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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.
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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. 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. 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 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 Marioteanu 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. fitjor-ʎ-i vs. o fitjor-ʎ-u
      boy-DEF PL PI boy-DEF OBL
      ‘The boys’ ‘To/ of the boys’
   b. majir-a vs. a li majir-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
   I am dat om-ul-ui/femei-i
   it I have given man-DEF-OBL/woman-OBL.
   ‘I have given it to the man/to the woman’

   Armanian (Libofshë)
   o barbat-u /a li frt-i
   ‘I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl’

   b. Genitive contexts

   Daco-Romanian
   Carte-a om-ul-ui/femi-i
   man-DEF-OBL/woman-OBL
   ‘The book of the man/of the woman’

   Armanian (Libofshë)
   o fotjor-u /a li frt-i
   ‘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
   a mr-u/a ta-u /a nost(ar)
   book-FSG PI my.rsg/PI your.rsg / 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, kat, a, yalla ‘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. daninti di fitʃor-ʎ-i/mujɛr-l-i
    before of boy-DEF-PL/woman-DEF-PL
    ‘Before the boys/the women’

b. daninti o fitʃor-ʎ-u/mujɛr-ɮ-u
    before  PI  boy-DEF-OBL/PI women-DEF-Obl
    ‘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) Këllez
a. mbu’iri di luk-a-ri
    stopped.sgc  work-TV-Inf
    ‘I stopped working’

b. ei ar vi-i-ta ti vid-r-ri 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 Marioteanu 1975, 2006; Poçi 2009). Caragiu Marioteanu (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 Panâ 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 Rêmën 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-Rêmën, 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/unә ‘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 Mari‑oţeanu 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, ‑ų/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 vanit / am vadzut fitor‑u / barbat‑u / fėt‑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 vanit / am vadzut un fitor / un barbat / un a fėt‑a
   (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/a girl’

(8) Libofshë
a. arә vanit / am vadzut fitor‑ʎ‑i / barbats‑i‑i‑i / fėt(a)‑i‑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. arә vanit / am vadzut Mults fitor‑i / barbats / mult fėt‑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 fitor‑u / o barbat‑u / a li fėt‑i
   to.him/her it 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 fitor / o un barbat / a (li) un fėt‑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 fitor‑i‑u / o barbats‑ur‑j‑u / o fėt‑i‑u
   to.them it I gave PI boy‑Def‑OBL / PI man‑Def‑OBL.PL / PI girl‑PL‑OBL
   ‘I gave it to the boys/the men/the girls’

b. i o ded o ts‑ur fitor‑i‑i‑i / o doi barbats / o mult fėt‑i
   to.them it I gave PI that‑Def‑OBL.PL / PI two man‑PL / PI many girl‑PL
   ‘I gave it to these boys/to two men/to many girls’

(11) Divjakë
a. vini / vadzui fitor‑u / barbat‑u / fėt‑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 / vadzui un fitor / un barbat / un a fėt‑a
   (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’
Divjakë

(12)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{'vinorọ} /vodzi/ & \text{fat} & /bɔrbats/-je & \text{fəta-}i \\
\text{they came} & /ləsw & \text{boy-PI.DEF} & /\text{man-PI.DEF} & /\text{girl-DE} \text{F-PI} \\
\text{‘The boys/the men/the girls came’, ‘I saw the boys/the men/the girls’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{'vinorọ} /vodzi/ & \text{ndoi fittor} & /\text{bɔrbats} & \text{ndau fət-i} \\
\text{they came} & /ləsw & \text{some.M boy} & /\text{some.M man.PI} & /\text{some.F girl-PI} \\
\text{‘Some boys/some men/some girls came’/ ‘I saw some boys/some men/some girls’}
\end{align*}
\]

Divjakë

(13)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{'i u dau o fatfor-u} & /\text{bɔrbat-u} & /a li/a ts-jei & \text{fət-i} \\
\text{to him/her} & /\text{I give} & \text{PI boy-MSG.DEF} & /\text{PI that-MSG.} & \text{PI girl-MSG.} \\
\text{‘I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{'i u dau o un fittor} & /\text{bɔrbat} & /a li un fət-a \\
\text{to him/her} & /\text{I gave} & \text{PI a boy} & /\text{PI a man} & /\text{PI a girl-MSG} \\
\text{‘I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl’}
\end{align*}
\]

Divjakë

(14)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{'y u dau o fətfor-ay-u} & /\text{bɔrbats-ay-u} & /\text{fət-ay-u} \\
\text{to them} & /\text{I give} & \text{PI boy-DEF.PI-MSG.DEF} & /\text{PI man-DEF.PI-MSG.} & /\text{PI girl-DEF.PI-MSG.} \\
\text{‘I gave it to the boys/to the men/to the girls’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{'y u dau o muls fətfor(-0)-i} & /\text{bɔrbats} & /\text{multi} & \text{fət-i} \\
\text{to them} & /\text{I give} & \text{PI many.PI boy-DEF.PI-MSG.DEF} & /\text{PI many.PI man} & /\text{PI many.PI girl-MSG.DEF} \\
\text{‘I gave it to these boys/to two men/to many girls’}
\end{align*}
\]

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 Këllez. The plural oblique selects a specialized morphology, -or in Korça-Plasë and -u in Këllez (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 -vi in the feminine, which combines with the simple stem of masculine nouns or the inflected oblique of feminine nouns, as in (17b) and (21b).

Korça-Plasë

(15)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{'vinorọ} /\text{vodzi/ & fətfor-u & /bɔrbats-u & /fət-a} \\
\text{they came} & /\text{ləsw & boy-MSG.DEF & /man-FSG.DEF & /girl-FSG.DEF} \\
\text{‘The boy/the man/the girl came’, ‘I saw the boy/the man/the girl’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{'vinorọ} /\text{vodzi/ & un fittor & /bɔrbat & /una fət-a} \\
\text{they came} & /\text{ləsw & a boy & /a man & /a girl-FSG} \\
\text{‘A boy/a man/a girl came’, ‘I saw a boy/a man/a girl’}
\end{align*}
\]

Korça-Plasë

(16)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{'vinorọ} /\text{vodzi/ & fətfor-ja & /bɔrbats-ja & /fət-i-i} \\
\text{they came} & /\text{ləsw & boy-PI.DEF & /man-PI.DEF & /girl-PI.DEF-PI} \\
\text{‘The boys/the men/the girls came’, ‘I saw the boys/the men/the girls’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{'vinorọ} /\text{vodzi/ & muls fittor & /muls bɔrbats & /muls-i fət-i} \\
\text{they came} & /\text{ləsw & many.PI boy & /many.PI man & /many.PI girl-MSG.DEF} \\
\text{‘Many boys/many men/many girls came’/ ‘I saw many boys/many men/many girls’}
\end{align*}
\]
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 datives and genitives are not introduced by the PI.

In this sense, this article can contribute to deepening the relation between inflectional, ablaut, and analogical processes. Exemplified by the paradigmatic data discussed in this paper, this approach may provide a relevant test bench for this theoretical approach. If it is to be tested, whether the extended features of the Aromanian nominal paradigms are endowed with interpretable content. As a consequence, syncretism must be traceable through the semantic properties of the elements involved. From this perspective, the Aromanian distribution of case/number and definiteness exponents can sufficiently be introduced by the PI. In what follows, we collate the systems of direct and oblique dative and genitive forms, in the singular and in the plural. We begin with the dialects they have come-for see-TV-INF me to.them it I.gave PI two boy-DEF-PL.OBL /PI two man-DEF-PL.OBL /PI two girl-PL-DEF-PL.OBL

In the noun class deriving from the third declension 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.

### Korça-Plasë

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>det</td>
<td>a (l) fitʃor-u</td>
<td>/a borbats-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to.him/her</td>
<td>I.gave</td>
<td>PI boy-MSG.Def</td>
<td>/PI man-MSG.Def</td>
<td>/PI girl-sg-Obl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>det</td>
<td>a un-ui fitʃor</td>
<td>/a un-ui borbats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to.him/her</td>
<td>I.gave</td>
<td>PI Art-Obl.MSG boy</td>
<td>/PI Art-Obl.MSG man</td>
<td>/PI Art-Obl.fsg girl-Obl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Libofshë

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>arı vonit</td>
<td>/am vadhut</td>
<td>majer-a</td>
<td>/km-l-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)he has come</td>
<td>/l have seen</td>
<td>woman-sg,Def</td>
<td>/dog-Def-sg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>arı vonit</td>
<td>/am vadhut</td>
<td>una majer-i</td>
<td>/un km-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)he has come</td>
<td>/l have seen</td>
<td>a woman-sg</td>
<td>/a dog-sg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kellëz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>vinaro</td>
<td>/vadzui</td>
<td>fitʃor-je</td>
<td>/borbats-je</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they came</td>
<td>/L saw</td>
<td>boy-MSG.Def</td>
<td>/man-MSG.Def</td>
<td>/girl-fsg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>vinaro</td>
<td>/vidzui</td>
<td>mults fitʃor</td>
<td>/ndoi borbats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they came</td>
<td>/L saw</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>many.pl boy(s)</td>
<td>/some man.pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kellëz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ded</td>
<td>a fitʃor-u</td>
<td>/a borbatsa-l-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to.him/her</td>
<td>I.gave</td>
<td>PI boy-PL-Obl</td>
<td>/PI men-pl-Obl</td>
<td>/PI girl-pl-Obl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ded</td>
<td>a un-ui fitʃor</td>
<td>/a un-ui borbats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to.him/her</td>
<td>I.gave</td>
<td>PI Art-Obl.MSG boy</td>
<td>/PI Art-Obl.MSG man</td>
<td>/PI Art-Obl.fsg girl-Obl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>det</td>
<td>a fitʃor-l-u</td>
<td>/a borbatsa-l-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to.them it</td>
<td>I.gave</td>
<td>PI boy-PL-Obl</td>
<td>/PI men-pl-Obl</td>
<td>/PI girl-pl-Obl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>det</td>
<td>a doi fitʃor-l-u</td>
<td>/a tsal-oi borbatsa-l-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to.them it</td>
<td>I.gave</td>
<td>PI two boy-PL-Obl</td>
<td>/PI those-pl-Obl</td>
<td>/PI two girl-pl-Obl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl’

‘I gave it to the boys/to the men/to the girls’

‘I gave it to a boy/a man/a girl came’, ‘I saw the boy/a man/a girl’

‘I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl’

‘I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl’

‘I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl’

‘I gave it to the boys/to the men/to the girls’

‘I gave it to two boys/to two men/to two girls’

‘A boy/a man/a girl came’, ‘I saw a boy/a man/a girl’

‘A boy/a man/a girl came’, ‘I saw a boy/a man/a girl’

‘I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl’

‘I gave it to a boy/to a man/to a girl’

‘I gave it to the boy/to the man/to the girl’

‘I gave it to the boys/to the men/to the girls’

‘I gave it to two boys/to two men/to two girls’

‘The woman/the dog has come’, ‘I have seen the woman/the dog’
(24) **Libofshë**

a. *aro vonit /am vodzut mojer-i/* /kej-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. *aro vonit /am vodzut mult mojer/* /kej
   - 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 mojer-i/* /o ken-i/*
   - to.him/her it I.gave Pl woman-Obl /Pl dog-Def-Obl

   ‘I gave it to the woman/to the dog’

b. i o ded *a/o un mojer-i/* /o un ken-i
   - to.him/her it I.gave Pl a woman-Obl /Pl a dog-Obl

   ‘I gave it to a woman/to a dog’

(26) **Libofshë**

a. i o ded *o mojer-i/* /o kej-i/*
   - to.them it I.gave Pl woman-Def-Obl /Pl dog-Def-Obl

   ‘I gave it to the women/to the dogs’

b. i oy ded *o dau mojer-i/* /o mults kej
   - to.them it I.gave Pl two woman-pl /Pl many-pl dogs

   ‘I gave it to two women/to many dogs’

(27) **Korça-Plasë**

a. *vini /vidzui mujer-i-a/* /kena-i/*
   - (s)he came /Lsaw woman-sc-fsc-Def /dog-Def-sg

   ‘The woman/the dog has come’, ‘I have seen the woman/the dog’

b. *vini /vidzui una mujer-i/* /un kei
   - (s)he came /Lsaw a woman-sg /a dog-sg

   ‘A woman/a dog has come’, ‘I have seen a woman/a dog’

(28) **Korça-Plasë**

a. ‘vinora /vidzui mujer-i-a-i/* /kej-j/*
   - they came /Lsaw woman-pl-def-pl /dog-pl-def-pl

   ‘The women/the dogs came’, ‘I saw the women/the dogs’

b. ‘vinora /vidzui mult-i mujer-i/* /mult kej
   - they came /Lsaw many-pl woman-pl /many-pl dog-pl

   ‘Many women/man many dogs came’, ‘I saw many women/man dogs’

(29) **Korça-Plasë**

a. i det *a li muj h-i/* /a i ken-i-i/*
   - to.him/her it I.gave Pl woman-Obl /Pl dog-sg-Def-Obl

   ‘I gave it to the woman/to the dog’

b. i det *a un-ei mujer-i/* /a un-ui ken-i
   - to.him/her it I.gave Pl Art-Obl fsc woman-Obl /Pl Art-Obl sce dog-Obl

   ‘I gave it to a woman/to a dog’

(30) **Korça-Plasë**

a. i det *a muj-1-or/* /a kej-1-or
   - to.them it I.gave Pl woman-def-Obl-pl /Pl dog-def-Obl-pl

   ‘I gave it to the women/to the dogs’

b. i det *a mult-i muj h-1-or/* /a mults kej-1-or
   - to.them it I.gave Pl many-pl woman-def-Obl-pl /Pl 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 *-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) Pl alternants.
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)

a. **Definite paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>MPL</th>
<th>FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom/Acc contexts</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>(Pal/ʎ)-i</td>
<td>(-l/ʎ)-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat/Gen contexts</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-l-um/(Pal)-ur-u/-v-u</td>
<td>-r-um/-l-um/-v-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Indefinite paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>MPL</th>
<th>FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom/Acc contexts</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>-ә Pal/(-i)</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat/Gen contexts</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>θ/Pal/</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. PI: o/¬¬ NMSG, ali/¬¬ NSG, o/¬¬ NPL

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

a. **Definite paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>MPL</th>
<th>FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom/Acc contexts</td>
<td>-l-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-i</td>
<td>-l-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat/Gen contexts</td>
<td>-l-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-um/-v-u</td>
<td>-l-um/-v-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Indefinite paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>MPL</th>
<th>FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom/Acc contexts</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat/Gen contexts</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-um/-v-u</td>
<td>-l-um/-v-u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. PI: o/¬¬ NMSG, ali/¬¬ NSG, o/¬¬ NPL

(34) Fërshërot

a. **Definite paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>MPL</th>
<th>FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom/Acc contexts</td>
<td>-l-i</td>
<td>-l-i-a</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-je</td>
<td>-l/a-l-i Korça-Plasë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat/Gen contexts</td>
<td>-l-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-je</td>
<td>-l/-l-e Këllëz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-l-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-om</td>
<td>-l-or Korça-Plasë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-l-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-um</td>
<td>-l-u Këllëz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Indefinite paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSG</th>
<th>FSG</th>
<th>MPL</th>
<th>FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom/Acc contexts</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)</td>
<td>-i Korça-Plasë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat/Gen contexts</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)</td>
<td>-l-or Korça-Plasë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-om</td>
<td>-l-or Këllëz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>(Pal)-l-um</td>
<td>-l-u Këllëz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. PI: a(li)/¬¬ NMSG, a(t)/¬¬ NMSG, 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 -ө 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, -o/-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 *borbat/borbats* ‘man/men’, *multi/mults* ‘much/many’, *ken/ken* ‘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 *-s*/*-r*, in (31a) and (33a), in the Libofshë dialect, and *-y* 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. Panâ Dindelegan 2013; Panâ 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 lë* 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 lë* before the singular feminine and *a lë* 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>2sg</th>
<th>3sg</th>
<th>3pl</th>
<th>1pl</th>
<th>2pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. direct</td>
<td>mini</td>
<td>tini</td>
<td>eu/ia</td>
<td>el/el</td>
<td>noi</td>
<td>voi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. dative</td>
<td>a jía</td>
<td>a tsea</td>
<td>o yui/a jei</td>
<td>o yoró</td>
<td>a nau</td>
<td>a vau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. u/ts</td>
<td>ar dato</td>
<td>a j-i-a</td>
<td>a ts-ea</td>
<td>/a ts-ea</td>
<td>/a ts-ea</td>
<td>/a ts-ea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘They gave it to me/to you’

A similar system characterizes Fërshërot, with the difference that the third person elements also include the forms *nes, nes-e, nes/i* ‘he/she/they, their’, 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>2sg</th>
<th>3sg</th>
<th>3pl</th>
<th>1pl</th>
<th>2pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. direct</td>
<td>mini</td>
<td>tini</td>
<td>/el/ia/nes/nesje</td>
<td>/el/elii/nes-nes-i</td>
<td>noi</td>
<td>voi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. dative</td>
<td>a jía</td>
<td>a teja</td>
<td>a lui/a je</td>
<td>a lor</td>
<td>a nau</td>
<td>a vau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. mi /ts</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/a</td>
<td>/a</td>
<td>/a</td>
<td>/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some dialects, *nes* 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.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (37) Libofshë a. mәn‑a fit(for‑u) / a li frt-i  
  - hand-fsg PI boy-msg /PI girl-Obl  
  - ‘The hand of the boy/of the girl’

- **a’.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (37) Libofshë a. kәd‑ә a li fit-or‑u / a li frt-i  
  - tail-Def sg PI dog-Def-Obl /PI a dog-Obl  
  - ‘The tail of the dog/of a dog’

- **b.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (37) Libofshë a. this is a li fit‑i‑ji / a li fit‑i‑ji  
  - a li fit‑i‑ji / a li muj‑i  
  - hand-DEF.PL PI boy-DEF.OBL /PI girl-DEF.OBL /PI woman-DEF.OBL  
  - ‘This is of the boys/of the women’

(38) **Divjakë**

- **a.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (38) Divjakë a. mәn‑a fit‑i‑ji / a li frt‑i‑ji  
  - hand-fsg PI boy-msg /PI girl-Obl  
  - ‘The hand of the boy/of the woman’

- **b.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (38) Divjakë a. mәl‑i a fit‑i‑ji / a li frt‑i‑ji  
  - hand-DEF.PL PI boy-DEF.OBL /PI girl-DEF.OBL /PI woman-DEF.OBL  
  - ‘The hands of the boys/of the girls’

(39) **Korça-Plasë**

- **a.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (39) Korça-Plasë a. mәn‑a a li fit‑for‑u / a li frt‑i‑ji / a li muj‑er‑i  
  - hand-fsg PI boy-msg /PI girl-Obl /PI woman-Obl /PI a-Obl woman-Obl  
  - ‘The hand of the girl/of the woman/of a woman’

- **b.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (39) Korça-Plasë a. mәn‑a a li fit‑for‑u / a li frt‑i‑ji / a li muj‑er‑i  
  - hand-fsg PI boy-msg /PI girl-Obl /PI woman-Obl /PI a-Obl woman-Obl  
  - ‘The hand of the boy/of the girl/of a boy/of a girl’

(40) **Këllez**

- **a.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (40) Këllez a. mәn‑a a li fit‑for‑u / a li frt‑i‑ji / a li muj‑er‑i  
  - hand-fsg PI boy-msg /PI girl-Obl /PI woman-Obl /PI a-Obl woman-Obl  
  - ‘The hand of the boy/of the girl/of a boy/of a girl’

- **b.**  
  - Languages 2024, 9, 46  
  - (40) Këllez a. mәn‑a a li fit‑for‑u / a li frt‑i‑ji / a li muj‑er‑i  
  - hand-fsg PI boy-msg /PI girl-Obl /PI woman-Obl /PI a-Obl woman-Obl  
  - ‘The hand of the boy/of the girl/of a boy/of a girl’

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 me- feminine vs. me- masculine, and the nominal exponents, such as, for instance, -l/‑ 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 yuila jeljo yorg ‘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).
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.

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).
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(87) a. \[ ⊆ [bərbats]-ur-u\]

b. < a ⊆ , [⊆ ... is systematic only with 

first and second person pronouns, differently from the third person, as in (89a'), where it

c. reflexive    eu z

d.  e clusters

(88) a. am vәdzut frat‑

b. nipot‑u‑

c. clusters

d. This is mine/yours/his/her

(89) a'.

b. have.1st

c. seen

d. brother-my-def.msg

e. Pl

f. jee-

g. a

h. je-

i. PI

j. my.msg

k. My brothers

(90)

Këllëz

a. tat‑u‑t‑u

b. ni‑pot‑u‑j‑u

c. i

d. to.him/her

e. It‑I.have given PI man‑my‑MSG

f. buubat‑j‑u

g. a

h. Pl

i. man-my-msg

j. My nephew

(91)

Castelluccio (Foggia, Apulia)

(92)

Morano (Calabria)

(93)

Këllëz

(95)

Castelluccio (Foggia, Apulia)

(96)

Morano (Calabria)

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 (Rohlf 1954, § 640; cf. Manzini and Savoia 2011; Baldi and Savoia
2021), as in (46) for a North-Apulian variety:

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).

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 dative⁵. 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*, *ya/ja/la* ’at, to’, *tu ’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 *ya/la ’at/to’. The element *kat ’at, to* is admitted with both kinds of referents.
Languages 2024, 9, x FOR PEER REVIEW 3 of 38

(48) **Libofshë**

a. **High-ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>estli</th>
<th>ya/kat</th>
<th>mini</th>
<th>/noi/atseu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be.3rd</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>/us/him-msg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He stays at my/our/his place’

a’. atseu nrdzi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ya</th>
<th>frt-a a mr-u</th>
<th>/fitfor-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

that.rsg goes
to
girl-rsg PI my.rsg

‘He goes to my/to his daughter’

a”. eu ini

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ya</th>
<th>mini</th>
<th>/tini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he comes to me</td>
<td>/you</td>
<td>/us/him.rsg/ her.rsg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He comes to me/you/us/them/him’

b. **Low-ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>atseu</th>
<th>ini</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>kas-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that.rsg comes to home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He comes home’

b’. esti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a/kat/tu</th>
<th>kas-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be.3rd</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘(S)he is at/in (the) home’

b”. mini

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>va</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>neg</th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>ðom-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>willPrt</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>to/in</td>
<td>room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I will go to my room’

that.rsg comes to bed

‘He comes to bed/bar/the church’

(49) **Divjakë**

a. **High-ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mini</th>
<th>viŋ</th>
<th>ja</th>
<th>tini</th>
<th>/atse-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I come to you/to him’

b. **Low-ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>esku</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>kasә</th>
<th>/tu</th>
<th>makin-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>at/in</td>
<td>house-rsg</td>
<td>/in</td>
<td>car-rsg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I am at home/in the car’

(50) **Korça-Plasë**

a. **High-ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mini</th>
<th>nek</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>so-r-a</th>
<th>a mi’a</th>
<th>/nes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>sister-rsg</td>
<td>PI my-rsg</td>
<td>/he.rsg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I go to my sister/to my brother/to him’

b. **Low-ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mini</th>
<th>est/neg</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>kas-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>am/go</td>
<td>at/to</td>
<td>home-sc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I am at home/I go home’

b’. mini est

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tu</th>
<th>krivat-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I am in bed’

(51) **Këllëz**

a. **High ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>el</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>nage</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>mini</th>
<th>/nes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that.rsg</td>
<td>will Prt</td>
<td>goes</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He will go to me/him/that girl’

b. **Low ranked referents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>el nedzi</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>kas-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he went</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>house-rsg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He went home’

b’. el nedzi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>la</th>
<th>krm</th>
<th>/krm-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he went</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He went to the field/to his field’

b”. el nedzi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tu</th>
<th>ðom-ә</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he went to/in</td>
<td>house-rsg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘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 pišti ‘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 /atseu /noi
   with me /him‑msg /her‑fsg /us
   ‘With me/him/her/us’
   vini ku tini /mini/ majer‑i/ fitfor‑u
   he comes with you /me /woman‑fsg/ boy‑msg
   ‘He comes with me/yOU/the woman/the boy’
   a’. ku kotsut‑u
   with knife‑msg
   ‘With the knife’
   b. dup mini /atseu /muj‑a
   after me /him‑msg /woman‑fsg
   ‘After me/him/the woman’
   c. o fakә 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 nәg frә fitfor /fitfor‑je
   I go without (the) boy /the boys
   ‘I go without the boy/the boys’
   b. u fets ti tini /frt‑a /fatfor‑u /bәrbats‑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 bәrbat‑u /majer‑e
   that is for man‑msg /woman‑fsg
   ‘(S)he comes with the boy/a boy’

(54) Korça‑Plasë
a. jin ku fitfor‑u /fjat‑a
   I come with boy‑msg /girl‑fsg
   ‘I come with the boy/the girl’
   a’. nәg ku el /ia /nәs
   I go with he /she /he‑msg
   ‘I go with him/her/him’
   c. u fak ti fitfor(‑u a me‑l) /tini
   it I make for boy(‑msg my‑msg) /you
   ‘I make for the boy/for my boy/for you’
   d. pištә (aiʃә) men‑ә /(aiʃ) fitfor
   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.  

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>man-a</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>mujer-o</th>
<th>/a li mujer-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hand-rsc of woman-rsg</td>
<td>/PI woman-Obl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The hand of (the) woman’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kas-a</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>mujer-l-i</th>
<th>/a li mujer-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>house-rsc of woman-pl</td>
<td>/PI woman-Obl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The house of the woman’

(56) **Korça-Plasë**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mën-a</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>aist fitfor</th>
<th>/a l fitfor-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hand-rsc of this boy-msg</td>
<td>/PI boy-msg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The hand of that boy/of the boy’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kuad-a</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>kën-i</th>
<th>/a l kën-i-l-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tail-rsc of dog-msg</td>
<td>/PI dog-Obl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The tail of the dog’

(57) **Kellëz**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>uno mën-a</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>fjat-o</th>
<th>/di mujer-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one hand of girl-rsg</td>
<td>/of woman-rsg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘One hand of girl/of woman’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mon-a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>frta-ji</th>
<th>/a mujer-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hand-fsg of girl-Obl</td>
<td>/PI woman-Obl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘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 possives, in (a.iii), alternating with *di* ‘of’ followed by the pronoun, in (b.iii).

(58) **Libofshë**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. i.</th>
<th>daninti</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>fitfor-á-u</th>
<th>/o mujer-á-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before PI boy-def-Obl</td>
<td>/PI women-def-Obl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Before the boys/the women’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. i.</th>
<th>daninti</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>fitfor-á-i</th>
<th>/di mujer-l-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before of boy-def-pl</td>
<td>/of woman-def-pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Before the girls’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.ii.</th>
<th>daninti</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>frt-á-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before PI girl-def-Obl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.ii.</th>
<th>daninti</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>frt-á-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before of girl-def-pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Before the girls’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.iii.</th>
<th>dan poi</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>me-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after PI my-fsg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.iii.</th>
<th>dan poi</th>
<th><em>di</em></th>
<th>mini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(59) Divjakë

a.i. 

b.i. 

a. ii. 

b. ii. 

(60) Korça-Plasë

a. ii. 

b. iii. 

(61) Këllëz

a. i. 

b. i. 

a. iii. 

b. iii. 

The distribution of the third person element nes 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 

b. ar 

c. ar 

(63) Këllëz

ku, ti, di, la 

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).
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. \( \varepsilon l \) vini \( di \) la \( tini \)  
he comes of to you  
‘He comes to you’

Korça-Plasë

b. Aist lukur esti fap-ta \( di \) la fitfor-\( u \)  
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 fitfor \( d \) a je-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’. 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. 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
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 \( \subseteq \), 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 \( \subseteq \), 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.

\[(69) \quad \text{di: } \subseteq\]

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 \( \varphi \) 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 \( v \).

\[(70) \quad \text{a. } < \text{di}_ \subseteq \varphi [\text{fit}\text{or-ʎ-i}] > \rightarrow [\text{p di}_ \subseteq \varphi \text{ [fit}\text{or-ʎ-i}]] \]
\[\text{b. } < \text{daniinti } N, [\text{p di}_ \subseteq \varphi [\text{fit}\text{or-ʎ-i}]] > \rightarrow [\text{PP di}_ \subseteq \varphi [\text{fit}\text{or-ʎ-i}]] \quad \text{‘before the boys’, in (54b.i)}\]
\[\text{c. } v…. \text{Locative } N \quad \text{P } \quad \text{D } \varphi \quad \text{N} \quad \text{daniinti } \text{di}_ \subseteq \text{fit}\text{or-ʎ-i}\]

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) *fitforía* ‘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* somewhat recalls the Italian preposition *da*, arguably deriving from *di-adlab* (Rohlfs 1954, § 833).

\[(71) \quad \text{a. } \text{la/ya: } [[\text{place part of} ] \subseteq ] \]
\[\text{b. } \text{di la: } [\subseteq [\text{animate place part of} ] \subseteq ]\]
The DOM effect, contrasting *yalla*/*kat* and *ai*/*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 animates 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 *ai*/*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 dsam* ‘of glass’, we can still treat the mass noun, here *dsam*, 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 *-l-, 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 *kmefi-l-i son la-i di nes* ‘the shirts are washed by him’ (cf. (66c)). The derivation combines the root and the agreement morphology, as in (72a,b,c).

(72) a. \[<1-a, \_TV > \rightarrow [la \_s] \]
   b. \[<1-a, _tpP > \rightarrow [[la] _TP] \]
   c. \[<1-a-t, _ipU > \rightarrow [\_p [lat] _i] \]
   d. \[... \_vp \_PastParticiple Prep \_DP/Causer \_nes\_vp \]

At this point, we must take into account the Pls, 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/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 Dindeleanu et al. 2019). According to some analyses, PIs combine the nominal invariable base a with the definite article, whereby aI 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 Dindeleanu 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 $kas$ ‘in the house’. The partial agreement with the possessor, alternating a l/a l/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. $a = [\{\leq\} (locative)]/\_ (deictic/Q) [IN] definite inflection$
   b. $di = [\leq]/\_ (deictic) N$

This analysis can be also applied to other basic prepositions, such as ti ‘for’, which attributes the quality ‘beneficiary’ to the recipient/possessor, $[[\leq], (beneficiary)]$.

The third person pronouns nes/nes-č/nes/-i are typical of Aromanian, as noted by Capidan (1932) and Caragiu Marioşeanu (1975). In some varieties, for example, the Fërshe rotor of Këlëz, 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 nes. 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-es into a prefixed prepositional element n followed by the third person morpheme, something like [n\[ es 3ps\]], where the initial n- introduces the part–whole relator. In some dialects, this lexical property operates in limiting the occurrence of nes to prepositional contexts, as suggested in (70’).

(70’) $n$-es $\leftrightarrow$ 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_msp and l_I_msp 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 $l$ before masculine nouns (Fërshe rotor). Thus, (74a) must be rewritten as in (75), where the alternants (a,b,c) are assigned to their contexts.
(74) highlights the difference between the two elementary operators. The operator 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 kasә* ‘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 *-u/-l-* 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):

\[(76) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{PL} & = [*⊆/R] \\
\text{b. Dative} & = [*⊆/DP]
\end{align*}\]

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 bәrbats-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 is combined, yielding the complex noun in (77b).

(77) a. < [r bәrbats‑], ‑ur[DEF,PL] > → [φ bәrbats‑ur]
   b. < [φ bәrbats‑], ‑u > → [c [φ bәrbats‑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 ⊆, both within the noun and DP.

(78) a. < o, [⊆ [bәrbats‑ur‑u]] > → [PP o ⊆ [⊆ ,bәrbats‑ur‑u]]
   b. ‑ur DEF, ⊆ ←→ R
   c. ‑u ⊆ ←→ P [[[DEF. ⊆ ]]_]

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 φ N o/φ/⊆ bәrbats‑ur‑u[DEF,M /⊆ ,]

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 ⊆. 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’), *mez‑i l‑i a mez‑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⊆‑]l[DEF,M]] i ⊆ ]
   b. < a⊆,[[[mɛ⊆‑]l[DEF,M]] i ⊆ ]] > → [ a⊆ [[[mɛ⊆‑]l[DEF,M ]] i ⊆ ]
   c. N…. P/PI D φ N aφ⊆ meli$_{PSG}$

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‑i‑a ‘to me’* (cf. (32b)).
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 mujev- ‘woman’ and kënv- ‘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’.

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).

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).

Something like that may apply to -u, which covers the plural in obliques and the definiteness in the masculine singular of the type fitor-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 -i 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 (\textit{e\^\text{a}}) 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. \textit{gli-illu-ille-i} ‘he/she’ \textit{colui-i} ‘he’, and, in addition, the dative \textit{gl-i} ‘to him/her/them’, the oblique including also the genitive, \textit{aldi cu-i} ‘to/of which’, \textit{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 \textit{They are knocking at the door}. (It’s Peter.) or \textit{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).

\begin{align*}
\text{(85)} & \quad a. \ [\text{krn-} (i-l) \ [i_\zeta]] \quad \text{‘dogs/the dogs’} \\
& \quad b. \ \exists x \subseteq [\text{dog}] \quad \text{‘an x such that x is a subset of individuals with the property dog’}
\end{align*}

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

\begin{align*}
\text{(86)} & \quad \text{-ur}_\zeta \leftrightarrow a (\text{Art}) \ Q [N_\zeta]
\end{align*}

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

\begin{align*}
\text{(87)} & \quad a. \ [\zeta, [\text{barbats-ur-u}]] \\
& \quad b. \ \langle a_\zeta, [\zeta, [\text{barbats-ur-u}]] \rangle \rightarrow [a_\zeta [\zeta, [\text{barbats-ur-u}]]] \\
& \quad c. \ v... \ \ P \ \ D_\varphi \ \ N_\zeta \\
& \quad \quad a_\zeta \quad \text{barbats-ur-u}_\zeta \\
\end{align*}

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, \textit{u} vs. \textit{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 \textit{accusative+dative}. In the plural, we find different alternants, \textit{i-ut}, \textit{y-ut} and \textit{l-ut} (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).
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(88) Libofshë

a. accusative  eu mi /ti /u /ni /vi /li vrd-i
he me /you /her/him /us /you /them see-ssg
‘He sees me/you/her/him/us/you/them’

b. dative  jü /tsi /i /na /u da libr-a
to.me /to.you /to.3ps /to.us /to.you give-ssg book-ssg
‘He gives the book to me/you/him/her/us/you/them’

c. reflexive  eu z ya /s apun-i
he himself wash-ssg /himself sit-ssg
‘He washes himself/he sits down’

d. clusters  ni u/tsi u/i u/n u/v u da
to.me it/to.you it/to.3sit/to.us it/to.you it give.3sg
‘He gives it to me/you/him/her/us/you/them’

Divjakë
e. clusters  y u dau o fatjor-a-y-u /o feta-y-u
to.them it give-ssg PI boy-Pt-Obl /PI girl-Pt-Obl
‘I give it to the boys/the girls’

Korça-Plasë

f. (clusters)  nrs i da a lui
he to.him (it) give-ssg PI him
‘He gives it to him’

f’. nrs mi da a jia
he to.me (it) give-ssg 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 [[(pi,ic] i<] ‘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; Ripceanu 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-ssg Prep me/you
‘(S)he sees me/you’

a’. nrs (u) ved-i atsr
he (her) see-ssg her
‘He sees her’

c. nrs mi da a ni/a/tsi
he to.me (it) give-ssg PI me/to.you
‘He gives it to me/
li da tuti a je
them (to her) give-ssg all PI her
‘He gives them all to her’

Libofshë

b. ti vo’dzu-r tini
you see.PAST-pl you
‘They saw you’

na aro vo’dz-u-t noi
us have-pl see-TV-PP noi
us
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))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Datφ</th>
<th>Accφ</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iφ</td>
<td>uφ</td>
<td>ded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. C | T | V | V | (PP) | N |

| miφ | ved‑i | pi | miniφ |

In this light, doubling is only a type of externalization\(^\textsuperscript{10}\), 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*.\(^\textsuperscript{11}\)

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

\[(92)\ v\ldots P D_\emptyset Q N a \subseteq li (\text{un}) f \subseteq t-i \subseteq /o \text{fitfor-u} \quad \text{to/of a girl}\]

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 noun.

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.\textsuperscript{12}
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.

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 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.

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).

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

\[
\begin{align*}
(96) & & \text{Korça-Plasë} \\
\text{a} & & \text{alents-l-or} & & \text{fitor-l-or} \\
\text{to/of} & & \text{other-pl-} & & \text{boy-pl-} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\text{‘To/of the other/these boys}

\[
\begin{align*}
(97) & & \text{a.} & & \ldots & & \text{P} & & D_q & & Q & & N \\
& & & & \text{alent-ui} & & \text{fit-for} \\
& & & & \text{to/my-pl} \\
& & \text{b.} & & \ldots & & \text{P} & & D_q & & N & & Q \\
& & & & \text{fit-for-u} & & \text{alent} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(98) & & \text{Libofshë} \\
\text{a.} & & \text{i} & & \text{o-m} & & \text{da-ta} & & \text{o} & & \text{kefi-l-u} & & \text{a} & & \text{me-\text{a}} \\
& & \text{to/her/him} & & \text{It-I-have} & & \text{give-PP} & & \text{to.Art} & & \text{dog-pl-} & & \text{to my-pl} \\
& & \text{‘I have given it to my dogs’} \\
\text{b.} & & \text{i} & & \text{o} & & \text{ded} & & \text{a} & & \text{li} & & \text{atse} & & \text{mar-a} \\
& & \text{to/her} & & \text{it} & & \text{I.gave to} & & \text{Art} & & \text{sister-} & & \text{that.FSG} & & \text{elder/big-FSG} \\
& & \text{‘I gave it to the elder sister’} \\
\text{c.} & & \text{< atsr(u)_{FSG}} & & \text{[mar-a_{FSG}]} & & \text{-> [i}_{ip} & & \text{atsr [i}_{ip} & & \text{mar-a]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

| (99) | a. & < [g frat], u_msc > → [[c [frat] m] ] & & frat-p-u ‘my brother’ (cf. (46a)) \\
| b. & < [[c [frat] m], u_msc ] > δ[i_msc [c [frat] m] ] \\
| c. & m → R ___ 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(99) a.} & & < [g frat], u_msc > & & \text{[c [frat] m] } & & \text{frat-p-u ‘my brother’ (cf. (46a))} \\
\text{b.} & & < [[c [frat] m], u_msc ] > & & \text{δ[i_msc [c [frat] m] ]} \\
\text{c.} & & m & & \text{→ R ___} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{We assume that enclitic elements are part of the inflectional structure of the word, within which they are inserted on the basis of selection constraints of the type in (99c) (for this approach to enclisis, cf. Savoia and Baldi 2023). We note that the inflectional mark}
\end{align*}
\]
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 possesive. We may find forms in which inflection precedes and follows the possesive, as in tat-u-t-u ‘tour father’ in (43a), as we can expect if enclitics are inflectional heads.

7. di/iti + 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 definitive-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 ko/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 complementiser tsi is followed by the modal introducer s and the inflected verb agreeing with an argument of the matrix sentence.

(100) Libofshë

a. mbo'ri13 di/iti mək-a-ri /durm-e-ri /cept-a-ri
   lstopped of/for eat /sleep /comb one’s hair
   ‘I finished eating/sleeping/combing my hair’

b. tsə dzef’ di (nu) fatscri
   to. you of Neg to.do
   ‘I told you (not) to do it’

b’. tsə dzef’ di γ-a-ri aist
   to. you l.tell of wash-TV-INF this
   ‘I told you to wash this’

c. am vən-i-t ti/iti vad-e-ri (ia/tini) / γ-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 kəmif-a di γ-a-ri
   be.3sg a shirt-fsc of wash-TV-INF
   ‘It is a shirt to be washed’

e. i o fets pan-a di mək-a-ri
   to.him/her it made.1sg bread-fsc of eat-TV-INF
   ‘I made him/her the bread to eat’
Divjakë

c. vin ti vad-e-ri (atseu)  came.1sg for see-TV-INF (him) 'I came to see him'
d. esti pana ti mak-a-ri  be.3sg bread for eat-TV-INF 'There is some bread to eat'
f. daninti ti vad-e-ri ia  before for see-TV-INF her 'Before seeing her'

Këllëz

a. mbu'si di luk-a-si  stopped.1sg of work-TV-INF 'I stopped working'
c. ei ar vin-i-ta ti vid-e-si mini  they have come-PP for see-TV-INF me 'They have come to see me'
d. esti una libu-e ti (ni) kant-a-si  be.3sg a book-fsg for (not) read-TV-INF 'It is a book (not) to read'

Korç-Plasë

a. mbiti'si di tfit-e-ri (kart-i-a)  stopped.1sg of read-TV-INF book-fsg 'I stopped reading the book'
c. vin ti vid-e-ri  came.1sg for see-TV-INF 'I came to see you'
d. esti una kart-i ti tfit-e-ri  be.3sg a book-fsg for read-TV-INF 'It is a book to read'

(101) Libofshë

b. ts'o dzef  tsi (nu) s u fats  to. you I said that (Neg) Prt it do.2sg 'I told you (not) to do it'

d. esti pana  tsi s mə'ka-m  be.3sg bread that Prt eat-1pl 'There is some bread to eat'
c. ei ar vin-i-ta ta s mi vjad-x  they have come-PP that Prt me see-Subj-3pl 'They have come to see me'

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).

\[(102)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & \quad \langle G, a_{TV/N} \rangle \rightarrow [\ [G] a_{TV}] \\
(b) & \quad \langle [G] a_{TV}, ri_{INF} \rangle \rightarrow [\ [G-a_{TV}]-ri_{INF}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 *tә* 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).

\[(103)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T} & \quad \phi \quad V \quad \text{Prt/N} \quad [\ldots] \quad T \quad v \\
\text{tsә} & \quad \text{dzɛf} & \quad \text{tsi} & \quad s & \quad u & \quad \text{fats} & \quad \text{‘tsә dzɛf tsi s u fats’ (in (94b))}
\end{align*}
\]

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 \([\subseteq]\) of *di/ti* is available to establish the relationship between the matrix and the dependent events, as in (104).

\[(104)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T} & \quad \phi \quad V \quad \text{Prep} \quad [\ldots] \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{tsә} & \quad \text{dzɛf/am vәnit} & \quad \text{di/ti} & \quad [\ [G-a_{TV}]-ri_{INF}] \quad \text{aist} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 (possessive–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 sub-word elements within the syntactic computation and are a possible realization of the Phases.
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Notes

1 Caragiu Mariotheanu (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 Mariotheanu (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 Sprio 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 *t in simple onsets has changed to tp. Thus a ‘to’ corresponds to original la, occurring in Daco-Romanian and other Aromanian varieties.

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

(i) loi a me-l/lu-i
took.1ST a me-l/lu-i

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) nan gat ‘in (the) glass’ (Gjirokastër)
mi libra ‘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’.
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 interpretative 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 adopted seems to us not only more natural and adequate but also now in accordance with the Chomskyan approach to the learnability of language structures.

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, […]’.

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].

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.

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

(i) ɛ̃ at-a-t man-pl-def.nom/acc before that-pl-obl ia-da-saj vaiz-e-s ɡovit-that-rsc-obl to. her it ‘Those men’

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 mba/ur-c-ɛri ‘stop’, as in (100), from Albanian mbaroj ‘I stop’, as in (i)

(i) mba/ur ɛn-i mbaro mbaroj ‘I stopped’

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.
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