

RODICA ZAFIU: LINGVISTA, PROFESOARA, COLEGA, PRIETENA

Volumul de față este dedicat, așa cum spune și titlul, lingvistei, profesoarei, colegei și prietenei Rodica Zafiu, personalitate și promotoare a școlii bucureștene de lingvistică, vreme de mai bine de un deceniu directoare a Departamentului de lingvistică al Facultății de Litere, autoare a unor cărți de referință și a numeroase studii de specialitate cu deschidere internațională, caracterizate, toate, prin cercetare minuțioasă, sincronică și diacronică, prin racordare la ultimele cercetări în domeniu și, mai ales, printr-o optimistă obiectivitate. Diversitatea domeniilor pe care le cuprinde acest volum reflectă diversitatea preocupărilor științifice ale sărbătoritei, iar numărul mare de autori și contribuții arată aprecierea, prietenia și recunoștința pe care le avem cu toții pentru omul de carte Rodica Zafiu, model științific și uman de echilibru și de înțelegere rafinată a mecanismelor de funcționare a limbii, în evoluția și complexitatea lor.

PERSONALITĂȚI
ALE UNIVERSITĂȚII
DIN BUCUREȘTI

RODICA ZAFIU: LINGVISTA,
PROFESOARA, COLEGA,
PRIETENA



Editori

Adina DRAGOMIRESCU
Carmen MÎRZEA VASILE
Cristian MOROIANU
Isabela NEDELCU
Andra VASILESCU



EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII DIN BUCUREȘTI
BUCHAREST UNIVERSITY PRESS



**Editura Universității din București – Bucharest University Press
folosește sistemul de peer review dublu anonim.**

Coperta domeniului/colecției: EUB – BUP
Redactor: EUB – BUP
Tehnoredactor: Mariana IONICĂ

Imagine (foto) copertă: Biblioteca Facultății de Litere, arhiva Universității din București

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României

Rodica Zafiu : lingvистa, profesoara, colega, prietena / coord., ed.: Adina Dragomirescu, Carmen Mîrzea Vasile, Cristian Moroianu, - București : Editura Universității din București - Bucharest University Press, 2023
Conține bibliografie
ISBN 978-606-16-1356-4

I. Dragomirescu, Adina (coord. ; ed.)
II. Mîrzea Vasile, Carmen (coord. ; ed.)
III. Moroianu, Cristian (coord. ; ed.)

81
929

© EUB – BUP pentru prezenta versiune

<https://editura-unibuc.ro/>

B-dul Mihail Kogălniceanu 36-46, Cămin A (curtea Facultății de Drept),
Corp A, Intrarea A, etaj 1-2, Sector 5, București, România; tel.: + (4) 0726 390 815
e-mail: editura@g.unibuc.ro
Librărie online: <https://editura-unibuc.ro/magazin/>
Centru de vânzare: Bd. Schitu Măgureanu, nr. 9, parter (holul Facultății de Sociologie
și Asistență Socială); tel. + (4) 021 305 37 03

CUPRINS

Ioana PÂRVULESCU	
De ce o admir pe Rodica Zafiu	11
Liviu PAPADIMA	
Lingvistă între literați, optimistă între pesimiști, prietenă între prieteni	15
	* *
	*
Liliana AGACHE	
Unde s-a tradus <i>Istoria poamelor</i> ?	19
Maria ALDEA	
Un promotor al limbii române: Nicolae Nifon Bălășescu	25
Bianca ALECU	
Stilistica rubricii <i>Cuvinte nepotrivite</i> : (mai mult de) un deceniu de „anamneze” lingvistice	33
Andrei A. AVRAM	
Name truncation and word clipping in Romanian	45
Larisa AVRAM, Alexandru MARDALE, Elena SOARE	
The comprehension of restrictive relatives by child heritage speakers of Romanian: on the role of reduced input	59
Cezar BĂLĂȘOIU	
Diagrafurile și recuperarea ordinii expresive. Studiu de caz	73
Gabriela BIRIȘ	
De la funcțional la ficțional – limbajul publicitar al proiectelor imobiliare	87
Marinela BOTA	
Funcții discursive ale marcatorului <i>no</i>	93
Mădălina BOTEZ STĂNESCU	
Trecerea elementului prepozițional „(pe) lângă” de la valoarea locativă la cea cumulativă	103

Raluca BRĂESCU, Irina PARASCHIV	
Aspecte ale conversiunii substantiv – adjectiv invariabil	115
Oana CHELARU-MURĂRUȘ	
Schită pentru o poetică a autoportretului – de la pictură la poezie	129
Adrian CHIRCU	
<i>De la mica ciupeală la marele fix</i> . Adverbe, locuțiuni și expresii adverbiale argotice românești	153
Antonia CIOLAC	
Éléments sous-standard ou standard du français canadien dans un dictionnaire bilingue roumain – québécois	173
Ștefan COLCERIU, Adina DRAGOMIRESCU, Alexandru NICOLAE	
Un fenomen sintactic explicabil prin contact lingvistic: folosirea pronumelui <i>cine</i> în relative cu antecedent	187
Francisco R. CONSTANTIN	
O analiză motivațională pe baza materialului dialectal din ALRR. <i>Sinteză I</i>	201
Mihaela-Viorica CONSTANTINESCU	
Construirea ludică a identității online	213
Simona CONSTANTINOVICI	
Memoriile de război ale lui George Topîrceanu. Considerații asupra lexicului militar	227
Alexandra CORNILESCU	
Varieties of Romanian Benefactives	239
Adriana COSTĂCHESCU	
Pragmatique des futurs en roumain: entre deixis et anaphore	255
Blanca CROITOR, Ion GIURGEA	
On the differential marking of definite objects in Romanian	271
Alexandra CUNIȚĂ	
Décrire le lexique, évoquer la représentation de ce qui est nommé, parler du monde réel	293
Maria CVASNÎI CĂTĂNESCU	
Despre ethos și pathos. Studiu de caz: <i>Răspunsul la Discursul de recepție în Academie</i>	307
Florica DIMITRESCU	
Poezie și culoare	319
Andreea DINICĂ	
Despre construcțiile de tipul „a avea frică” în limba română veche	339
Mihaela-Liliana DOBRE NAE	
Funcționarea întrebării retorice în textele vechi românești	347

Felicia DUMAS	
Le lexique chrétien en langue française et sa vitalité	361
Claudia ENE	
Modalizarea în discursul de lansare a campaniei pentru alegerile prezidențiale	371
Viviana-Monica FĂTU ILIE	
Aspecte vechi și noi ale argoului din mediul școlar	385
Cristina FLORESCU	
Termenii astronomici între științific, uzual și dialectal	391
Alina-Georgiana FOCȘINEANU	
Considerații asupra autoreferirii în raport cu Poarta în epoca fanariotă. Studiu de caz: folosirea unor formule care au ca formant substantivul „rob”	403
Alexandru GAFTON	
Norma lingvistică	411
Gerda HÄBLER	
L’usage du passé simple et du passé composé du français classique et la description de ces deux temps dans des grammaires de l’époque	437
Luminița HOARȚĂ CĂRĂUȘU	
Mărcile ezitării și corectării în româna vorbită	449
Cornelia ILIE	
Conceptualizing freedom: Keywords in a cross-linguistic perspective	465
Liliana IONESCU-RUXĂNDIOIU	
Titu Maiorescu, parlamentar	477
Coman LUPU	
Din nou despre datarea cultismelor în DCECH	485
Martin MAIDEN	
Why <i>urzică</i> and not <i>**urțică</i> ? A prickly problem of historical etymology	501
Mihaela MANCAȘ	
Metafora afectivității în poezia contemporană. Preliminarii	511
Margareta MANU MAGDA	
Aspecte ale atitudinii apologetice: exemplul limbii române	525
Alexandru MAREȘ	
Istoria icoanei Maicii Domnului de la Mănăstirea Neamț, prima creație literară a lui Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu)?	543
Mihaela MARIN	
Un termen românesc vechi cu echivalente în limbile balcanice: <i>strungă</i>	557

Stanca MĂDA	
Elemente nonverbale în pedagogia Franz Kett. O abordare pragmasemantică	567
Călin-Andrei MIHĂILESCU	
On natural languages' naturalness	579
Ioan MILICĂ	
Anatomia invectivei și publicistica eminesciană	581
Mihaela MIRON-FULEA	
Anafora asociativă. Particularități pragmasemantice	595
Mihaela-Roxana MUNTEANU	
Secvențe discursive într-un apel caritabil. Studiu de caz: UNICEF	607
Simona-Ștefania NEAGU	
Variații de topică în structurile cu forme verbale compuse. Cu raportare la un corpus de documente originale din secolele al XVII-lea și al XVIII-lea	613
Raluca-Mihaela NEDEA	
Lexic comun vs lexic specializat. Câteva argumente pentru o altfel de abordare lexicografică în DEX a terminologiei medicale	623
Florentina NICOLAE	
Fitonimele în psalmii lui Dosoftei	637
Oana NICULESCU	
A preliminary study of filler particles in Romanian connected speech	651
Gabriela PANĂ DINDELEGAN	
Pe marginea a două concepte recente: <i>degramaticalizare</i> , <i>delexicalizare</i>	663
Elena PLATON	
Pe spinarea vântului	671
Cecilia Mihaela POPESCU	
Le futur et le conditionnel des langues romanes: zones de convergence et de divergence au niveau intra- et interlinguistique	687
Carolina POPUȘOI	
Sinonimia frazeologismelor adverbiale în limba română	699
Christopher J. POUNTAIN	
Tracing "change from above": the diastratic and diaphasic trajectory of Spanish cultured borrowings	719
Roxana-Magdalena PREDA (DINCĂ)	
Observații asupra utilizării marcatorului <i>gen</i> în limba română	733
Leonardo Maria SAVOIA	
The residual case system in the Aromanian varieties spoken in Southern Albania	745
Răzvan SĂFTOIU	
Politicianul digital: O analiză bidimensională	757

Andreea SOARE	
Pentru o viață sănătoasă, evitați cuvintele de plastic	771
Maria STANCIU ISTRATE	
Rarități morfologice în romanul popular <i>Varlaam și Ioasaf</i>	779
Gabriela STOICA	
Funcționarea retoric-argumentativă a emoțiilor sociomorale. Studiu de caz	787
Ariadna ȘTEFĂNESCU	
<i>Cum a fost la mare?</i> Analiză a unei povestiri în format dialogal	805
Mădălina TĂBĂCITU	
Câteva verbe cu paradigmă defectivă – în dicționare normative și în uzul actual. Studiu de caz: verbul <i>a accede</i>	815
Dana-Lumița TELEOACĂ	
Aspecte ale productivității în câmp discursiv paremiologic: Cu referire la tipare proverbiale ce includ termeni religioși	829
Emanuela TIMOTIN	
Despre vechea tradiție românească a <i>Imnului Acatist</i> . Versiunea tipărită de Antim Ivireanul	843
Alice TOMA, Doina BUTIURCĂ	
Variații culturale în terminologia sportului. Studiu de caz contrastiv: volei de plajă în română, franceză și engleză	857
Dragoș Vlad TOPALĂ	
Limbajul veteranilor moldoveni în istoria orală a Războiului din Afganistan (1979–1989) – evocarea mediului ambiant	871
Camelia UȘURELU	
Procedeele retorice în predici, ornament sau necesitate? (Cu referire la <i>Didahiile</i> lui Antim Ivireanul și la <i>Cazaniile</i> lui Ilie Miniati)	887
Oana UȚĂ BĂRBULESCU, Melania ROIBU	
Judecăți, prejudecăți și marginalia la negația metalingvistică	899
Luisa VALMARIN	
Una prosatrice da riscoprire: Sidonia Drăgușanu	913
Monica VASILEANU	
Cum vorbește generația Z	929
Ioana VINTILĂ-RĂDULESCU	
Absențe din DOOM ³	939
	* * *
Tabula gratulatoria	943

Leonardo Maria SAVOIA*
University of Florence, Italy

THE RESIDUAL CASE SYSTEM IN THE AROMANIAN VARIETIES SPOKEN IN SOUTHERN ALBANIA¹

Abstract: This article addresses some morphosyntactic phenomena concerning the nominal inflections in the Aromanian varieties spoken in Southern Albania, in the villages of Libofshë, in Musachia, and Këllez, in the region of Gjirokaštër. These varieties share a residual system of case morphology, more precisely, a specialized inflection associated with the plural definite and feminine singular nouns in prepositional, genitive, and dative contexts introduced by the Possessive Introducer (PI). Our approach assumes that morphology is part of the syntactic computation based on the Merge operation.

1. Introduction

The Aromanian varieties of Myzeqeja/ Musachia (Rëmën), and the Gjirokaštër area (Frashërot or Vllehtë), spoken in southern Albania, despite some minor differences, share fundamental properties, including a restricted system of case morphology characterized by a specialized oblique inflection in the plural of definite nouns and, partially, in the feminine singular. The oblique forms occur in genitive, dative, and complex locative prepositions where they are introduced by the Possessive Introducer (PI) (cf. Capidan 1932, Caragiu Marioțeanu 1975, Poçi 2009). This morphology, which we descriptively label in terms of case, reveals a connection with the properties of nominal inflection, providing a test bench for the nature of the case and its role in syntax. The data we examine in this article have been collected through field research in Musachia (Libofshë, L), and in the region of Gjirokaštër (Këllez, K). Specifically, we will focus on the data of the speakers of Libofshë. The Aromanian varieties spoken in southern Albania are substantially heritage languages, characterized by borrowing, attrition and reduction phenomena.

* leonardomaria.savoia@unifi.it

¹ I am pleased and honored to participate in this volume in honor of Rodica Zafiu, whom I have known for many years. I regard Rodica as an eminent scholar in many fields of Romanian linguistics, language teaching, and Romanian culture and literature, whose vast competence I have personally appreciated during these years. I am also pleased to recall the great attention and friendship that she has had towards me, which I gladly reciprocate.

2. The nominal system

Aromanian has a paradigm of nominal features and definiteness enclitic exponents in which the case distinctions are residual, unlike Romanian, including the direct case, for the subject and object, and the indirect case, for the beneficiary and other oblique contexts (Dobrovie-Sorin, Giurgea 2013, Pană Dindelegan 2016). The Aromanian data we will discuss concern mainly the dialect of Libofshë (L). (1a) illustrates the definite direct morphology of the subject and the object in the singular, (1b) the corresponding indefinite contexts. (2a) and (2b) the plural definite and indefinite direct forms. In (1)–(2), inflectional exponents have the following provisional labels: *-u* = MSG/ OBL, *-a* = FSG, *-i/ l* = DEF, *-i* = PL/CLASS, *-ur-* = PL.

- (1) a. ari vənit / am vədzut fitfor-**u** / fət-**a** **L**
 (s)he.has come / I.have seen boy-DEF.MSG / girl-DEF.FSG
 / un fitfor / unə fət-ə
 / a boy / a girl-FSG
 “The boy / the woman has come”, “I have seen the boy / the girl”
- (2) a. arə vənit / am vədzut fitfor-**ɬ-i** / bərbats(-**i**) / fət-**l-i**
 they.have come / I.have seen boy-DEF-PL/ man-PL / girl-DEF-PL
 “the boys/the men/the girls have come”, “I have seen the boys/the men/the girls”
 b. Arə vənit / am vədzut mult fitfor-**i** / bərbats / mult fət-**i**
 they.have come / I.have seen many boy(-PL) / man.PL / many girl-PL
 “many boys/ men/ girls have come” / “I have seen many boys/men/girls”

Genitive and dative contexts are introduced by the PI, a morphological element agreeing with the embedded noun, hence unlike Romanian, where PIs only occur before pronominal elements devoid of case morphology, as noticed by Capidan (1932) and Caragiu Marioțeanu (1975). (3a) illustrates the oblique (dative) in definite singular contexts, (3b) in indefinite singular contexts. (4a) and (4b) illustrate the distribution in the plural.

- (3) a. i o ded o fitfor-**u** / ali fət-**i** **L**
 to.him/her it I.gave PI boy- MSG / PI girl-CLASS
 “I gave it to the boy/the girl”
 b. i o ded o un fitfor/ ali un fət-**i**
 to.him/her it I.gave PI a boy / PI a girl-CLASS
 “I gave it to a boy/a girl”
- (4) a. i o ded o fitfor-**ɬ-u** / o bərbats-**ur-u** / o fət-**ɬ-u** /
 to.them it I.gave PI boy-DEF-OBL / PI men-PL-OBL / PI girl-PL-OBL
 o məʎer-**l-u**
 PI woman-DEF-OBL
 “I gave it to the boys/the men/the girls/the women”
 b. i o ded o doi bərbats / o dau fət-**i**
 to.them it I.gave PI two men.PL / PI two girl-PL
 “I gave it to the two men/ to two girls”

In genitive contexts in which the possessor is expressed by a DP, we find the same distribution of inflections and PIs as in dative, as in (5a) for DPs and (5b) for predicative occurrences.

- (5) a. mən-a o fitfor-u / a li fət-i L
hand-FSG PI boy-MSG / PI girl-CLASS
“The hand of the boy/ of the girl”
b. aist esti o fitfor-ɹ-u/ o fət-ɹ-u
this is PI boy-DEF-OBL / PI girl-DEF-OBL
“this is of the boys/ of the girls”

Let us consider the examples in (1)–(5). In the masculine singular, the enclitic definite exponent *-u* is associated with the masculine gender in the singular, where no special mark for oblique emerges in the singular, as in (1a,b), (3a) and (5a). The indefinite masculine singular form has no exponent, as in (1b) and (3b). The feminine singular, in direct contexts, shows the alternation between the definite exponent *-a*, as in (1a), and the indefinite exponent *-ə* in (1b), alternating with *-i* in other nominal classes, cf. for instance *mujer-i* “woman”. In oblique singular contexts the inflection *-i* occurs, as in (3a, b), (5a). In the definite plural direct contexts, both masculine and feminine nouns present a specialized plural inflection which includes a lateral element, *-ɹ/-* that we connect with definiteness. In masculines, the palatalization of the final consonant occurs, as in (2a); in the feminine plural, palatalization is lacking. In indefinite forms, feminine nouns have *-i*, variably selected also in masculine nouns, as in (2b). In plural oblique contexts, the inflection *-u* combines with the plural inflection *-ɹ-* or *-r-*, as in (4a), (5b), whereas in indefinite contexts, the feminine nouns again insert the inflection *-i*, as in (4b). 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 *ali* for the feminine singular, as exemplified in (3a, b), (4a, b), (5a). We synthesize these data in (6), where we associate the inflections with syntactic contexts, descriptively indicated by case labels; Pal = palatalization of the final C.

(6) a. Definite paradigm	Libofshë			
	MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
Nom/Acc contexts	-u	-a	(Pal/ɹ)-i	(-l/ɹ)-i
Dat/Gen contexts	-u	-i	-ɹ-u/ (Pal)-ur-u	-r-u/ɹ/l-u
b. Indefinite paradigm				
	MSG	FSG	MPL	FPL
Nom/Acc contexts	∅	-ə/-i	Pal/(-i)	-i
Dat/Gen contexts	∅	-i	∅	-i
c. PI:	o / ___ N _{MSG} ,	ali / ___ N _{FSG} ,	o / ___ N _{PL}	

Other nominal classes show partially different paradigms. In particular, in the class that derives from the 3rd declension of Latin, the indefinite singular has the exponent *-i* and the

definite singular the exponent *-l-i*, as, for instance, *ken-i* “dog” vs *ken-l-i* “the dog”. In the plural, the indefinite form *ken* “dogs” alternates with the definite *ken-l-i* “the dogs” and the oblique *ken-ur-u* “the dogs”.

The variety of Këllëz (K) has a similar system except for some minor morpho-phonological differences (Poçi 2009). (7a) illustrate the subject context, (7b) the dative, (7c) the genitive. PIs include *a* and variably *ali* before the singular feminine and *al* before masculines.

- (7) a. fitʃoʔ-je alants / fetə-l-i alant-i nu vinərə **K**
 boy-PL other.PL / girl-DEF-PL other-PL NEG came
 “other boys/ other / girls did not come”
- b. i u ded a(l) fitʃoʔ-u / a/ ali fetə-ji
 to.him/her it I.gave PI boy-MSG / PI girl-CLASS
 “I gave it to the boy/ to the girl”
- c. libʔ-a a(l) fitʃoʔ-u / a(l) fitʃoʔ-l-u / a fetə-ji / a fetə-l-u
 book-FSG PI boy-MSG / PI boy-DEF-OBL / PI girl-CLASS / PI girl-DEF-OBL
 “the book of the boy/ the girl/ the boys / the girls”

Pronominal elements distinguish the forms occurring in nominative/accusative contexts, in (8a), from those preceded by the introducer PI, exactly like nouns, specifically the inflected alternant corresponding to the dative, in (8b). The genitive, in (8c), is nothing but the possessive element, which agrees with the noun designating the possessee, the head noun of DP or the subject in predicative contexts. The relevant examples are in (9a,b) for possessives and in (9c) for the dative. The 3rd person pronominal possessors are lexicalized by the oblique forms of 3rd person pronouns, both in dative and genitive, cf. *o yui/a jei /o yorə* “of him/ her/ them” in (8b) and (8c) for Libofshë (Manzini and Savoia 2018, Baldi and Savoia 2021).

- (8) 1sg 2sg 3sg 3pl 1pl 2pl **L**
 a. direct mini tini eu/ia eʌ/eli noi voi
 I/me you (s)he/him/her they/them we/us you
- b. dative a nia a tsea o yui/a jei o yorə a nau a vau
 PI me PI you PI him/her PI them PI us PI you
- c. genitive a neu a tou o yui/a jei o yor(ə) a nōstər a vōstər
 PI my_M PI your_M PI him/her PI them PI our PI your, etc.
- (9) a. libr-a a mēu / tau / nōst(ər) **L**
 ook-FSG PI my.FSG / your.FSG / our
 “my/your/our book”
- b. atseu esti a neu/ tou/ o yui
 that.MSG is PI my.MSG / your.MSG / PI him
 “it is mine/yours/ his”
- c. n/ ts u ar datə a n-ia/ ts-ea
 to.me you it have.3PL given PI me-OBL / you-OBL
 “they gave it to me/you”

The PI of personal pronouns and possessives is *a*, except for 3rd person elements, where we find *o* in the masculine singular and in the plural, *o ȳui /o ȳorə* ‘‘of him/them’’, as in the nouns.

Summarizing, some features appear to be salient:

- ✓ The oblique interpretation is always associated with the presence of the PI; this agrees with the embedded noun, unlike canonical linkers
- ✓ A massive syncretism affects the inflectional morphology. In particular, *-u* is associated with the masculine definite and the plural oblique; *-i* embraces the feminine oblique and the feminine and masculine plural, and the paradigm of a nominal class (cf. (6a, b)).
- ✓ *-l/-/i-* in the plural of definite forms can be associated with the definiteness, as we expect given their derivation from the Latin demonstrative **ille*. The exponent *-ur-* realizes the plural (as in Romanian, cf. Pană Dindelegan 2013, Brăescu *et al.* 2019).

It is useful to consider the paradigm in (6) from a historical perspective. We can speak of a residual case system in so far as the oblique inflection in Aromanian is not able to autonomously realize the dative or genitive, but it must be introduced by the PI. This appears to be a crucial difference from the original conditions illustrated in Maiden *et al.* (2021). The other characterizing property is that the morphological differentiation of the oblique is now limited to the definite plural and partially to the singular exponent *-i*. The syncretic status of the latter, encompassing the indefinite singular oblique and the plural, is already attested in ancient texts (Maiden *et al.* 2021, 75 ff.). Thus, Aromanian shows a reduced inflectional system in relation to the original system examined by Maiden *et al.* (2021) and the current Romanian system (cf. Pană Dindelegan 2019).

The introducers of oblique contexts are etymologically related to the standard Romanian possessive articles *al/ a/ ai/ ale* preceding genitive DPs (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013). According to some analyses, PIs combine the nominal invariable base *a* with a definite article, whereby *al* is essentially an agreement head, taking a genitive Spec (Giurgea 2012, Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea 2013). Cornilescu (1995: 126–127) treats *al* as a case D marker. Another explanation assumes that *al* combines the preposition *a* with the enclitic article (cf. Grosu 1994, Cornilescu and Nicolae 2013). In fact, the invariable form *a* is attested in Old Romanian. Hence, if *a* corresponds to the Latin preposition *ad*, it can be explained why in Old Romanian *a* was admitted also as the dative introducer (Pană Dindelegan 2016). In Aromanian, the data in (3), (4), (7) and (8b) seem to attest a similar distribution. Unlike Romanian, in Aromanian PIs agree with the possessor (Manzini and Savoia 2018) and introduce datives as well; in 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, Brăescu *et al.* 2019).

As we have observed, oblique morphology is selected in PI *o/a/ali* contexts, which cover possession and dative². In the contexts introduced by the basic prepositions, the direct morphology is realized, as in (10a,b,c) with the prepositions *ku* “with”, *ya* “at, to”, and *ti* “for”.

- (10) a. vini ku fitfor-u / un fitfor L
 (s)he.comes with boy-MSG / a boy
 “(s)he comes with the boy/ a boy”
 b. mini neg ya un fet-ə/ fet-a / tini
 I go at a girl/ girl-FSG/ you
 “I go to a girl/ the girl / you”
 c. o fakə ti atseu
 it I.do for that.MSG
 “I do it for him”

The preposition *di* “of” is in complementary distribution with the PI both in possessive contexts, such as (11a), and, systematically, in locative complex prepositions, where the PI with the oblique, in (11b,c), alternates with the preposition *di* followed by the direct form of the noun, in (11b’,c’) (Savoia *et al.* 2020). *di* can select the indefinite form, in (11a) and (11c’). With pronominal referents, the feminine possessive, in (11d), alternates with *di* + the direct form of the pronoun, in (11d’). The same alternation characterizes the dialect of Këllëz in (12e).

- (11) a. mən-a di mujer-ə/ ali mujer-i L
 hand-FSG of woman-FSG / PI woman-OBL
 “the hand of (the) woman”
 b. dəninti o fitfor-λ-u b’. də jəs di fitfor-λ-i
 before PI boy-DEF-OB under of boy- DEF-PL
 “Before the boys” “Under the boys”
 c. dəninti o fet-λ-u c’. dəninti di fet-λ-i
 before PI girl-DEF-PL before of girl-DEF-PL
 “before the girls” “before the girls”
 d. dən poi a mēu d’. dən poi di mini
 after PI my after of me
 “after me” “after me”
 e. dən poi ali / di karrig-i K
 behind PI / of chair-CLASS
 “behind the chair”

² It is interesting to note that a similar distribution of the oblique characterizes the Northern Istro-Romanian variety spoken in Žejane (Geană 2020). In this dialect, both the dative and the genitive use the *a lu* construction, as illustrated in (i) (from Geană 2020, 184).

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

Finally, *di* occurs in other contexts, as the introducer of the substance of an object, in (12a), the causer, in (12b), and, variably, the infinitive in a subset of the infinitival constructs, in (12c).

- (12) a. *esti di dʒam* b. *Aist kəmiʃ-li səntə ɣatə di ia L*
 It.is of glass these shirt-FPL are washed by her
 “it is glass” “these shirts are washed by her”
 c. *ma tsə dzək di fətsəri*
 Progressive Particle to.you I.say Prep to.do
 “I am telling you to do it”

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 (Franco and Manzini 2017). This also applies to Aromanian, where 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 in locative contexts. In keeping with Franco, 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, Den Dikken (1997: 170). According to them, “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). An example is provided by *di*, that includes apparently diverse readings as illustrated in (12a,b,c). On the basis of this syncretism, we assume that *di* can be analyzed as the elementary operator $[\subseteq]$, as in (13) (Savoia *et al.* 2020). It interprets the relation involved in oblique contexts as a type of inclusion.

- (13) *di*: \subseteq

This proposal explains the contexts where *di* introduces a nominal complement in complex PPs, as in (14), where R labels the lexical root and φ is an abbreviation for nominal features.

- (14) $[_{DP} də \text{ ʒ} \text{ ɔ} \text{ S} [\text{ PP}_{\subseteq} di [\varphi [\text{ R } \text{ fit}[\text{or}]-\lambda\text{-i}]]]]$ “under the boys” (11b’)

The idea, discussed by Savoia *et al.* (2020), is that in the complex PPs the locative expression (Axial Part) is associated with a ‘possessor’, more precisely, its ‘zonal inclusion’ fixed by the noun, in (14) *fitforăi* “the boys”.

3. The morphology of case

Chomsky’s most recent papers (Chomsky 2019, 2020, 2021) criticize the head movement as a genuine syntactic rule at the basis of the Probe-Goal φ -feature matching in affixation. Specifically, “head raising is problematic insofar as it does not entail semantic effects

and, structurally, it is counter-cyclic". The solution of Chomsky (2019: 268) "is simply to drop the condition that Internal Merge (Movement) has to be triggered, so it's free, like External Merge". Chomsky (2021: 30, 36 ff.), assumes that Merge operation can create the combination of morphemes in complex words by amalgamation. Thus, in the case of inflected verbs, the amalgamation yields complex forms such as [INFL [v, Root]], which realizes the properties of the C/T Phase. In keeping with this conceptualization of the morphology-syntax relationship, the Merge operation combines sub-word elements (root and affixes) into a complex syntactic object. 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, like verbal inflection.

Hence, the morphological merge is part of the syntactic computation and there is no specialized morphological component (Manzini *et al.* 2020, Savoia *et al.* 2018, Savoia, Baldi 2022; see also Collins, Kayne 2020, Marantz 2001). In the approach that we adopt, lexical elements, including morphemes, are endowed with interpretable content, thus excluding Late Insertion and the manipulation of terminal nodes used by Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993). The agreement is the morphological manifestation of the identity between referential features corresponding to the same argument of the sentence.

Coming now to the notion of case, we know that this feature, a classic category of the cartographic model, has a spurious status; it is no accident that Chomsky (2021:16) concludes that "Case doesn't enter into semantic interpretation" and is part of externalization. Actually, the distribution of nominal inflections and the syncretism we have examined in section 2 suggest that what is called case must be identified with bundles of nominal features, such as number, gender, definiteness, or syntactic operators. We have seen that inflections show such a high degree of syncretism that there is no clearly specialized morpheme for the oblique contexts. In fact, the data in (5) show that, apart from *-a*, for the definite singular feminine in direct contexts, and the liquid bases, *-l/ʎ/r-*, for definiteness, the other inflections cover diverse interpretations. Specifically, *-i* encompasses the singular feminine and the plural; *-u* includes the masculine singular and the plural in oblique contexts. Based on Chierchia (1998) and following Manzini and Savoia (2018: 30) we can think of plurality as a type of subset relationship, which we have identified with the operator \subseteq . Thus, plural and oblique refer to two different interpretations of the \subseteq predicate.

- Within the noun, plurality isolates a subset of the set of all things to which the noun (its root) can be predicated,
- In genitive/ dative contexts it is read as superset-of/possessor and its scope is either sentential, applying to the internal arguments of the verb, or, in genitives, DP-internal.

This analysis can explain the preservation of a special morphology for the oblique contexts in the plural, where the exponent *-u* contributes to introducing the possessee, the head noun in genitives, as the sub-set.

Let us now consider the data presented in section 2, starting from the introducers *o/ali/a*. The fact that their occurrence is associated with the part-whole reading of genitives, datives, and complex locatives makes it possible to conclude that their content is similar to that of *di* “of”, i.e. the inclusion operator. Unlike *di*, PIs are restricted by selection rules of the type in (15), which are part of their lexical information and are applied by the *Elsewhere criterion*.

- (15) a. $ali \leftrightarrow _ / [_{\text{FSG}}$ b. $a \leftrightarrow _ / [1/2\text{person}$ c. o

Thus, if we take the sentence *i o ded o bərbats-ur-u* “I gave it to the men” (cf. (4a)), the free application of Merge (Chomsky 2019), yields the amalgamation between the root and the definite inflection, marked by *-ur-*, in (16a), characterized as DEF,PL, with which $-u_{\subseteq}$ is combined, yielding the complex noun in (16b).

- (16) a. $\langle [_{\text{R}} \text{bərbats}], -ur_{\text{DEF,PL}} \rangle \rightarrow [_{\phi} [\text{bərbats}]-ur]$
 b. $\langle [_{\phi} \text{bərbats}] -ur, -u_{\subseteq} \rangle \rightarrow [_{\subseteq} [[\text{bərbats}]-ur]-u]$

The occurrence of the oblique inflection requires the introducer, here *o* (cf. (15)), as in (17a); the insertion of sub-word elements depends on subcategorization restrictions such as in (17b) and (17c). Merge is based on the agreement between the syntactic features, including \subseteq , both within the noun and DP.

- (17) a. $\langle o_{\subseteq}, [_{\subseteq} [\text{bərbats}]-ur-u] \rangle \rightarrow [_{\text{PP}} o_{\subseteq} [_{\subseteq} [\text{bərbats}]-ur-u]]$
 b. $-ur_{\text{PL}/\subseteq} \leftrightarrow R_{\text{M}} _$
 c. $-u_{\subseteq} \leftrightarrow \text{PI} [[_{\text{DEF,PL}}] _]$

The inflected noun is able to realize the interpretive properties of D, (18), within the Phase DP, without assuming head-raising. The PI realizes the preposition that associates the noun with the event.

- (18) $v \dots P/\text{PI} \quad D_{\phi} \quad N$
 $o_{\phi/\subseteq} \quad \text{bərbats-ur-u}_{\text{DEF.M}/\subseteq}$

As discussed in Giusti (in press), D has been assigned the case feature K and, among other hypotheses, the Definiteness, a prototypical property of determiners. However, we have followed a different path, identifying the case with the referential features of nouns. As to the agreement of PIs, for instance *-li* in *ali un məjəri* “to a woman” (cf. (3b)), where the element of definiteness *-l-* is combined with the inflection *-i*, we must assume that derivation via Merge in (19a, b), based on the coincidence between the ϕ -features of the PI and the noun.

- (19) $\langle [a_{\subseteq} [I_{\text{DEF}-i}_{\text{FEM}}]], [_{\text{DP}} \text{un} [[_{\text{R}} \text{f}\text{t}}] -i_{\text{FEM}}]] \rangle \rightarrow [_{\phi} a_{\subseteq} -l-i] [_{\text{DP}} \text{un} [_{\phi} [\text{f}\text{t}}] -i]]$

In genitival contexts, as well, we find *a+possessive*, as illustrated in (20) for (9a), *libr-a a meu* “my book”, where the part-whole reading is also introduced by a lexical property of the possessive, in (20b). In these contexts, the PI does not realize the agreement, possibly

because the possessive agrees with the possessee, thus excluding the opposite agreement of the PI.

- (20) a. $\langle a_{\subseteq}, [[m_{\subseteq}] \varepsilon u_{\text{FSG}}] \rangle \rightarrow [a_{\subseteq} [m \varepsilon u_{\subseteq, \text{FSG}}]]$
 b. N... P/PI D_φ N
 $a_{\phi/\subseteq} \quad m \varepsilon u_{\subseteq, \text{FSG}}$

In dative sentences, 1st/2nd person pronouns have a specialized inflection for the oblique, as in (21a,b) for ... *a n-ia* “to me” (cf. 9c).

- (21) a. $\langle a_{\subseteq}, [[j] ia_{\subseteq}] \rangle \rightarrow [a_{\subseteq} [nia_{\subseteq}]]$
 b. v... P/PI D_φ N
 $a_{\phi/\subseteq} \quad nia_{\subseteq}$

The nature of the specialized inflections in oblique contexts remains to be understood. A natural hypothesis is that *-u* in the masculine plural, *-i* in the feminine singular, and the oblique inflection of person pronouns in (9c), can license a super-set/ possessor reading only if they are combined with a prepositional element, as in (15). In other words, although it is associated with the inclusion operator, $-u_{\subseteq}$ is unable to introduce by itself the part-whole interpretation over DPs, unlike the PI or the preposition *di* “of”. Thus, a plural oblique such as (22) can no longer perform a dative reading on DPs. It is, by now, only a plural allomorph selected in the PIs contexts, as in (17a).

- (22) $[_{\subseteq} [b\bar{a}r\bar{b}a\bar{t}s]-ur-u]$

On the contrary, the preposition *də* in (23a,b), *də ʃɔs di fitʃor-ʎ-i* “under the boys” (cf. (8b)), is sufficient to introduce the dative independently of the inflection of the noun.

- (23) a. $\langle di_{\subseteq}, [_{\phi} \text{fitʃor-ʎ-i}] \rangle \rightarrow [_{\text{PP}} di [_{\phi} \text{fitʃor-ʎ-i}]]$
 b. v... P D_φ N
 $di_{\subseteq} \quad \text{fitʃor-ʎ-i}$

As regards the syncretism of *-u* and *-i* between plural and singular reading, our idea is that nominal inflections belong to a very elementary semantic space associated with referentiality. We can think that both *-u* and *-i* in (6) specify inclusiveness so that they can introduce plurality, as in the plural oblique. Moreover, as relators, they can introduce the reference to a singularity, as *-u* in definite masculine singular, in (1a), or the masculine and feminine oblique plural in (3a), (4a). Similarly, *-i* realizes the feminine plural but also the indefinite reference in feminines. This pattern is not exceptional, just think of the syncretism in Latin case inflections (cf. Halle and Vaux 1997). Also in Italian the

inflection *-i*, typically associated with the plural, can characterize the 3rd singular person pronouns, cf. *egl-i/ lu-i/ le-i* “he/she” (Manzini and Savoia 2014).

4. Conclusion

In this article, we apply a morphosyntactic approach based on fully interpretable sub-word elements, the combination of which is implemented by syntactic computation. We have followed the proposals discussed by Chomsky (2019, 2021) in the direction of a syntax based on the free application of Merge (IM and EM) and on the idea that inflected words are a possible realization of the Phases. The hypothesis that the case corresponds to bundles of nominal or other semantic features allows bringing to light the relationship between case and plural as realizations of the same semantic properties, specifically the part-whole relation, typically expressed by the preposition *di* “of”. In keeping with this conceptualization, the combination of the PI and the inflected noun in oblique contexts can be accounted for as the result of Merge.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Baldi, Benedetta, Leonardo M. Savoia, 2021, “Possessives in Aromanian. A comparison with Albanian and North-Calabrian dialects”, *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, vol. LXVI, no. 2–3, 99–131.
- Belvin, Robert, Marcel Den Dikken, 1997, “There, *happens*, to, be, have”, *Lingua*, no. 101, 151–183.
- Brăescu, Raluca, Adina Dragomirescu, Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu, 2019, *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Capidan, Theodor, 1932, *Aromânii dialectul aromân. Studiu Lingvistic*, București: Imprimeria Națională.
- Caragiu Marioțeanu, Matilda, 1975, *Compendiu de dialectologie română*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Chierchia, Gennaro, 1998, “Partitives, reference to kinds and semantic variation”, in Aaron Lawson (ed.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, VII. CLC Publications, Ithaca, 73–98.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2019. “Some Puzzling Foundational Issues: The Reading Program”, in Ángel Gallego, Dennis Ott (ed.), *Generative Syntax: Questions, Crossroads, and Challenges*, *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*. Special Issue, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 263–285.
- Chomsky, Noam, 2020, The UCLA Lectures (29 April–2 May 2019). Online: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005485>
- Chomsky, Noam, 2021, “Minimalism: Where Are We Now, and Where Can We Hope to Go”, *Gengo Kenkyu*, no. 160, 1–41.
- Collins, Chris, Richard Kayne, 2021, *Towards a Theory of Morphology as Syntax*, online: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005693> (accessed on 10 February 2023).
- Cornilescu, Alkexandra, 1995, “Romanian Genitive Constructions”, in Guglielmo Cinque, Giuliana Giusti (ed.), *Advances in Romanian Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–52.

- Cornilescu, Alexandra, Alexandru Nicolae, 2011, "Romanian possessives: adjectives or pronouns? A comparative perspective", in Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Alice Toma, Rodica Zafiu (ed.), *Studii de lingvistică. Omagiu doamnei profesoare Angela Bidu-Vranceanu*, Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 111–143.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Ion Giurgea (ed.), 2013, *A Reference Grammar of Romanian, Volume 1: The Noun Phrase*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franco, Ludovico, M. Rita Manzini, 2017, "Instrumental prepositions and case: Contexts of occurrence and alternations with datives", *Glossa*, vol. 2, no. 1, 8, 1–37.
- Geană, Ionuț, 2020, "Case-marking in Istro-Romanian", *Studia UBB Philologia*, vol. LXV, no. 4, 173–187.
- Giurgea, Ion, 2012, "The origin of the Romanian "possessive-genitival article" al and the development of the demonstrative system", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, vol. LVII, no. 1, 35–65.
- Giusti, G. Forthcoming, *Arguments for the universality of D and determiners*.
- Grosu, Alexander, 1994, *Three studies in Locality and Case*, London, Routledge.
- Halle, Morris, Alec Marantz, 1993 "Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection", in Ken Hale, Samuel J. Keyser (ed.), *The view from Building 20*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 111–176.
- Halle, Morris, Bert Vaux, 1997, "Theoretical aspects of Indo-European nominal morphology: The nominal declension of Latin and Armenian", in Jay Jasanoff, Craig Melchert, Lisi Olivier (ed.), *Mir Curad. A Festschrift in honor of Calvert Watkins*, Universität Innsbruck, 223–240.
- Maiden, Martin, Adina Dragomirescu, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Oana Uță Bărbulescu, Rodica Zafiu, 2021, *The Oxford History of Romanian Morphology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, 2011, "Reducing 'case' to 'agreement': nominal inflections in the Geg Albanian variety of Shkodër", *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, vol. 11, no. 1, 76–120.
- Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, 2014, "From Latin to Romance: case loss and preservation in pronominal systems", *Probus*, vol. 26, no. 2, 217–248.
- Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, 2017, "Case in the nominal and pronominal systems in Aromanian: oblique case and its interactions with the person split", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, vol. LXII, no. 2–3, 115–142.
- Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, 2018, *The Morphosyntax of Albanian and Aromanian Varieties: Case, Agreement, Complementation*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, Benedetta Baldi, 2020, "Microvariation and macrocategories: Differential Plural Marking and Phase theory", *L'Italia Dialettale*, no. 82, 189–212.
- Marantz, Alec, 2001, *Words*, handout for the WCCFL (West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics) XX, University of Southern California, February 2001. Online: <http://web.mit.edu/afs/athena.mit.edu/org/l/linguistics/www/marantz.home.html> (accessed on 11 March 2023).
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.), 2016, *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.), 2013, *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poçi, Spiridhulla, 2009, *Vllehtë. Historia dhe gjuha e tyrë*, Tiranë: Botimet Toena.
- Savoia, Leonardo M., Benedetta Baldi, 2022, "Phenomena in Romance verb paradigms: Syncretism, order of inflectional morphemes and thematic vowel", *LINGBAW*, no. 8, 5–23.
- Savoia, Leonardo M., Benedetta Baldi, M. Rita Manzini, 2019, "Asymmetries in Plural Agreement in DPs", in Joseph Emonds, Markéta Janebová, Ludmila Veselovská (ed.), *Language Use and Linguistic Structure*, Olomouc: Palacký University Olomouc, 204–224.
- Savoia, Leonardo M., Benedetta Baldi, M. Rita Manzini, 2020, "Prepositions in Aromanian", *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, vol. LXXI, no. 1, 149–160.