CASE IN THE NOMINAL AND PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS IN AROMANIAN: OBLIQUE CASE AND ITS INTERACTIONS WITH THE PERSON SPLIT

M. RITA MANZINI[1], LEONARDO M. SAVOIA[2]

Abstract. In this work, we analyze the internal structure of the Aromanian noun, based on the assumption that the morphological organization of the noun projects in syntactic structure. The comparison between Aromanian and Romanian, and between Aromanian and Albanian (Shkodër) provides us with a crosslinguistic perspective, leading to a clearer view of the relevant phenomena. In keeping with Manzini and Savoia (2011a,b, 2012, 2014a), oblique case is understood as a part-whole or possessee-possessor relation, and formalized as the inclusion predicate ⊂. We extend this analysis to DOM phenomena, assuming that the oblique form taken by DOM objects in Romanian/Aromanian, Albanian, etc. reflects the fact that they are inserted as the 'possessors' of the event. As for linkers, we propose an analysis whereby they are identified with D elements. Interesting differences between Aromanian and Romanian/Albanian emerge, for example the fact that in Aromanian, the linker also occurs in dative contexts. Finally, we examine possessive structures. In Aromanian, as in Romanian and in Albanian, 3P pronouns pattern with lexical DPs, whereas 1/2P have specialized possessive forms, which show a complex internal structure, including an initial linker, the 1/2P pronoun proper and finally an inflectional element agreeing with the possessee (i.e. the head noun). Based on these forms, we argue for the continuity of possessive pronoun agreement with so-called Suffixaufnahme phenomena.

Keywords: agreement inflection, linker, possessive, Suffixaufnahme, Aromanian.

We take advantage of fieldwork data on Aromanian varieties spoken in South Albania, to provide additional empirical support for a line of analysis developed by Manzini and Savoia (2011a ff.) for other Romance and Balkan languages. Oblique cases are two-place predicates; specifically, genitive in the DP domain and dative in the *v*P domain introduce a part-whole relation between a whole (the possessor) and a part (the possessee). The phenomenon of linkers, found in Aromanian in front of both genitive and dative obliques, is connected to the presence of this relation, in that linkers provide a lexicalization of one of the arguments of the

[1] University of Florence, mariarita.manzini@unifi.it
[2] University of Florence, lsavoia@unifi.it

RRL, **LXII**, *2*, p. 115–142, Bucureşti, 2017

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

relator (section 1). Pronominal inflection systems are often richer than nominal ones and often include a Person split differentiating 1/2P(erson) from 3P. We argue that these facts are not mere morphological quirks; rather they externalize Person splits with respect to case at the underlying syntactic level. Within this line of research, we examine 1/2P possessives in Aromanian (and Romanian), which are endowed with an inflection agreeing with the head noun, unlike 3P possessives. We construe their inflection as a doubling of the linker (or vice versa), and argue that both belong to the larger set of so-called Suffixaufnahme elements (section 2).

1. NOMINAL INFLECTIONS, LINKERS AND THE NATURE OF OBLIQUE (GENITIVE/DATIVE) CASE

1.1. Nominal inflections in Aromanian

Aromanian, like Romanian, preserves case inflections on nouns and distinguishes direct from oblique case – where the latter covers dative and genitive contexts. We illustrate this with the nominal inflection system of the Aromanian variety spoken in the town of Libofshë (L); additional data come from the nearby towns of Fier (F) and Diviakë (D), all in South Albania. The examples in (1) contain the definite inflection paradigm, which is schematically summarized in (2) below.

(1) a. ari vənit/ am vədzut fitʃor-u/bərbat-u/fet-a/məjɛr-a **L**
has come/ I.have seen boy-the/man-the/girl-the/woman-the
'The boy/the man/the girl/the woman has come'/'I have seen the man, etc.'

b. arə vənit/ am vədzut fitʃor-ʎi/bərbats(-i)/fət-li/məʎer-li
have come/I.have seen boys-the/men-the/girls-the /women-the
'The boys/the men/the girls/the women have come'/ 'I have seen the men, etc.'

c. i o ded o fitʃor-u/o bərbat-u/ali fət-i/
to.him/her it I.gave Lkr boy-the/Lkr man-the/Lkr girl-the/
ali məjɛr-i
Lkr woman-the
'I gave it to the boy/the man/the girl/the woman'

d. i o ded o fitʃor-ʎu/o bərbats-uru/o fət-ru/
to.them it I.gave Lkr boys-the/Lkr men-the/Lkr girls-the /
o məʎer-lu
Lkr women-the
'I gave it to the boys/the men/the girls/the women'

In the masculine singular, the *-u* inflection externalizes properties only of nominal class (gender), i.e. masculine. The externalization of oblique case depends

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

entirely on the presence of the Linker (Lkr) element that precedes the noun, namely *o*. In the feminine singular, *-a* in the direct case contrasts with *-i* in the oblique. The masculine plural presents either palatalization of the final consonant of the lexical base or palatal *ʎ*; in either instance nominative *-i* alternates with oblique *-uru*. In the feminine plural there is no palatalization; case endings are *l-i* for the direct cases and *r/l-u* for the oblique. The Lkr takes the form *ali* in the feminine singular and *o* in the plural.[3] To be more precise, the declension in (2) corresponds to I and II class nominal bases. In (3) we illustrate the inflectional system of III class nouns (e.g. *keni* 'dog').

(2)		msg	fsg	mpl	fpl
	Direct	*u*	*a*	Palatal/*ʎi*	*li*
	Oblique	*u*	*i*	*ʎu*/Palatal-*uru*	*ru/lu*
		Lkr *o*	Lkr *ali*	Lkr *o*	Lkr *o*

(3)		m/fsg	m/fpl
	Direct	*li*	(Palatal)*li*
	Oblique	*li*	(Palatal)*uru*

It may be useful to compare the Aromanian declension in (2) to that of standard Romanian in (4). Final *-i* is associated with the oblique singular (though only in the feminine in Aromanian) and with the non-oblique plural (though only in the masculine in Romanian). In its double role as a plural and as an oblique, *-i* continues Latin *-i* (nominative plural and genitive/dative singular). Similarly, the oblique plural *-lor* of Romanian and *-ru/lu* (eventually palatalized) are transparently connected to the Latin plural oblique (genitive) *-ru(m)*.

(4)		msg	fsg	mpl	fpl
	Direct	*ul*	*a*	(Palatal)*ii*	*ele*
	Oblique	*ului*	*ei*	(Palatal)*ilor*	*elor*

The nouns that we have considered so far are interpreted as definite. Indefinite nouns have a reduced set of inflections, which differentiate direct and oblique case only in the feminine singular, as illustrated in (5). In turn indefinite articles are not case inflected in Aromanian, so that the difference between direct and oblique case is externalized by the Lkr preposed to the oblique. The relevant facts are summarized in (6) for the I and II class and in (7) for the III class[4].

[3] Manzini and Savoia (2014c) illustrate the nominal declension paradigm of the varieties of Diviakë and Fier, which yield the same paradigm, with minimal differences – for instance in the masculine plural one finds *fitʃor-jə/-ju* rather than *fitʃor-ʎi/-ʎu* in (1), without the *ʎ* segment.

[4] Manzini and Savoia (2014c) have examples from the varieties of Diviakë and Fier, which display the same inflectional system (cf. fn. 3).

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(5) a. ari vənit/ am vədzut un fitʃor/un bərbat/unə fɛt-ə/ **L**
has come/I.have seen a boy/a man/a girl/
unə məjɛr-ə
a woman
'A boy/a man/a girl/a woman has come'/ 'I have seen a man, etc.'

b. arə vənit/ am vədzut mult bərbats/mult fitʃor(-i)/
have come/I.have seen many men/many boys/
mult fet-i/mult məʌɛr-i
many girls/many women
'Many boys/men/girls/women have come'/ 'I have seen many men, etc.'

c. i o ded o un fitʃor/ali un fet-i
to.him/her it I.gave Lkr a boy/Lkr a girl
'I gave it to a boy/a girl'

d. i o ded o doi bərbats/ o dau məʌɛr-i
to.them it I.gave Lkr two boys/Lkr give women
'I gave it to two boys/women'

(6)

	msg	fsg	mpl	fpl
Direct	∅	*ə*	(Palatal/*i*)	*i*
Oblique	∅	*i*	(Palatal/*i*)	*i*
	Lkr *o*	Lkr *ali*	Lkr *o*	Lkr *o*

(7)

	m/fsg	m/fpl
Direct	*i*	Palatal/*i*
Oblique	*i*	Palatal/*i*

The overall shape of the indefinite paradigm in Romanian is the same as in Aromanian, with only feminine singular displaying a residual case alternation between direct case -*ă* [ə] and oblique -*i*, as schematized in (8). From a strictly morphological point of view, the comparison between Romanian (8) and Aromanian (6) brings to light the fact that Romanian has a specialized inflection -*e* for the feminine, while in Aromanian the plural is always -*i*. Similarly, note the -*e* ending of the dative singular feminine, as opposed to Aromanian -*i*.

(8)

	msg	fsg	mpl	fpl
Nom/Acc	∅	*ă*	(Palatal)-*i*	*e*
Dat/Gen	∅	*e*	(Palatal)-*i*	*e*

From a syntactic point of view, a notable difference between Aromanian and Romanian is introduced by the Lkr element in the oblique, which we will discuss in section 1.2. Before proceeding it is worth noting that in Romanian datives can be introduced by the preposition *la* 'to'. Specifically, in normative Romanian, "an indirect object whose first component of the nominal phrase … cannot receive the specific dative case-marker will be realized as a PP headed by the preposition *la*" (Pană Dindelegan 2013: 153). However "in spoken Romanian the indirect object is

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

realized by the preposition *la* 'to' even in configurations in which the first component of the phrase has case inflections" (ibid.). In other words, in spoken Romanian datives can generally be introduced by *la*, as in (9). Importantly, the preposition *la* in (9) is unconnected with the Lkr element surfacing in front of Aromanian linkers. Historically, pre-dative *la* continues the Latin preposition *ad* 'to' (Pană Dindelegan 2013: 375), while the Lkr continues the demonstrative *ille, illa*, etc. and is therefore comparable to the *l-* determiner in other Romance varieties.

(9) Le-am dat bomboane la copii/copii-lor [Romanian]
to.them-I.have given sweets to children-the/children-the obl
'I gave sweets to the children'

In fact, both Romanian and Aromanian share the lexicalization of the Lkr element in another major oblique context, which we have not considered so far, namely the genitive context (Dobrovie-Sorin *et al.* 2013 on Romanian), which we will also consider in the next section.

1.2. Linkers

In many languages, a Lkr element is inserted between a noun and an adjective or a genitive complement that modifies it (relative clause modifiers are also relevant cross-linguistically, but are not considered here). Among Indo-European languages, the Iranian ezafe is generally taken to be a Lkr. While in Persian the ezafe is invariable (*-e*), in Kurdish varieties, the ezafe agrees with the head noun (Holmberg and Odden 2008; Franco *et al.* 2015). What remains invariant is the core distribution of the Lkr, in front of modifiers of a head noun *N* and its constituent structure, i.e the fact that the Lkr element forms a constituent with the following modifier *XP [N [Lkr XP]]*. This is true even when the Lkr is phonologically enclitic to the preceding N, as is the case for the Iranian ezafe (Larson and Yamakido 2008, Philip 2012).

Manzini and Savoia (2014b), Franco *et al.* (2015) argue that pre-adjectival and pre-genitival articles in Albanian and Aromanian (or Romanian) manifest Lkr properties. Before turning to their analysis, we will briefly review the facts. In Romanian, no Lkr is found between a noun and an adjective – though the so-called strong form of the definite article (*cel*, etc.) may appear in Lkr position, as in (10a). Importantly, *cel* is mutually exclusive with demonstratives, as in (10b), pointing to an operator-like content for it, denoting familiarity, which is missing from Lkrs (Cornilescu and Giurgea 2013: 408).

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(10) a. maşin-a (cea) nouă [Romanian]
car-the.f (the.f) new.f
'the new car'
b. *acele case cele vechi
those houses the old
'the old houses'

Genitives, as in (11), are introduced by a Lkr agreeing with the head noun; hence the oblique 'of the boy' is introduced by the masculine singular Lkr *al* agreeing with 'a glass' in (11a) and by the feminine plural Lkr *ale*, agreeing with 'two shirts' in (11b). *Al, ale*, etc. are forms of the definite article (Lat. *ille*). To be more precise, Grosu (1994), d'Hulst *et al.* (2000), Dobrovie-Sorin (2000) distinguish an invariable element *a* followed by the suffixal definite article. For Grosu *a* is the preposition *a* followed by the enclitic article; for d'Hulst *et al.* (2000) and Dobrovie-Sorin (2000), *a* is an invariable N constituent, so that the categorial signature of the *al* series is D (see also Cornilescu 1992).

(11) a. un pahar al băiat-ul-ui [Romanian]
a glass Lkr.msg boy-the-obl
'a glass of the boy'
b. două cămăş-i ale băiat-ul-ui
two shirts-fpl Lkr.fpl boy-the-obl
'two shirts of the boy'

Several restrictions apply to the construction in (11). First, the Lkr element is normally left out under adjacency with a definite head noun (Dobrovie-Sorin *et al.* 2013: 314–317). Furthermore the presence of the Lkr element in Romanian depends on the inflectional properties of the genitive DP; if the latter is without case inflection, the preposition *a* is used (Cornilescu 1992, Giurgea 2012), as in (12).

(12) haine a mai multe persoane [Romanian]
clothes-f to several people
'the clothes of several people'

In Aromanian, there are two candidates for Lkr status. The best studied Lkr elements occur in front of adjectives and correspond to the demonstrative pronouns of the language (Campos 2005, Campos and Stavrou 2005, Manzini and Savoia 2014b). As pointed out in (10), the position between N and Adj is available to demonstratives in Romanian, which however are in complementary distribution with pre-nominal demonstratives. This is not the case in Aromanian (Manzini and Savoia 2014b). In (13) we reproduce the singular masculine and feminine, to illustrate the fact that head noun, Lkr and modifying adjective are in an agreement relation with respect to phi-features and case.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(13)	a.	fitʃor-u	(a)tse-u	mar-u	**D/F**
		boy-msg	Lkr-msg	big-msg	
		'the big boy'			
	b.	o fitʃor-u	ats(-uɣ)ui	mar-u	
		Lkr boy-msg	Lkr-obl.msg	big-msg	
		'to the big boy'			
	c.	fɛt-a ats-ɛ	mar-ɛ		
		girl-fsg Lkr-fsg	big-fsg		
		'the big girl'			
	d.	ali fɛt-i	ats-jei	mar-i	
		Lkr girl-obl.fsg	Lkr-obl.fsg	big	
		'to the big girl'			

In fact, the Lkr is sensitive not only to phi-features and case, but also to definiteness, since it cooccurs only with definite head nouns, behaving in this respect like Greek polidefiniteness (Lekakou and Szendröi 2012 for a recent analysis). Thus there is no Lkr in the indefinites in (14). We may see the definiteness restriction holding of the Lkr construction in Aromanian as a consequence of the fact that the Lkr (the demonstrative) agrees in definiteness with the head noun– and is therefore only compatible with definite inflections on it. In Albanian (Franco *et al.* 2015) and in some Kurdish varieties (Holmberg and Odden 2008), where Lkrs are externalized both with definite and indefinite head Ns, different Lkr morphologies surface with definites and indefinites – which can also be captured as an effect of agreement in (in)definiteness properties.

(14)	a.	un fitʃor	mari		**D/F**
		a boy	big		
		'a big boy'			
	b.	un fɛtə	mari		
		a girl	big		
		'a big girl'			

What we are directly interested in here are Lkr elements found in front of obliques. In Romanian, the Lkr is fully inflected for phi-features, comprising the four forms *al* (msg), *a* (fsg), *ai* (mpl), *ale* (fpl). The Aromanian paradigm is somewhat simplified opposing masculine and plural *o* to feminine singular *ali*. The most important differences between Romanian and Aromanian are however syntactic in nature. First, in Romanian the *al* Lkr series only appears in genitive contexts; dative complements are externalized by the oblique DP without any preposed Lkr. In Aromanian, on the contrary, Lkrs are obligatory also in front of datives, both definite and indefinite, as illustrated in (1) and (5) respectively.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

In Romanian, furthermore, the pre-genitival Lkrs agree with the head noun. In Aromanian both the pre-dative Lkr and the pre-genitival Lkr agree with the embedded dative and genitive respectively, as can be seen in (15). In (15) the head N remains fixed, namely 'the hand'; the form of the Lkr changes according to whether the genitive is masculine (*o*) or feminine (*ali*) singular.

(15) mən-a o fitʃor-u/ali fət-i/ali məʌer-i **L**
the hand Lkr boy-the /Lkr girl-the /Lkr woman-the
'the hand of the boy/the girl/the woman'

As already mentioned, several treatments of Lkrs are available in the theoretical literature. We will consider pre-adjectival Lkrs first, and then turn to pre-oblique Lkrs in section 1.3. Existing treatments of Aromanian depend on what we may broadly characterize as predicative theories of Lkrs (or copular theories, den Dikken and Singhapreecha 2004). Campos (2005), Campos and Stavrou (2005) propose a construal of Lkrs as copulas for Greek and Aromanian. For them, each modifier of N is introduced as part of a small clause PredP. The demonstrative in Aromanian is the subject of the predication, as illustrated in (16) for example (13a).

(16) … [$_{PredP}$ atseu [$_{Pred}$ φ [$_{AP}$ maru

For the same authors, on the other hand, the article in Greek is a lexicalization of the Pred head; in the model of Campos (2008) the pre-genitival Lkr of Albanian in (17a) would have the same structure, namely (18)[5].

(17) a. ɛrði burr-i i vɔgəl [Albanian (Shkodër)]
came man-msg.nom.def Lkr little
'The little man came'

b. libr-i i msusɛ-s
book-msg.nom.def Lkr teacher-fsg.obl.def
'the book of the teacher'

(18) [$_{DP}$ burr-i [$_{PredP}$ [$_{Pred}$ i [$_{AP}$ vɔgəl

The analysis in (18), at least for Albanian, clashes with various facts presented by Franco *et al.* (2015) and most directly with the fact that the Lkr introduces adjectives and genitives not only within the DP, as in (18), but also in post-copular contexts, as in (19) where they obviously occupy a position different from that of the copula.

(19) a. aj aʃt i kutʃ [Albanian (Shkodër)]
that it.is Lkr red
'It is red'


[5] We thank the colleagues of the University of Shkodër Eliana Lacej and Alma Hafizi for providing us with data from the Shkodër variety.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

b.	kja	aʃt	ɛ	mɔtəɾ-s	t	ɛmɛ
	this	is	Lkr	sister-fsg.obl.def	Lkr	my
	'That is of my sisters's'					

Following Franco *et al.* (2015) and especially Manzini and Savoia (2014b) for Aromanian, we conclude that the connection between Lkrs and predication is correct. However a structurally simpler implementation of this idea than (16), (18), avoiding the abstract head Pred (the 'copula'), is preferable on both empirical and theoretical grounds. We categorize Lkrs as Ds, based on the morpholexical identity of Lkr elements with articles (e.g. in Albanian) or demonstratives (e.g. in Aromanian). Therefore the structure of the Aromanian Lkr phrase in (13a) is as in (20). According to Higginbotham (1985), nouns are predicates and have an argumental slot, which is saturated by the determiner D. In the same way, the adjectival predicate is associated with an open argument slot, which is satisfied by a D element, i.e. the Lkr, in a language like Aromanian. Concretely, in (20) the Lkr/D element *atseu* provides a (partial) lexicalization for the argument of the predicate *maru* 'big'.


(20)



The overall structure of (13a) takes the form in (21). D is independently lexicalized on the head noun by the *-u* ending of the masculine singular and the *-a* (direct case) or *-i* (oblique case) endings of the feminine singular; the scope position of this D is indicated by an abstract D. In (21) two predicative bases are present, namely the adjective *mar-*'big' and the head noun *fit͡ʃor-* 'boy'. They both have an argument slot and according to the discussion surrounding (20) the Lkr is necessary to provide a satisfaction for the argument of the adjective. The same is true of the *-u* inflection of the noun, satisfying its argument slot. Following Higginbotham (1985), adjectival modification involves the identification of the theta-role of the adjective with that of the noun. In other words, in (21) there is ultimately a single argument satisfying both the predicate 'girl' and the predicate 'big'; correspondingly, the referent denoted by the complex DP lies at the intersection of the 'big' and 'girl' properties (see also Parsons 1979, Partee 1995). The syntactic correlate of theta-unification is Agree, as discussed in more detail by Franco *et al.* (2015), hence the adjective, the noun and their Ds all agree.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(21)



At this point we are in a position to clarify the difference between Lkr D and determiner D according to Franco *et al.* (2015). Crucially, the higher D, i.e. the determiner, is interpreted as an operator. On the other hand, the lower D, i.e. the Lkr, simply values the argument slot of A, but does not provide a quantificational closure. What a Lkr D and a determiner D have in common is that they are both able to satisfy argument slots. What they do not share depends on their different position of merger. A D closing off the DP is an operator, establishing a relation between a restrictor (the NP) and a domain of quantification (a VP). A Lkr D is a bound variable of the higher D – it provides a satisfaction for a theta-role ultimately bound by the higher D. In other words, it has the meaning of a bound pronominal that satisfies the adjectival role, prior to the introduction of higher operators.

If this conception of Lkrs is to be extended to the embedding of oblique complements, we deduce that obliques involve a predication of some sorts. In the next section indeed we argue that the presence of Lkrs in front of genitives (and datives) supports the classical relational conception of case, at least in so far as oblique cases are concerned.

1.3. The nature of oblique case

We assume the characterization of direct case(s) suggested by Chomsky (2001), namely that so-called nominative and accusative reflect Agree applying between a DP and the functional heads I and *v* respectively. This leaves the question open of what oblique case is. One may try to enforce an Agree characterization as well, where the oblique DP would check its case against Appl(icative) heads. However no Appl heads are externalized in the languages we are considering. Furthermore, postulating an Appl head, while increasing the abstractness of structures including oblique cases does not address the issue of what their content is – i.e. in itself it is not much more explanatory than postulating a K Case head.

In fairly traditional terms (Fillmore 1968), the oblique case endings of languages like Romanian or Aromanian in section 1.1 are the inflectional

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

equivalent of the prepositions *to* or *of*. Following Manzini and Savoia (2011a ff.) both are elementary two-place predicates introducing a relation between the argument they select and another argument. Specifically, genitive case introduces a part/whole (partitive) or possession relation. In turn possession, especially inherent possession, may be viewed as a surface manifestation of the more elementary part-whole relation. Belvin and den Dikken (1997: 170) define the relation introduced by 'have' as 'zonal inclusion'. As for dative, the line of analysis of ditransitive verbs initiated by Kayne (1984) is characterized by the assumption that verbs like 'give' take a predication as their complement; the content of this predication is a possession relation between the accusative direct object (the possessum) and the dative (the possessor) (see also Pesetsky 1995, Beck and Johnson 2004, Harley 2002).

This complex of ideas can be illustrated in relation to the dative structures of Romanian. In (22b) we provide a structure for Romanian (22a), where the (⊆) part-whole content is associated with the case ending *-or*. The (⊆) element takes as its complement its sister DP *băieţil-* 'the boys' and as its external argument the theme DP, here represented by the clitic *l* 'it', and says that 'it' is 'zonally included' by 'the boys' (it is in their material possession, or in their vicinity, etc.).

(22) a. I-l am dat băieţ-i-l-or [Romanian]
them.it I.have given boy-mpl-def-obl
'I gave it to the boys.'

b. dat $[_{DP}$ l $[_{(\subseteq)P}$ băieţil $[_{(\subseteq)}$ or]]

This analysis of oblique case as an elementary two-place predicate provides a simple way of connecting the two main contexts where Lkrs appear, namely the pre-adjectival and the pre-genitival one. Consider for instance the structure in (23b) for Romanian (23a). The structure in (23b) parallels (22b) in that oblique case introduces the (⊆) possession/inclusion predicate. The internal argument of (⊆) is the DP to which the oblique case attaches, i.e. the possessor. The *ale* Lkr provides a lexicalization of the possessee (external) argument of (⊆), acting essentially as a bound variable (a 'doubling clitic') of the head noun.

(23) a. două kămăş-i ale băiatu-l-ui [Romanian]
two shirts-fpl Lkr.fpl boy-the-obl
'two shirts of the boy'


b. [două kămăşi]$_x$ [ale$_x$ [[băiatul$_y$][$_{(\subseteq)}$-ui$_{\lambda x,y}$]]]

Now, cross-linguistically pre-genitival Lkrs normally agree with the head noun of the DP embedding the genitive. In present terms, this means that the Lkr is a partial satisfaction of the external argument of the genitive/part-whole predicate, as just discussed for (23). Aromanian however differs from Romanian, but also from Albanian, Kurdish, etc. in that pre-genitival Lkrs agree with the genitive DP. At least in the feminine singular it appears that the Lkr includes both a D

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

constituent (*al*-) and an inflection (-*i*) exactly reproducing that of the genitive DP. In other words, the Lkr doubles the phi-features of the genitive DP and its case properties, yielding structures of the type in (24), for example (15).

(24)



The constituent structure assigned to the Aromanian Lkr in (24) is essentially the same as in Romanian (23). Interpretively, on the other hand, the pre-oblique Lkr of Romanian (23) concurs to the satisfaction of the external argument of the (⊆) relation and is a bound copy of higher lexical material. On the contrary the pre-oblique Lkr of Aromanian (24) helps introducing the oblique case, i.e. the (⊆) relation, and its internal argument, doubling lower lexical material. The same is true when the Lkr introduces not the genitive (i.e. the possessor depending on a head noun), but rather the dative (i.e. the possessor in a sentential context). The similarity between the two types of Lkrs is that they are copies or doubles of a D/case element otherwise realized in the structure.

The literature on Lkrs referred to so far, including references on Aromanian, originates from a cross-linguistic interest in the phenomenon. Genitive constructions have attracted considerable interest in the literature on Romanian, which typically however does not address the continuity of so-called 'possessive articles' with Lkr phenomena. Some of the relevant literature has been briefly mentioned in presenting the data in (11)–(12). Recall that Grosu (1994) argues that the *al* series results from the *a* preposition followed by the enclitic article, leading him to assign a Case-marking role to these elements. Though Cornilescu (1992:126–127) identifies the *al* series with the category D, her conclusion is also that its role is that of a case-marker: "AL is a functional D head which assigns Gen[itive] to its QP/DP complement, on condition that the latter has an inflectional Q/D head" notwithstanding the fact that "AL is a pronoun-like element which duplicates the … features of the noun that theta-marks the Gen" (see also Giurgea 2012). Other notable proponents of the D categorization (in fact D-N, where N is the invariable *a* base) like d'Hulst *et al.* (2000), Dobrovie-Sorin (2000) argue instead that the *al* elements are essentially agreement heads, taking a genitive Spec.

In a cross-linguistic perspective, theories of Lkrs as case assigners have been proposed in the literature (notably Larson and Yamakido 2008 for the Persian ezafe), but they have been argued to meet problems (Franco *et al.* 2015). Vice versa, in the

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

predicative theory of Lkrs embraced here, Lkrs are seen essentially as bound Ds – which brings them close also to a characterization as agreement heads.

2. INTERACTIONS OF CASE WITH THE PERSON SPLIT

2.1. Morphological syncretism vs. syntactically different case

Within the framework outlined above, we concentrate now on the interaction of case distinctions with the intrinsic referential properties of arguments. In many Romance languages inflectional case, while absent from nouns, is preserved in the pronominal system and specifically in 1st/2nd person (1/2P) pronouns, which therefore come to differ from 3rd person (3P) pronouns (Loporcaro 2008, Manzini and Savoia 2014a).

The standard Romanian pronominal system is a case in point. The 3P case system reflects the two-case organization direct/oblique described for lexical Ns – however 1/2P distinguish more cases, as in (25). First, 1/2P singular have an accusative case – though it must be kept in mind that this only occurs embedded under prepositions (Pană Dindelegan 2013: 385), including the *pe* preposition that introduces Differential Object Marking (DOM). Second, only 3P pronominal forms are embeddable in all oblique contexts (dative and genitive); 1/2P forms are restricted to dative contexts, while genitive contexts are given over to so-called possessive adjectives, whose inflectional endings agree with the head N.

(25)		1sg	2sg	3sg	3pl	1pl	2pl
	Nom	*eu*	*tu*	*el/ea*	*ei/ele*	*noi*	*voi*
	Acc	*mine*	*tine*	*el/ea*	*ei/ele*	*noi*	*voi*
	Dat	*mie*	*ţie*	*lui/lei*	*lor*	*nouă*	*vouă*
	Gen	*me-u/a/i/le*	*tă-u/a/i/le*	*lui/lei*	*lor*	*nostr-u*, etc.	*vostr-u*, etc.

In (26a) we exemplify nominative pronouns (1/2P) or direct forms (3P). In (26b) we display the typical context in which 1/2P accusative forms are found, namely embedded under the *pe* preposition that introduces DOM in Romanian. (26c) illustrates core dative contexts.

(26) a. Eu dorm/tu dormi/el dorme/ea dorme [Romanian]
I sleep/you sleep/he sleeps/she sleeps

b. m-/te/ne-/v-/l- a văzut pe
me/you/us/you/him/her he.has seen DOM
mine/tine/noi/voi/el/ea
me/you/us/you.pl/him/her
'He saw me/you/us/him/her'

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

c. Mi/ţi/ni/vi/i l-a dat
to.me/you/us/you.pl/him/-her/-them it has given
mie/ţie/nouă/vouă/lui/el/lor
to.me/you/us/you.pl/him/her/them
'He gave it to me/you/us/him/her/them'

Genitive contexts require a brief discussion of their own. Despite having their own inflectional agreement with the head N, 1/2P possessive pronouns, no less than the oblique pronouns in the 3P, must be preceded by linkers, as in (27b), unless they are adjacent to a definite head N, as in (27a).

(27) a. cas-a me-a/profesor-u-lui [Romanian]
house-the mine/professor-the
'my/the professor's house'
b. cas-a de vacanţă a me-a/profesor-u-lui
house-the for vacation Lkr mine/professor-the
'my/the professor's vacation home'

Most prepositions embedding oblique, embed in fact genitives, since 1/2P pronouns take the possessive form, as illustrated in (28). To be more precise, the prepositional expression appears to contain a noun ('back', 'face'), bearing nominal inflections, with which the genitive pronoun agrees (Mardale *et al.* 2013: 535).

(28) în spate-le nostr-u/ în faţ-a noastr-ă [Romanian]
in back-the our-msg/in face-the our-fsg
'at our back (behind us)/ in our face (in front of us)'

Manzini and Savoia (2012), Savoia and Manzini (2012) study case differences imputable to the person split (1/2P vs. 3P) in Albanian, both Geg varieties (exemplified by Shkodër) and Tosk (Arbëresh) varieties. Albanian, like Romanian, has a definite and indefinite declension of Ns; four cases are distinguished, namely nominative, accusative and oblique (genitive/dative), and (less productively) ablative (i.e. locative). 3P pronouns present the same system as lexical Ns, as illustrated in (29) for the variety of Shkodër. With 1/2P pronouns in (30), the same pronoun covers accusative contexts and dative ones, though the ablative, associated with certain prepositional contexts, is kept distinct. In the 3P pronouns in (29) the ablative and the oblique are non-distinct (as in most Ns).

(29) Nom Acc Obl/Abl [Albanian (Shkodër)]
3sg *a-i* *at-ɛ* *at-ii*
3pl *at-a* *at-a* *at-ynɛ*

(30)

	Nom	Obl	Abl
1sg	*un*	*m-u*	*mej-ɛt*
2sg	*t-i*	*t-y*	*tej-ɛt*
1pl	*n-a*	*n-e*	*ne-ʃ*
2pl	*ju*	*ju*	*ju-ʃ*

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

The classical way to approach pronominal paradigms such as (29)–(30) is in terms of some morphological notion of syncretism (e.g. Turano 2004). The underlying case paradigm is fixed for the whole language and different nominal or pronominal subsystems may obfuscate this underlying regularity because of morphological readjustments (syncretisms). Manzini and Savoia (2007 ff.), on the contrary, view morphological patterns such as those considered in this section as clues to syntactically significant patterns. Not dissimilarly, Kayne (2010) views syncretisms as forms of 'ambiguity', i.e. the syncretic form has a syntactic-semantic core content that gets disambiguated according to the context of insertion. Specifically, Manzini and Savoia (2012), Savoia and Manzini (2012) argue that 1/2P pronouns (and/or clitics) exclude accusative case in Albanian and only have nominative or oblique inflections, the latter including genitive/dative and ablative; the labels in (30) reflect this analysis. In turn this state of affairs, far from representing a morphological quirk of the language, is due to the fact that 1/2P pronouns are systematically subject to DOM, which in Indo-European languages generally takes the form of obliquization. Thus Albanian 3P object, whether nominal or pronominal are in the direct case, but 1/2P pronouns are in the oblique case (the same case that surfaces in dative contexts) because this is the form that DOM takes in the language.

Similarly, in the Romance (Abruzzese) variety in (31a) it is only 1/2P pronouns that are associated with the prepositional introducer *a* corresponding to the canonical form of DOM in Romance; 3P pronouns as well as all lexical DPs are embedded as bare objects, as in (31b) (Manzini and Savoia 2005: 505).

(31) a. a camatə a mme/ a nnu [Colledimacine (Abruzzi)]
he.has called DOM me/ DOM us
'He called me/us'

b. a camatə frattə tiə/ kwiʎʎə
he.has called brother yours/ him
'He called him/your brother'

Manzini and Savoia (2012), Savoia and Manzini (2012) argue that the overt dative morphology of DOM objects in (31) corresponds to the fact that these forms are not directly embedded as the internal argument of the event. Rather, their embedding requires the presence of a case layer, the dative, dedicated to the expression of 'possessors'. Suppose that following section 1.3, we characterize the possession relation in terms of zonal inclusion, and we label the oblique case, carrying the relational inclusion content, as (⊆). In these terms, the structure of *a mme/a nnu* in (31a) is as in (32).

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(32) $[_{vP}$ CAUS $[_{VP}$ cam- $[_{PP(\subseteq)}$ a [me]]]]

In (32) the two arguments of (⊆) are the 1/2P pronoun and the event itself – adopting and adapting in this respect an idea of the applicative literature (Pylkkänen 2008). Intuitively, transitive predicates can be paraphrased by an elementary predicate associated with an eventive name. Thus 'call' alternates with 'give a call to'. Hale and Keyser (1993), Chomsky (1995) formalize this intuition about the complex nature of transitive predicates by assuming that they result from the incorporation of an elementary state/event into a transitivizing (typically causative) predicate. Within such a conceptual framework it becomes clearer what we mean when we say that in (32), (⊆) takes as its arguments the (elementary) state/event and the 1/2P pronoun. Thus (32) can be informally rendered as 'He caused me a call'. The claim is that the only way the 1/2P pronoun in (32) can be introduced as an object is by making it into a 'possessor' i.e. an element that takes in its 'zonal inclusion' domain the elementary event. The same characterization can be extended to DOM patterns involving definite/animate DPs.

The assimilation of DOM *a* arguments to *a* goals datives has long been held impossible because DOM arguments can passivize, while goal datives do not in Romance. This problem is discussed in great detail by Manzini and Franco (2016), who argue that the discriminating factor is that the dative case is inherent with verbs like 'give', i.e. it is selected by the verb as in Chomsky (1986), while the dative case with 'call' in (32) is structural, since it depends not on the selection properties of the lexical items involved, but on the syntactic configuration. Since goal obliques are selected by certain predicates, this requirement cannot be circumvented derivationally. On the contrary, DOM obliques are enforced by a requirement on VP-internal high ranked referents. This constraint can be circumvented derivationally, i.e. by extracting the highly ranked referent to a VP-external position, as in passive.

On the basis of our brief discussion of Albanian (30) and Abruzzese (31), we may now go back to the Romanian pronominal paradigm in (25). It is tempting to see in the so-called accusative pronouns *mine, tine* a form of DOM obliques, associated with prepositional contexts which select direct case with other pronouns. This hypothesis does not conflict with other evidence, since on external grounds the nature of the *–ne* morphology remains an open issue (Pană Dindelegan 2013: 380). According to our hypothesis, the structure associated with (26b) should be of the type in (33).

(33) $[_{vP}$ CAUS $[_{VP}$ văzut $[_{PP(\subseteq)}$ pe [mi $[_{(\subseteq)}$ne]]

Apart from the *–ne* morphology of the 1/2P pronoun, the other aspect of (33) that warrants some discussion is the preposition *pe* that introduces the DOM object. This is independently attested in Romanian with the locative meaning 'on'. Now, if

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

DOM is associated with obliquization, we in principle expect that a range of oblique prepositions or cases will be able to introduce DOM arguments, rather than just the *a* preposition or the dative case. Specifically, having assumed that the fundamental content of oblique cases/prepositions is (⊆), i.e. part/whole or inclusion, we may speculate that locative cases/prepositions, are characterized by locative restrictions on the (⊆) content. In other words 'the book in the box', 'the book on the shelf', etc., are essentially 'the book $(\subseteq)_{Loc}$ the box/the shelf' where different prepositions specify different locative restrictions, i.e. spatial configurations. Within the present framework of assumptions it is particularly easy to relate the locative use of *pe* to its occurrence as the DOM introducer. It is sufficient to say that the locative restriction depends on the locative content of the complement noun. In DOM contexts, the locative restriction on *pe* is removed, leaving just the elementary (⊆) content, as in (33).

In section 2.2 we complete our survey of Aromanian data within the general conceptual framework that we have now defined. In section 2.3 we return to possessive pronouns.

2.2. The Aromanian evidence

In Aromanian, all pronouns pattern alike, and in fact together with nouns, in having a single form for all direct case contexts. This makes Aromanian different from Romanian (25), and also from its contact language Albanian in (29)–(30). In (34) we exemplify the subject pronoun paradigm of Aromanian with the conjugation of 'I sleep'.

(34) mini dorm(u) **L**
tini dorɲ
atse-u/atsɛ-u/eu/ia dɔrmi
noi durɲim
voi durɲits
atsei dɔrm
'I sleep, you sleep, s/he sleeps, we sleep, you sleep, they sleep'

The same series of pronouns is found in the direct object position as in (35)–(36) or as the object of the DOM prepositional introducer *pe/pi* in (37).

(35) mi/ti/u/nə/və/li arə vədzutə mini/tini/atse-u/atsɛ-u/ **L**
me/you/him-her/us/you.pl/them they.have seen me/you/him/her/
noi/voi/atse-ʎi/atse-li
us/you.pl/them.m/them.f
'They have seen me/you/him/her/us/them'

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(36) mi/ti/ni vedi mini/tini/noi **F**
me/you/us he.sees me/you/us
'He sees me/you/us'

(37) a. mini gresku pe tse-u **D**
I call DOM him
'I call him'
b. atse-u ni/vi vedi pi noi/voi
he us/you sees DOM us/you
'He sees us/you'

Besides *pe/pi*, other prepositions select the direct case both with Ns and with pronouns. These include *di/ti*'for' in (38a)[6], *ɣa*'to' in (38b-b'), *ku* 'with' in (38c) and *dup* 'after' in (38d).

(38) a. mini o fakə ti/di mini/tini/atse-u/noi/voi/atse-ʎi/atse-li/ **L**
I it do for myself/you/him/us/you.pl/them.m/them.f/
məjɛr-a/fitʃor-u
woman-the/boy-the
'I do it for myself/you/him/us/them/the woman/the boy'
b. mini vas nɛg ɣa tini/atse-u/fɛt-a/fitʃor-u
I am going to you/him/girl-the/boy-the
'I am going towards you/him/the girl/the boy'
b'. eu ini ɣa mini/tini/noi/voi/atse-u/atsɛ-u
he comes to me/you/us/you.pl/him/her
'He comes towards me/you/us/them/him'
c. vini ku tini/mini/noi/atse-u/məjɛr-i/fitʃor-u
he.comes with you/me/us/him/the woman/the boy
'He comes with me/you/us/him/the woman/the boy'
d. dup mini/tini/noi/atse-u/atse-ʎi
after me/you/us/him/them.m

In the 1/2P singular, the form *mini/tini*, found only in the accusative in Romanian, is extended to nominative contexts. In section 2.1, we suggested that Romanian *mine/tine* are DOM forms, i.e. obliques rather than accusatives, as schematized in (33). In Aromanian, it is natural to assume that if *mini/tine* are essentially DOM obliques, their extension to subject position passes through the fact that in pro-drop languages (like Romanian and Aromanian), lexical subjects do not fill the [Spec, IP] position, but rather a left peripheral Topic position.

Let us then consider dative contexts. On the basis of the general parallelism between 3P pronouns and lexical Ns, we may expect that 3P pronouns are preceded by Lkr elements agreeing with them (i.e. *o* in the masculine and in the plural and

[6] In these varieties *ti/ di* is also the prepositional introducer of infinitival sentences (Manzini and Savoia forthcoming).

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

ali in the feminine, cf. section 1.1). This seems to be the case, since masculine and plural forms are introduced by *o*, as in (39b), while the feminine singular is introduced by *a*, as in (39a). On the other hand, in (39)–(40) 1/2P are preceded by the invariable element *a*. Recall from section 1.2 that the agreeing pre-genitival Lkr *al*, etc. of Romanian is analyzed as consisting of an invariable base *a* followed by the enclitic article. In turn, some scholar take *a* to be the preposition 'to' (Grosu 1994) while others consider *a* to be the invariable nominal base to which the enclitic article attaches (d'Hulst *et al.* 2000, Dobrovie-Sorin *et al.* 2013). In (40)–(41) therefore *a* could be an invariable Lkr, or a preposition.

(39) a. ɲ/ts/j u ar datə a **L**
to.me/you/him it they.have given Lkr/to
ɲ-ia/ts-ea/ts-iei/jei
me/you/her/her
'They gave it to me/you/her'

b. j u ar datə o ts-ui/ɣ-ui/ɣ-ɔrə
him it they.have given Lkr him/him/them
'They gave it to him/them'

c. atse-ʎi va s n/v u da a n-au/v-au
they will Prt to.us/you.pl it give Lkr/to us/you.pl
'They will give it to us/you'

(40) ɲ/ts/n u da a ɲ-ia/ts-əja/n-au **D**
to.me/you/us it he.gives Lkr/to me/you/us
'He gives it to me/you/us'

Genitive contexts remain now to be considered. 3P pronouns present the same oblique form as is found in dative contexts in (39)–(40), reproducing in this respect the pattern of lexical Ns. This is illustrated for instance in (41b'). On the other hand, 1/2P pronouns are associated with specialized possessives agreeing with the head N. For instance, the inflection on the possessives in (41a) and (41b) differs depending on the number of the head noun 'house(s)'; the same holds of (41c) and (41d). These possessive pronouns are preceded by the invariable Lkr/preposition *a*, namely the same form found in dative contexts. The examples in (42)–(43) show the same set of phenomena when nouns and their possessive modifiers are embedded in an oblique position.

(41) a. kas-a/mən-a a mɛ-u/ta-u/nɔst **L**
house-the/hand-the Lkr/to my-sg/your-sg/our
'my/your/our house/hand'

b. kas-li a mɛ-li/ta-li/nɔst-i
houses-the Lkr/to my-fpl/your-fpl/our-pl
'my/your/our houses'

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

b’. kəmiʃ-li o ɣui/ɣɔrə
shirts-the Lkr him/their
‘his/their shirts’

c. frat-li a ɲe-u/to-u/jei/nɔst
brother-the Lkr/to my-sg/your-sg/her/our
‘my/your/our brother’

c’. frat-li o tsu-i/ɣɔrə
brother-the Lkr him/them
‘his/their brother’

d. kɛɲ-ʎi a ɲe-ʎi/to-ʎi/nɔst
the dogs Lkr/to my-mpl/your-mpl/our
‘my/your/our dogs’

ar vənit frats-ʎi a to-ʎ/
they.have come brothers-the Lkr/to your-mpl/
surɛr-li a mɛ-li
sisters-the Lkr/to my-fpl
‘Your brothers/my sisters came’

(42) a. i o dəd ali sor-li/ a ta-u/
to.her/them it I.gave Lkr sister-the Lkr/to your-sg/
o surɛr-li a ta-li
Lkr sisters-the Lkr/to your-fpl
‘I gave it to your sister/sisters

b. i o am dat o frat-lu o to-u/
to.her/them it I.have given Lkr brother-the Lkr your-sg/
fratʃ-ʎu a to-ʎi
brothers-the.Obl Lkr/to your-mpl
‘I gave it to your brother/to your brothers’

(43) j u dəd o hij-u a ɲe-u/tə-l **F**
to.him it I.gave Lkr son-the Lkr/to my-msg/your-msg
‘I gave it to my/your/his son’

In copular, predicative contexts, 1/2P possessive pronouns again agree with the possessee, namely with the EPP argument, as illustrated in (44).

(44) a. atseu esti a ɲe-u/ to-u/ o tsui **L**
it.m is Lkr/to my-msg/your-msg/ Lkr him
‘It is mine/yours/hers/his’

atsɛu esti a mɛ-u/ ta-u/ jei/ o ɣui
it.f is Lkr/to my-fsg/your-fsg/her/ Lkr him
‘It is mine/yours/hers/his’

b. atse-i kɛɲ-ʎi səntə a ne-ʎə/to-ʎ(i)/nɔstər/ o ɣui
those dogs-the they.are Lkr/to my-mpl/your-mpl/our/ Lkr him
‘Those dogs are mine/yours/ours/his’

b’. aist kəmiʃ-li sənə a me-li/ta-li/ o ɣɔrə
these shirts they.are Lkr/to mine/yours/ Lkr them
‘These shirts are mine/yours/their’

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

Finally, 1/2P possessive pronouns are embedded under spatial/temporal expressions such as 'behind', 'in front' in (45)–(46), which otherwise select the oblique form of 3P pronouns or of nouns, as in (46a). Following the analysis of these phrases in Romanian (Mardale *et al.* 2013), the agreement of the possessive element depends on the head of the spatial/temporal expression, which is evidently nominal in character.

(45) a. esti dəninti/dənəpoi a mɛ-u/ta-u/nɔstrə/vɔstrə/ **L**
is behind/in front Lkr/to my/your/our/your/
a jei
Lkr/to her
'He/she/it is behind/in front of me/you/us/you.pl/her'

b. esti dəninti/dənəpoi o ɣui/ɣɔrə/fitʃɔr-u
is behind/in front Lkr him/them/boy-the
'He/she/it is behind/in front of him/them/the boy'

(46) a. deninte o fitʃor-u/un fitʃor-u **D**
in front Lkr boy-the/a boy
'in front of the/a boy'

b. deninti a me-u/ta-u/nostər/vostər/ts-jei
in front Lkr/to my/your/our/your/her
'in front of me/you/us/her'

c. deninti o tsuɣ-or
in front Lkr them
'in front of them'

Let us summarize so far. The pronominal case system that we have described for Aromanian varieties can be summarized as in (47), where all pronouns are associated with a single direct case, but 1/2P pronouns differ from 3P pronouns in the expression of the oblique. 3P pronouns behave like nouns in that they have a single oblique form for both dative and genitive contexts. On the contrary, in genitive contexts 1/2P pronouns take the form of possessives, whose inflection agrees with the head N. With 1/2P possessive pronouns but also oblique pronouns in general the role of Lkr is played by the invariable element *a.*

(47)		1sg	2sg	3sg	3pl	1pl	2pl
	Direct	*mini*	*tini*	*eu/ia*	*eʎ/eli*	*noi*	*voi*
	Dat	*aʃtia*	*a tsea*	*o ɣui/a jei*	*o ɣor(ə)*	*a nau*	*a vau*
	Gen	*amɛ-u, a mɛ-li,* etc.	*a ta-u, a ta-li,* etc.	*o ɣui/a jei*	*o ɣor(ə)*	*a nɔstər*	*a vɔstər*

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

The most interesting aspect of the pronominal system of Aromanian is therefore the Person split observed in the expression of obliques – specifically the emergence of 1/2P possessors characterized both by a Lkr(-like) introducer and by inflectional agreement with the head N. We focus on possessive pronouns in the next section.

2.3. Possessive pronouns as Suffixaufnahme

In typological work (Plank 1995), the Suffixaufnahme label covers a number of phenomena, which include Lkrs as in Albanian and Romanian/Aromanian, and case stacking, i.e. the phenomenon whereby an oblique DP is seen to have a double case – namely its own case and the case of a noun it modifies (e.g. in Lardil, Pama-Nyungan). Structural criteria confirm the identification of the two phenomena. Specifically, stacked suffixes and Lkr heads display the same syntactic distribution, occurring first and foremost in adnominal modification contexts. Furthermore, Lkr heads and stacked suffixes have the same constituent structure, since both are internal to the projection of the modifier phrase (say, the genitive phrase); this is obvious for suffixation and has been briefly discussed for Lkrs in section 1. On the other hand, linear order differs, since Lkrs precede the genitives or other modifiers while stacked cases are suffixed to them. Furthermore, Lkr heads normally bear phi-feature agreement properties, while stacking in Australian languages does not.

Nevertheless, the potential formal differences between Lkrs and case stacking are bridged by intermediate phenomena, such as inflected genitive postpositions in Indo-Aryan languages. Consider Punjabi, which has a residual case inflection in the masculine (Manzini and Savoia 2015). As can be seen in (48), Punjabi stacks a case and agreement inflection on the postpositional genitive. Thus suffixal material may involve agreement only in case (Lardil), or agreement in both case and phi-features (Punjabi). Lkrs in turn can display agreement in phi-features and case (Albanian, Aromanian) or just in phi-features (Kurmanji Kurdish, Franco *et al.* 2015).

(48) a. munɖ-ea-d-a darwaddʒ-a [Punjabi]
boy-mpl.obl-of-msg door-msg
'the door of the boys'

b. munɖ-e-d-i kita:b
boy-msg.obl-of-fsg book.fsg
'the book of the boy'


c. munɖ-e-d-e pra-d-i kita:b
boy-msg.obl-of-msg.obl brother.msg-gen-fsg book.fsg
'the book of the brother of the boy'

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

In the picture of variation just outlined, the possessive pronouns of Romance languages, agreeing with the head N, are naturally understood as a residual Suffixaufnahme. The evidence for this line of analysis is particularly strong in Romanian/Aromanian where, in the words of Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2011) "agreeing pronominal possessors occupy the same syntactic position as genitive marked pronouns". They conclude that "inherent φ-features (i.e., features that give indications regarding the referent of the Possessor itself) may co-occur with inherited φ-features i.e., features that are inherited from the N-head, which give indications regarding … the grammatical features of N°". In the technical detail, Giurgea (2011) suggests that in Romanian "the agreement morpheme does not attach directly to the root, but the root is first extended by an element … that can be analyzed as a possessive suffix […] Given this decomposition, the agreement morpheme of agreeing possessors does not attach to DP, but rather to a Case projection". The connection with the so-called pre-genitival articles of Romanian (*al*, etc.) and of Albanian is also noted by Giurgea (2011).

Concretely, consider the Aromanian example in (41e). In present terms, the structure of *surɛrli a tali* 'your sisters' is as in (49), adopting the idea that the extension of the 2P root *t-* by *-a* is a form of genitive marking. The genitive case is the relational predicate (⊆), taking as its internal argument the 1/2P pronoun 'you' and as its external argument the head N 'sisters'. The *–li* ending on *ta-li* provides a representation of the external argument of the (⊆) predicate internal to the maximal projection of (⊆).

(49)



Under the account we just gave of it, the structure in (49) is like a Lkr structure – except that the role played by the Lkr in Albanian or in Romanian (23) is played here by the suffixal agreement *-li*. This role is to provide an instantiation (a copy) of the external argument of the genitive relation (⊆), internal to the maximal projection of (⊆) itself. In other words, we conclude that Lkrs and agreeing possessive pronouns are unified by the generalization in (50), at least in so far as genitive/dative case, i.e. (⊆), environments are concerned.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

(50) **Syntactic Aufnahme**. The arguments of the (⊆) predicate are instantiated within the (⊆)P phrase.

A comparison with Albanian shows that the internal structure of possessives in Albanian, as in Aromanian (49), includes three parts, namely an initial Lkr, the 1/2P pronominal element and an agreement inflection. By way of an example, we illustrate the 1/2P singular forms from the Shkodër variety in (51)–(52). In keeping with the analysis suggested in Demiraj (1985), we can segment these forms into an initial element *j/e/t* which lexicalizes definiteness and is sensitive to the case and phi-features of the head noun, like other Lkrs. This is followed by an element fixing the 1/2P referent and by a final agreement element occurring only with feminine head nouns. The morphemes carrying 1/2P reference consist of a simple radical form in singular DPs in (51). However, in plural DPs in (52) we can distinguish the *m-, tu-* root from an *-i* inflection which we may identify with a (⊆) 'genitive' morpheme[7].

(51) a. tʃɛn-i j em/at [Albanian (Shkodër)]
dog-msg.nom.def Lkr my/your
'my/your dog'

a'. tʃɛn-in/tʃɛn-it t em/and
dog-msg.acc.def/dog-msg.obl.def Lkr my/your
'(to) my/your dog'

b. ʃpi-a j em-e/ɔt-e
house-fsg.nom.def Lkr my-f/your-f
'my/your house'

b'. ʃpi-n/ ʃpi-s t em-e/and-e
house-acc.def/house-fsg.obl.def Lkr my-f/your-f
'(to) my/your house'

(52) a. tʃej-t e m-i/tu-i
dog-pl.def Lkr my/your
'my/your dogs'

a'. tʃej-vɛ t m-i/tu-i
dog-pl.obl Lkr my/your
'to my/your dogs'


[7] A further point of interest is that in the singular DPs in (51), the possessive morphology shows a case split contrasting nominative contexts in (51a–b) with objective (accusative and dative) ones in (51a'–b'). In plural DPs in (52), the split is between direct case contexts in (52a–b) and oblique case contexts in (52a'–b'). The distribution in plural DPs is that found throughout the nominal paradigm, where nominative and accusative morphology are identified in the plural and separated from the oblique. However the distribution in singular DPs in (51) does not reflect the nominative-accusative-oblique organization of the nominal paradigm, but rather the opposition nominative-oblique found in the 1/2P paradigm in (30).

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

b.	ʃpi-t	e	m-i-a/tu-i-a
	house-pl.def	Lkr	my-fpl/your-fp
	'my/yourhouses'		
b'.	ʃpi-vɛ	t	m-i-a/tu-i-a
	house-pl.obl	Lkr	my-fpl/your-fpl
	'to my/your houses'		

The structure in (53) for (52b') parallelsthat in (49). Specifically, the case category merged with the 1/2P element seems to coincide with the one present in Aromanian/Romanian. Crucially (53) satisfies the requirement in (50) by representing the external argument of (⊆) inside the possessor phrase, via the Lkr element and here also via the suffixed agreement.

(53)



In the structure in (54) for (51b) it is more difficult to segment away a (⊆) morpheme. However, the essence of what we have called syntactic Suffixaufnahme holds in this simplified representation as well, namely the presence of both arguments of the possessive relation inside the possessive phrase. The possessor is of course represented by the 1/2P pronoun, while the possessee (ultimately the head noun) is represented by the Lkr and the inflectional agreement.

(54) $[_{DP}$ ʃpi-a_x $[_{DP}$ j$_x$ $[_{1/2P}[em_y]$ $[e_x]]]$

3. CONCLUSIONS

In this contribution we analyzed the internal structure of the Aromanian noun. We focused on inflection and case categories, which have been investigated here on the basis of a theoretical framework that aims to get over the traditional cartographic design. Rather, we have followed the idea that the morphological

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

organization of the noun projects syntactic structure, in strict adherence to the minimalist principle of projection of syntax from the lexicon. From an empirical point of view, we have introduced a systematic comparison between Aromanian and Romanian, on the one hand, and between Aromanian and Albanian (Shkodër) on the other. This crosslinguistic perspective allowed us to obtain a clearer view of the relevant phenomena, specifically DOM and Linkers.

Following recent proposals (Manzini and Savoia 2011a,b, 2012, 2014a, Savoia and Manzini 2012), we provide a treatment of oblique case as a lexicalization of the part-whole or possessee-possessor relation that we formalize as the inclusion predicate $\subseteq$. This conceptualization makes it possible to unify genitive and dative on the basis of a shared semantico-syntactic content. We have extended this analysis to DOM phenomena, assuming that the oblique form taken by DOM objects in Romanian/Aromanian, Albanian, etc. reflects the fact that they are introduced by $\subseteq$. Specifically in many languages 1/2P elements cannot be inserted as themes or patients of an event, but they need be inserted as the 'possessors' of the event, more precisely they are represented as including the event. This pattern emerges in Albanian, where the paradigm of 1/2 person pronouns unifies the lexicalization of the internal argument of transitives with the oblique. Something similar may be going on in Romanian/Aromanian with the 1/2P forms *mine/tine*.

As for Linkers, we have proposed an analysis whereby they can be identified with agreement elements, even if interesting differences between Aromanian and Romanian/Albanian emerge, for example in the fact that in Aromanian the Linker introducing a genitive agrees with the complement and not with the head of the DP. Another difference between Aromanian and Romanian/Albanian is the presence of the Linker element also in dative contexts. We briefly show that the copular nature of Linkers cannot be defended; it is the $\subseteq$ oblique case that introduces a predication, while Linkers provide partial satisfactions of one of the arguments of the predication (normally the possessee) within the $\subseteq$ projection.

Finally, we have examined possessive structures. In Aromanian, as in Romanian and in Albanian, 3P pronouns patterns with lexical DPs. However, 1/2P pronouns have specialized possessive forms, which show a complex internal structure, including an initial Linker, the 1/2P pronoun proper and an inflectional element agreeing with the possessee (i.e. the head noun). Based on these forms, we have argued for the continuity of agreeing possessive pronouns with Suffixaufnahme phenomena. Moreover, in Romanian and Aromanian possessives occur in prepositional contexts pointing to the nominal nature of the elements embedding them. In general, we have tried to reach an analysis based on the morphemic organization of the various elements considered, assuming that morphological structure is normally isomorphic to the syntactic organization it externalizes.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

REFERENCES

Aissen, J., 2003, "Differential object marking: iconicity vs. economy", *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 21, 435–483.
Beck, S., K. Johnson, 2004, "Double objects again", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35, 97–124.
Belvin, R., M. den Dikken, 1997, "*There*, happens, *to, be, have*", *Lingua*, 101, 3–4, 151–183.
Campos, H., 2005, "Noun modification, pseudo-articles, and last resort operations in Arvantovlaxika and in Romanian", *Lingua*, 115, 311–347.
Campos, H., 2008, "Some notes on adjectival articles in Albanian", *Lingua*, 119, 1009–1034.
Campos, H., M. Stavrou, 2005, "Polydefinites in Greek and Aromanian", in: O. M. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 137–173.
Chomsky, N., 1986, *Knowledge of Language. Its nature, Origin, and Use*, New York, Praeger.
Chomsky, N., 1995, *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
Chomsky, N., 2001, "Derivation by phase", in: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language.* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1–52.
Cornilescu, A., 1992, "Notes on the structure of the Romanian DP and the assignment of the Genitive Case", *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 107–133.
Cornilescu, A., I. Giurgea, 2013, "The adjective", in: C. Dobrovie-Sorin, I. Giurgea (eds), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian Volume 1: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 97–174.
Demiraj, Sh., 1985, *Gramatikë historike e gjuhës shqipe*, Tiranë, Shtëpia botuese "8 Nëntori".
den Dikken, M., P. Singhapreecha, 2004,"Complex noun Phrases and linkers", *Syntax*, 7, 1–54.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 2000,"(In)definiteness spread: from Romanian genitives to Hebrew construct state nominals", in: V. Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative studies in Romanian syntax,* Amsterdam, Elsevier, 177–226.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C., I. Giurgea, 2011, "Pronominal Possessors and Feature Uniqueness", *Language*, 87, 127–157
Dobrovie-Sorin, C., I. Giurgea, I. Nedelcu, 2013, "Genitive DPs and pronominal possessors", in: C. Dobrovie-Sorin, I. Giurgea (eds), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian Volume 1: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 309–354.
Fillmore, C., 1968, "The Case for Case", in: E. Bach, R. T. Harms (eds), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1–88.
Franco, L., M. R. Manzini, L. M. Savoia, 2015, "Linkers and agreement", *The Linguistic Review*, 32, 277–332.
Giurgea, I., 2011, "Agreeing possessors and the theory of case", *Bucharest Working papers in Linguistics*, 2, 5–35.
Giurgea, I., 2012, "The origin of the Romanian "possessive-genitival article" *al* and the development of the demonstrative system", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 56, 1, 35–68.
Grosu, A., 1994, *Three studies in Locality and Case*, London, Routledge.
Hale, K., S. J. Keyser, 1993, "On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations", in: K. Hale, S. J. Keyser (eds), *The view from Building 20*, Cambridge, Mass, The MIT Press, 53–109.
Harley, H., 2002, "Possession and the Double Object Construction", *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 2, 29–68.
Higginbotham, J., 1985, "On semantics", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16, 547–621.
Holmberg, A., D. Odden, 2008, "The noun phrase in Hawrami", in: S. Karimi, V. Samiian, D. Stilo (eds), *Aspects of Iranian Linguistics*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 129–151.
d'Hulst, Y., M. Coene, L. Tasmowski, 2000, "Last resort strategies in DP: Article reduplication in Romanian and French", in: V. Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative studies in Romanian syntax,* Amsterdam, Elsevier, 135–176.
Kayne, R., 2010, *Comparisons and Contrasts*, New York, Oxford University Press.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)

Larson, R., H. Yamakido, 2008, "Ezafe and the deep position of nominal modifiers", in: L. McNally, C. Kennedy (eds), *Adjectives and adverbs. Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 43–70.

Lekakou, M., K. Szendrői, 2012, "Polydefinites in Greek: Ellipsis, close apposition and expletive determiners", *Journal of Linguistics,* 48, 107–149.

Loporcaro, M., 2008, "Opposizioni di caso nel pronome personale: i dialetti del mezzogiorno in prospettiva romanza", in: A. De Angelis (ed.), *I dialetti meridionali tra arcaismo e interferenza*, Palermo, Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, 207–235.

Manzini, M. R., L. Franco, 2016, "Goal and DOM datives", *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory,* 34, 197–240.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2005, *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2007, *A unification of morphology and syntax,* London, Routledge.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2011a, *Grammatical Categories,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2011b, "Reducing 'case' to 'agreement': Nominal inflections in the Geg Albanian variety of Shkodër", *Linguistic Variation*, 11, 76–120.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2012, "The Interaction of DOM and Discourse-Linking in Arbëresh Pronouns: Case as Nominal Property", in: G. Turano, R. Memushaj, F. Koleci (eds), *Theoretical and empirical studies in Albanian Syntax. Studime teorike dhe empirike në fushën e sintaksës së shqipes*, München, Lincom Europa, 119–139.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2014a, "From Latin to Romance: case loss and preservation in pronominal systems", *Probus*, 26, 217–248.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2014b, "Linkers in Aromanian in comparison to Albanian and Romanian", *RGG.Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 36, 83–104.

Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2015, "Oblique case and Indo-European ergativity splits", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, LX, 297–315.

Manzini M.R., L.M. Savoia, forthcoming, "Finite and non-finite complementation, particles and control in Aromanian, compared to other Romance varieties and Albanian", *Linguistic Variation.*

Mardale, A., C. Dobrovie-Sorin, I. Giurgea, 2013, "Adnominal prepositional phrases", in: C. Dobrovie-Sorin, I. Giurgea (eds), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian Volume 1: The noun phrase*,Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 531–564.

Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), 2013, *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Parsons, T., 1979, "An Analysis of Mass Terms and Amount Terms", in: F. J. Pelletier(ed.), *Mass terms: some philosophical problems*, Dordrecht, Springer, 137–166.

Partee, B. H., 1995, "Lexical Semantics and Compositionality", in:L. R. Gleitman, M. Liberman, (eds), *An Invitation to Cognitive Science (Second Edition). Volume 1: Language*, Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 311–360.

Pesetsky, D., 1995, *Zero syntax*, Cambridge, Mss., The MIT Press.

Philip, N. J., 2012, *Subordinating and coordinating linkers*, PhD diss., University College London.

Plank, F., 1995, "(Re-) Introducing Suffixaufnahme", in: F. Plank (ed.), *Double Case. Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3–112.

Pylkkänen, L., 2008, *Introducing Arguments,* Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Savoia, L. M., M. R. Manzini, 2012, "Case as Nominal Property: the Interaction of DOM and Discourse-linking in Shkodër Pronouns", in: R. Ismajli (ed.), *Shqipja dhe gjuhët e Ballkanit – Albanian and Balkan Languages*, Prishtinë, Akademia e Shkencave dhe e Arteve e Kosovës – Akademia e Shkencave e Shqipërisë, 411–432.

Turano, G., 2004, *Introduzione alla grammatica dell'albanese*, Firenze, Alinea.

BDD-A26031 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:55:29 UTC)