region (south of the Danube).

[2] We are very grateful to our informants, among whom the main ones are the following: Piro Mistaku of Libofshë, 45-year-old man, farmer and worker; Leonida and Spiro Kruti of Divjakë, men between 70 and 80 years, farmers; Spiridhulla Poçi of Këllëz, 50-year-old woman, professor at the University of Gjirokastër; Wilma Veriga of Korça-Plasë, 50-year-old woman, housewife. They agreed to collaborate and made a substantial contribution to the research, providing suggestions, comments, and grammaticality judgments that greatly improved our understanding of phenomena.

[3] In these varieties, the original *l* in simple onsets has changed to *j*. Thus, *ja* 'to' corresponds to original *la*, occurring in Daco-Romanian and other Aromanian varieties.

[4] The construct with the PI *a* also characterizes the pronominal occurrence of the possessive as in (i).

    (i)   loi   a   me-l/lu-i
         took.1st   PI   my.msg/he-obl

[5] 'I took mine/hers' A similar distribution of the oblique characterizes the Northern Istro-Romanian variety spoken in Žejane (Geană 2020), where both the dative and the genitive use the *a lu* construction, as illustrated in (i) (from Geană 2020, p. 184).

    (i) Av   zis   a lu   tatu
        they.have.AUX   say.PPLE   DAT   thief.DEF
        'They told the thief'

[6] This structure can be explained by assuming that the preposition is sufficient to introduce the referential specifications necessary to the interpretation. Thus, in Albanian, one finds examples like those in (i).

    (i) nən gɔt 'in (the) glass' (Gjirokastër)
       mi libər 'over (the) book' (Shkodër)

[7] This conclusion is already clearly formulated in Chomsky (1995, p. 228): 'categories are elementary constructions from properties of lexical items, satisfying the inclusiveness condition; there are no bar levels and no distinction between lexical items and "heads" projected from them'.

8　　An anonymous reviewer wonders why the relation between inflection and meaning 'could simply not be dealt within [...] Distributed Morphology, since it is the building blocks that bring interpretational components not the inflectional elements themselves.' This is, indeed, a crucial point. In Distributed Morphology, the insertion of morphemes is successive to syntax (Late insertion); it is based on a mechanism in which sub-word elements (affixes and clitics) are understood as 'dissociated morphemes' (see the discussion in the text). The separation between syntax and morphology has the consequence of admitting morphological elements devoid of interpretive content. This is true in the case of thematic vowels of Romance languages, identified with 'ornamental pieces of morphology' by Embick (2010). What is more, agreement and case morphemes are not represented in syntax but are added post-syntactically, 'during Morphology', by virtue of the 'Late insertion' mechanism. The latter allows the featural content of syntactic terminals to be manipulated by adjustment rules such as Impoverishment with the effect of obscuring the relation between syntax and interpretation. This mechanism does not meet the requirement of the Inclusiveness Condition, whereby, between the lexical items and the heads that they project, there is no distinction (Chomsky 1995, p. 228). It is no accident that Chomsky refuses Late Merge, as discussed in fn. 10. Concluding, our basic question is why the grammar should obscure what it generates. This holds for morpho-syntax, but also for phonology, from which Morris Halle seems to derive the DM model. The solution we adoptedseems to us not only more natural and adequate but also now in accordance with the Chomskyan approach to the learnability of language structures.

9　　Late Insertion is a costly descriptive tool, to which we can assimilate the notion and the use of Late Merge, which Chomsky (2019, p. 267) criticizes as 'a complex operation of substitution of the newly Merged element in exactly in the place where it originally appeared'. Chomsky (2019, pp. 266–67) concludes that 'everything which is done with what is called Late Merge: it's completely unacceptable, because it involves operations that are complex, unmotivated, [...]'.

10　　A very common doubling is *subject–verb inflection*, as already discussed in Rizzi (1982), which, within the GB framework, proposes to characterize the inflection as [-pronoun].

11　　An anonymous reviewer asks why we discuss clitic doubling and the related DOM phenomenon in this article. The phenomenon seems to us relevant in relation to the way that pronominal elements realize case/arguments properties in the sentence. Specifically, although direct morphology of pronouns of first/second person do not distinguish between nominative and accusative, nevertheless, the accusative interpretation is expressed by clitic doubling and (variably) preposition. Again, preposition does not select the oblique but it is itself able to introduce a specialized meaning, just like in the other prepositional contexts.

12　　For instance, in Gjirokastër variety, the doubling of nominal specifications on prenominal demonstratives and nouns can occur as in (i):

(i)	ata	burr-a-t		'Those men'
	that.Pl.Nom/Acc	man-pl-def.Nom/Acc		
	pərpara	at-yrɛ	burr-a-vɛ	'Before those men'
	before	that-pl.Obl	man-pl-Obl	
	ia	ðatʃ asaj	vaiz-ɛ-s	'I gave it to that girl'
	to. her it	I.gaveɖhat.fsg.Obl	girl-fsg-Obl	

13　　An anonymous reviewer asks for more information about the contact between Aromanian and Albanian. The topic seems to go beyond the limits of this article. We only note that both Aromanian and Albanian share some important Balkan features, such as the enclitic article and the reduced use of infinitive. The data we have discussed show some borrowings from Albanian, such as, for instance, the aspectual verb *mbə/ur-ɛ-ri* 'stop', as in (100), from Albanian *mbaroj* 'I stop', as in (i)

(i)	ɛ	mbarɔva	sə	ŋgrən-i
	it	I.stopped	Art.Gen	eat.PP-Gen
	'I stopped eating it'			

During the discussion, we have highlighted other types of convergence, such as the agreement within the DP and the use of indefinite noun forms in prepositional contexts.

References

Baldi, Benedetta, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2021. Possessives in Aromanian. A comparison with Albanian and North-Calabrian dialects. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 2–3: 99–131.

Belvin, Robert, and Marcel Den Dikken. 1997. There, *happens*, to, be, have. *Lingua* 101: 151–83. [CrossRef]

Capidan, Theodor. 1932. *Aromânii Dialectul Aromân. Studiu Lingvistic*. Bucureşti: Imprimeria Naţională.

Caragiu Marioţeanu, Matilda. 1975. *Compendiu de Dialectologie Română*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Caragiu Marioţeanu, Matilda. 2006. *Aromânii şi Aromâna în Coştiinţa Contemporană*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1984. Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, USA.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998a. Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of "semantic parameter". In *Events and Grammar*. Edited by Susan Rothstein. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 53–103.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998b. Reference to Kinds across Language. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 339–405. [CrossRef]

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2019. Some Puzzling Foundational Issues: The Reading Program. In *Generative Syntax: Questions, Crossroads, and Challenges, Catalan Journal of Linguistics. Special Issue*. Edited by Ángel Gallego and Dennis Ott. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, pp. 263–85.

Chomsky, Noam. 2020. The UCLA Lectures (35 April–2 May 2019). Available online: https://www.google.com.hk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiR5oatgOmDAxUBia8BHdFnD6AQFnoECBAQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fcanvas.umn.edu%2Fcourses%2F190374%2Ffiles%2F15725106%2Fdownload%3Fverifier%3D7uikxlhlPsohUJxfnq1cRgizJKuRtEgY77sAcfJa%26wrap%3D1&usg=AOvVaw0h2n21rCHHiMti7g8Fm6ch&opi=89978449 (accessed on 24 December 2023).

Chomsky, Noam. 2021. Minimalism: Where Are We Now, and Where Can We Hope to Go. *Gengo Kenkyu* 160: 1–41.

Collins, Chris, and Richard Kayne. 2021. Towards a Theory of Morphology as Syntax. Available online: https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005693 (accessed on 4 January 2024).

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 1995. Romanian Genitive Constructions. In *Advances in Romanian Linguistics*. Edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Giuliana Giusti. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–52.

Cornilescu, Alexandra, and Alexandru Nicolae. 2011. Romanian possessives: Adjectives or pronouns? A comparative perspective. In *Studii de Lingvistica. Omagiu Doamnei Profesoare Angela Bidu-Vranceanu*. Edited by Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Alice Toma and Rodica Zafiu. Bucharest: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, pp. 111–43.

Costa, João, and M. Cristina Figueiredo Silva. 2002. Notes on nominal and verbal agreement in Portuguese. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 27: 17–29.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1990. Clitic Doubling, Wh-Movement, and Quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 351–97.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, and Ion Giurgea, eds. 2013. *A Reference Grammar of Romanian, Volume 1: The Noun Phrase*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, and Isabela Nedelcu. 2013. De-al genitives. In *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*. Edited by Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Ion Giurgea. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 339–47.

Embick, David. 2010. *Localism versus Globalism in Morphology and Phonology*. Cambrigde: The MIT Press.

Embick, David, and Rolf Noyer. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 555–95. [CrossRef]

Franco, Ludovico, and M. Rita Manzini. 2017. Instrumental prepositions and case: Contexts of occurrence and alternations with datives. *Glossa* 2: 1–37. [CrossRef]

Franco, Ludovico, M. Rita Manzini, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2021. Locative Ps as general relators: Location, direction, DOM in Romance. *Linguistic Variation* 21: 135–73. [CrossRef]

Geană, Ionuț. 2020. Case-marking in Istro-Romanian. *Studia UBB Philologia* 4: 173–87. [CrossRef]

Giurgea, Ion. 2012. The origin of the Romanian 'possessive-genitival article' *al* and the development of the demonstrative system. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 57: 35–65.

Giusti, Giuliana. Forthcoming. Arguments for the Universality of D and Determiners. Available online: https://iris.unive.it/retrieve/e4239dde-2e03-7180-e053-3705fe0a3322/universal%20dp%20second%20draft.pdf (accessed on 24 December 2023).

Grosu, Alexander. 1994. *Three Studies in Locality and Case*. London: Routledge.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The view from Building 20*. Edited by Ken Hale and Samuel J. Keyser. Cambridge: The MIT Press, pp. 111–76.

Halle, Morris, and Bert Vaux. 1997. Theoretical aspects of Indo-European nominal morphology: The nominal declension of Latin and Armenian. In *Mir Curad. A Festschrift in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Edited by Jay Jasanoff, Craig Melchert and Lisi Olivier. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck.

Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistics Inquiry* 16: 547–93.

Hill, Virginia. 2013a. The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive. *The Linguistic Review* 30: 1–37. [CrossRef]

Hill, Virginia. 2013b. The emergence of the Romanian supine. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3: 230–71. [CrossRef]

Jaeggli, Osvaldo. 1981. *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kramer, Ruth. 2015. *The Morphosyntax of Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2017. The Romanian Definite Article in a Comparative Romance Perspective. In *Sintaxa ca mod de a fi. Omagiu doamnei profesoare Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, la aniversare*. Edited by Adina Dragomirescu, Alexandru Nicolae, Camelia Stan and Rodica Zafiu. Bucharest: Editura Universități din București, pp. 231–47.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1995. A case of construct state in Romance. In *Scritti Linguistici e Filologici in Onore di Tristano BOLELLI*. Edited by Roberto Ajello and Saverio Sani. Pisa: Pacini, pp. 293–329.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1996. *The Syntax of N-Raising: A Minimalist Theory*. OTS Working Papers, 96, no. 5. Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2011. Human landmarks in spatial expressions: From Latin to Romance. In *Case, Animacy, and Semantic Roles*. Edited by Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi and Jussi Ylikoski. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 209–34.

Maiden, Martin, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uță Bărbulescu, and Rodica Zafiu. 2021. *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manzini, M. Rita. 2021. Chomsky's (2020) Links and linker phenomena. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali. Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies (QULSO)* 7: 89–102.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2005. *I Dialetti Italiani e Romanci. Morfosintassi Generativa, 3 vv*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2010. Case as denotation. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata SILTA* 39: 409–39.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2011. Reducing 'case' to 'agreement': Nominal inflections in the Geg Albanian variety of Shkodër. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 11: 76–120. [CrossRef]

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2014. From Latin to Romance: Case loss and preservation in pronominal systems. *Probus* 26: 217–48. [CrossRef]

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2018. *The Morphosyntax of Albanian and Aromanian Varieties: Case, Agreement, Complementation*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, and Benedetta Baldi. 2020. Microvariation and macrocategories: Differential Plural Marking and Phase theory. *L'Italia Dialettale* 82: 189–212.

Marantz, Alec. 2001. *Words*, Handout for the WCCFL (West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics) XX, University of Southern California, February 2001. Available online: https://babel.ucsc.edu/~hank/mrg.readings/Phases_and_Words_Final.pdf (accessed on 4 January 2024).

Nedelcu, Isabela. 2013. Prepositions and prepositional phrases. In *The grammar of Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 451–65.

Nedelcu, Isabela. 2016. Prepositions and prepositional phrases. In *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 424–42.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2016. *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela, ed. 2013. *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (coordinator), Raluca Brăescu, Adina Dragomirescu, Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, and Rodica Zafiu. 2019. *Gramatica Limbii Române*. Bucureşti: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

Poçi, Spiridhulla. 2009. *Vllehtë. Historia dhe Gjuha e tyrë*. Tiranë: Botimet Toena.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*. Edited by Liliane Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281–339.

Rîpeanu Reinheimer, Sanda, Liliane Tasmowski, and Andra Vasilescu. 2013. *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*. Edited by Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Ion Giurgea. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 231–68.

Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1954. *Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten III. Syntax und Wortbildung*. Berlin: A. Francke AG.

Rosetti, Alexandru. 1986. *Istoria Limbii Române*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Savoia, Leonardo M., and Benedetta Baldi. 2022. Root, Thematic Vowels and Inflectional Exponents in Verbs: A Morpho-Syntactic Analysis. *Languages* 7: 104. [CrossRef]

Savoia, Leonardo M., and Benedetta Baldi. 2023. Enclisis, mesoclisis and inflection in Italo-Romance varieties: A minimalist analysis. *Lingbaw* 9: 172–96. [CrossRef]

Savoia, Leonardo M., Benedetta Baldi, and M. Rita Manzini. 2020. Prepositions in Aromanian. *Studii şi Cercetari Lingvistice* LXXI: 149–60.

Stan, Camelia. 2016. Polydefinite structures. In *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 304–12.

Stoica, Daniela-Carmen. 2021. Identity Constructions among the Members of the Aromanian Community in the Korçë Area. In *The Romance-Speaking Balkans. Language and the Politics of Identity*. Edited by Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Mihai Dragnea, Thede Kahl, Blagovest Njagulov, Donald L. Dyer and Angelo Costanzo. Leiden: Brill, pp. 146–70.

Svenonius, Peter. 2006. The Emergence of Axial Parts. *Nordlyd: Tromsø Working Papers in Linguistics* 33: 1–22. [CrossRef] [PubMed]