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0. Introduction

The main topic of this article will be the analysis of Albanian DPs modified by adjectives, possessives and genitives. These constructions, in fact, have a crucial property in common: they are introduced by the same article-like element, as illustrated by the examples in (1).

(1) a. libri  i  tij
   'book-the  the  his'
   His book
b. libri  i  studentit
   'book-the  the  student-GEN'
   The student’s book
c. libri  i  kuq
   'book-the  the  red'
   The red book

With respect to (1a) and (1b), I will argue for an analysis which unifies possessive pronouns and genitival phrases. In particular, I will present an analysis of these constructions which is based on the DP structure proposed by Manzini & Savoia (1998, 
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1999), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) to account for the rich variety of clitic and possessive patterns displayed by various Italian dialects. Their analysis presupposes the existence, within the DP, of different positions which host different kind of features. Specifically, the authors propose a universal hierarchy of positions like the one sketched in (2):

(2) \[ \text{D} \_\text{op} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{N} \]

\( \text{D}_{\text{op}} \) is the position associated with modal properties. In particular, this category is the counterpart to the modal properties of the verb, represented by the complementizer system. \( \text{D}_{\text{op}} \) can be lexicalised by prepositional elements like the element *di* ‘of’ introducing partitive NP. \( \text{D} \) is the category denoting definiteness. This position can be lexicalised by the definite article. \( \text{R} \) (from Referential) is associated with specificity properties. \( \text{Q} \) is the position hosting indefinite quantifiers. \( \text{P} \) (from Person) identifies the elements of first and second person. This category denotes the reference to the speaker and to the hearer. \( \text{Loc} \) (from Locative) represents spatial reference. This position can be lexicalised by demonstratives, in virtue of their spatial interpretation. Finally, \( \text{N} \) is the position corresponding to the head of the Noun Phrase.

According to Manzini & Savoia (1998, 1999), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) the positions illustrated in (2) are universally represented in DP structure and in the structure of the sentence. Furthermore, on the basis of the empirical evidence coming from Italian dialects and Albanian dialects spoken in Southern Italy, Manzini & Savoia (1998, 1999), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) assume that the hierarchical string of positions illustrated in (2) can repeat itself in the temporal domain immediately above \( I \) and above \( C \):

(3) \[ [ \text{C} \quad \text{D}_{\text{op}} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{N} \quad [ I \quad \text{D}_{\text{op}} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{N} \quad [ V \quad \text{D}_{\text{op}} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{N} \quad ] ] ] \]

In this paper, I will argue that Albanian possessive constructions can be assigned the structure in (3), adopted by Manzini & Savoia (1998, 1999), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) for Italian possessive constructions. In particular, I will assume that possessives are inflectional elements which lexicalize the inflectional head positions \( \text{P} \) and \( \text{Q} \) within the extended projection of the noun. So, the Albanian possessive construction illustrated in (1a) has the following structural representation:
With respect to (1b), I will show that the genitival construction can be given the same analysis as the possessive construction, with the exception that the genitive in (1b) realizes the specifier position of R, inside the possessive string:

(5) …… DOP D R Q P Loc N
    libr i [Maries] libr

This analysis seems to be superior to previous approaches since it permits to derive the genitival constructions without the assumption of complex derivations involving fronting of the genitive phrase to SpecDP (Kayne 1994), Den Dikken (1997, 1998). Besides, it offers a way to capture a range of properties associated with Albanian possessives which none of the standard analyses capture correctly. Finally, the analysis adopted in this paper permits unification of possessive and genitive constructions.

With respect to (1c), I will argue for a structural analysis which treats the article preceding the adjective as a D° element which realizes part of the extended projection of the adjectival phrase:

(6) …… DOP D R Q P Loc AGG N
    libr [i kuq] libr

Before I move on to the analysis of the constructions illustrated in (1), I will outline the structure I adopt for Albanian DPs in section 1. In section 2, I present an analysis for Albanian possessive constructions. The analysis of Albanian DPs modified by genitival phrases is presented in section 3. In section 4, I discuss the syntax of adjectival modifiers and their position with respect to the noun.

---

1. The head noun libr moves from N to a higher position in order to incorporate the definite article; see below sections 1.1 and 2.3.
1. The structure of Albanian DP

1.1. Albanian determiners

An interesting peculiarity of Albanian nominals is the postposition of the definite article to the noun (Giusti 1993, Giusti 1997, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998, Turano & Rrokaj 2000, Turano 2001):

(7) a. qen
dog

b. qenë
'dog-the'

The dog

As the example in (7b) shows, in Albanian the definite article is realized as a suffix on the noun. This suffix also represents the morphological expression of gender and number. In fact, Albanian nouns ending in -i or in –u are interpreted as definite singular masculine nouns; nouns ending in -a are interpreted as definite singular feminine; nouns in -t are interpreted as definite plurals. Compare the four different forms in (8):

(8) a. burri

'man-theMASC SG'

The man

b. shoku

'comrade-theMASC SG'

The comrade

2. Albanian dialects spoken in southern Italy also have a definite article t/të for neuter nouns:

(i) burri

'man-theMASC'

(ii) shoku

'comrade-theMASC'

(iii) vajza

'girl-theFEM'

(iv) ujë

'water-theNEUTER'
c. vajza
 'girl-theFEM SG'
 *The girl*

d. burrat/shokët/vajzat
 'men-the/comrades-the/girls-thePL'
 *The men/comrades/girls*

With respect to the definite nouns in (8), I assume that the bound morpheme on the noun which lexicalises the definiteness is realised in a position independent from the position where the noun is generated.

In Abney (1987) it is suggested that the noun phrase is a DP projection: D is taken to be the functional head where determiners are realised. The noun is generated inside an NP projection, which is a complement of the head D. Thus, D is the position where Albanian suffixes -i, -u, -a, and –t, which realize the definiteness, are lexicalised. The definite nouns illustrated in (8) are derived by moving the noun to the SpecCP of the nominal constituent, and by attaching it to the definite article in D, as is shown in (9):

(9) | C | D<sub>op</sub> | D | R | Q | P | Loc | N |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
[bur-] | -i | | | | | | burrë |
[shok-] | -u | | | | | | shok |
[vajz-] | -a | | | | | | vajzë |

I exclude that N is left-adjointed to D<sub>°</sub> or that it raises to C<sub>°</sub>. I will claim that movement of the noun is not an instance of head movement, but rather it is a case of NP-preposing. This assumption is based on the fact that in structures with more heads, a head movement approach of the noun would cause a violation of the Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984)<sup>3</sup>. Evidence for NP movement within the DP comes from Greek, where a basic structure like (10) allows different possible combinations of NP and APs:

(10) a. to megalo to kokino to vivlio
     the big the red the book
b. to megalo to vivlio to kokino
c. to vivlio to megalo to kokino

<sup>3</sup> See section 2.3.
d. to kokino to vivlio to megalo

e. to vivlio to kokino to megalo

Androutsopoulou (1994, 2001) assumes that the different word orders in (10) cannot be derived by the single N-raising of the noun vivlio. Rather, Greek data can be captured only by assuming that a bigger constituent moves to the specifier of a higher head. So, for instance, in (10b) the noun vivlio moves together with the determiner to to the specifier of an intermediate projection. In (10c) vivlio raises to the specifier of the highest projection. In (10d) the constituent containing kokino vivlio moves to the specifier of the highest projection. Finally, (10e) is the result of a two-step movement. First, the noun vivlio moves to a position dominating the AP occupied by the adjective kokino. Then, the constituent containing vivlio and kokino moves to the specifier of the highest projection.

Another type of sentence Androutsopoulou (2001) uses as evidence for NP-preposing is illustrated by the following example:

(11) o thavmasmos ja ton Aristoteli o megalos
    the admiration for the Aristotle the great
    The great admiration for Aristotle

According to Androutsopoulou (2001) the derivation of (11) involves two movement operations. First, the PP ton Aristoteli moves from its thematic position to a position which is lower than the position containing thavmasmos. In such position, the PP forms a constituent with the DP thavmasmos. Then, the new constituent containing the PP and the DP moves to SpecD/PP:
Androutsopoulou (2001) extends this structure to the Albanian counterpart of the Greek example illustrated in (11):

(13)  admirimi           i madh    për  Aristotelin
  admiration-the the great  for   Aristotle-the
  The great admiration for Aristotle

The derivation of (13) involves NP-movement of *admirmi* from its base position to Agr2P and from Agr2P to SpecD/PP.
Coming back to Albanian, I exclude that NP moves to SpecDP under Koopman’s (1996) generalization that for any given projection overt elements may appear either in the head or in the Spec, but not in both position\(^4\). Since the DP projection has the definite article in the head position, thus the specifier position of this projection must be empty.

The overt movement of NP to SpeCP is motivated by the morphological enclitic nature of the article.

Let us now consider Albanian indefinite article, illustrated in (15):

(15)  a. një  djalë  i bukur  iku  
     a/one  boy  nice  left  

b. *një  djali  i bukur  iku  
    a/one  boy-the  nice  left  

\(^4\) The same conclusion is reached in Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) for independent reasons. With respect to the realization of the D-feature, for instance, Manzini & Savoia argue that it can be realized either in the head position of a nominal inflection, by inserting a subject clitic or it can be realized in the Spec position by inserting or moving a lexical subject. The former strategy is found in Northern Italian dialects, the latter strategy is found in English. According to their analysis either the head or the specifier may be lexicalized, but not both.
As we can see in (15), Albanian *një* ‘a/one’ is a free element which always precedes the noun. *Një* only occurs with nouns having an indefinite form (see the contrast between (15a) and (15b)). Let us assume that *një* lexicalises the Q position of the string in (16), whereas the noun moves to an inflectional position I:

(16)  
\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
D_{op} & D & R & Q & P & \text{Loc} & I & \text{AGG} & N \\
\text{një} & [\text{djalë}] & [\text{i bukur}] & \text{djalë}
\end{array} \]

Consider now the demonstratives:

(17)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. ky \quad \text{djalë i bukur} \\
'\text{thisMASC NOM boy nice}' \text{This nice boy} \\
\item b. kjo \quad \text{vajzë e bukur} \\
'\text{thisFEM NOM girl nice}' \text{This nice girl} \\
\item c. pashë \quad \text{këtë burrë/vajzë i/e bukur} \\
\text{saw-1sg thisACC man/girl nice} \\
'\text{I saw this nice man/girl}'
\end{enumerate}

As we can see in (17), Albanian demonstratives always precede the head noun and agree with it in gender, number and Case. I assume that Albanian demonstratives are heads in Loc. The structure for (17) is given in (18):

(18)  
\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
D_{op} & D & R & Q & P & \text{Loc} & I & \text{AGG} & N \\
\text{ky/kjo/këtë} & [\text{djalë/vajzë}] & [\text{i/e bukur}] & \text{djalë/vajzë}
\end{array} \]

Finally, consider quantifiers. Albanian quantifiers always precede the head noun, but unlike demonstratives, quantifiers do not agree with the head noun:

(19)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. çdo \quad \text{burrë i bukur} \\
'\text{every man nice}' \text{Every nice man} \\
\item b. çdo \quad \text{vajzë e bukur} \\
'\text{every girl nice}' \text{Every nice girl}
\end{enumerate}
c. ca burra të bukur
   'some men nice'
   *Some nice men

d. ca vajza të bukura
   'some girls nice'
   *Some nice girls

I assume they are in Q, as is një in (16). The representations of (19) are illustrated in (20):

(20) a. Dop D R Q P Loc I AGG N
dó [burrë/vajzë] [i/e bukur] burrë/vajzë

b. Dop D R Q P Loc I AGG N
cá [burra/vajza] [të bukur] burrë/vajzë

In Albanian, definite article, demonstratives and quantifiers are in complementary distribution:

(21) a. *ky burri doli
      'this man-the came out'

b. *një burri doli
   'a man-the came out'

c. *ky një burrë doli
   'this a man came out'

d. *çdo ky burrë doli
   'every this man came out'

An apparent counterexample to the structures given in (21) is represented by a construction involving the co-occurrence of the definite article and the demonstrative. This structure will be discussed in the next subsection.

1.2. Structures containing a demonstrative and a definite noun

There exist in Albanian structures in which a demonstrative combines with a definite noun, namely a noun displaying the definite article –i, -u, or –a. As we said, the co-
occurrence of these elements is not a real counterexample to (21). Note, in fact, that while the sentence in (22) is grammatical, the sentence in (23a) is bad (cf. also (21a)):

(22) Ishte një mbret. Ai mbreti kishte një pele
    'Was-3sg a king that king-the had a donkey'
    There was a king. That king had a donkey

(23) a. *Ai mbreti kishte një pele
    'that king-the had a donkey'
    That king had a donkey
b. Ai mbret kishte një pele
    'that king had a donkey'
    That king had a donkey

The contrast between (22) and (23a) seems to suggest that the co-occurrence of a demonstrative with a definite noun is just permitted in topic-comment sentences representing a situation where given a topic (një mbret ‘a king’), the speaker makes a comment about it (kishte një pele ‘had a donkey’). In particular, the demonstrative ai in (22) gives prominence to the constituent selected for the comment.

A characteristic of a sentence like (22) is that between the demonstrative and the definite noun there is no relation of dependence: omission of one of the two constituents does not produce ungrammaticality:

(24) a. Ishte një mbret. Ai kishte një pele
    'Was-3sg a king that had a donkey'
    There was a king. This had a donkey
b. Ishte një mbret. Mbreti kishte një pele
    'Was-3sg a king king-the had a donkey'
    There was a king. The king had a donkey

Instances of co-occurrence of a demonstrative with a definite noun can also be found in Modern Greek (Horrocks & Stavrou 1987; Giusti 1993, 1995, 1997) and Spanish (Brugè 1994, 1996). In Modern Greek, for example, the demonstrative can be found in different positions, as the examples in (25) show:
(25) a. to oreo to vivlio afto
   'the good the book this'
b. to oreo afto to vivlio
c. afto to oreo to vivlio

There is, however, an interesting contrast between Greek and Albanian. The Albanian counterparts of (25a-b) are ungrammatical:

(26) a. *i mirë libri ky
   'the good book-the this'
b. *libri i mire ky
   book-the the good this
c. *i mire ky libri
   the good this book-the
d. *libri ky i mirë
   book-the this the good

(26) shows that the Albanian demonstrative can occur neither in a low position nor in an intermediate position. It can only appear in a high position and only in topic-comment sentences (cf. (22)), if associated with a definite noun.

With respect to the position of the demonstrative in Modern Greek a proposal has been advanced by Giusti (1995, 1997) and Brugè & Giusti (1996) who assume that demonstratives are modifiers of the head noun generated in adjective position (25a), and further moved to an intermediate Spec position (25b) or to SpecDP (25c).

Coming back to Albanian, I will maintain the idea that the demonstrative is a head rather than a specifier but with respect to the sentence in (22) the problem naturally arises of what is the position of the demonstrative, given that it precedes the definite noun which I assume to be raised to the C domain. The only way to capture the fact that the demonstrative precedes the noun in SpecCP is to assume that demonstrative lexicalises a Loc position in a higher string:

(27) ..... Loc ..... C D_{op} D R Q P Loc N
  ai [mbret-] i mbret
2. Albanian Possessive System

In this section, I will present an analysis of Albanian possessive constructions which have never been investigated before in the generative syntactic framework. Albanian possessive system has the following characteristics. First, Albanian possessives cannot occur in the absence of the definite article on the noun. Secondly, they display a split in the singular paradigm between first and second person possessives on one hand and third person possessives on the other; third person possessives are characterised by the presence of an article which is the same article that we find in pre-articulated adjectives and in genitive constructions. In the plural paradigm, the article also precedes first and second person possessives. Finally, possessives with kinship nouns behave differently from possessives with common nouns or proper names. Before discussing these characteristics, I will briefly illustrate the position of the possessives with respect to the noun and the agreement relation between the possessive and the head noun.

2.1. The position of Albanian possessives

In Albanian, possessives only occur in post-nominal position with either common nouns or proper names. A pre-nominal occurrence of the possessive is ungrammatical independently of the definiteness of N:

(28) a. libri  im
    'book-the my'
    *My book

b. *im  libri
    'my book-the'

c. *im  libër
    'my book'

(29) a. Gjoni   im
    'John-the my'
    *My John

b. *im  Gjoni

c. *im  Gjon
    'my John'
Whatever the position and the status of the possessive may be, which is a question I will discuss later, the post-nominal position of the possessive is derived from movement of NP which raises to SpecCP, leaving the possessive behind (cf. (9)).

The relation between the possessive and the head noun is expressed through the agreement in gender, number and case. So, for example, the four different forms that we find in (30) depend on the gender, number and case features of the head noun.

(30) a. libri    im
    'book-theMASC NOM myMASC NOM'
    My book
b. librën    tim
    'book-theMASC ACC myMASC ACC'
c. çanta    ime
    'bag-theFEM NOM myFEM NOM'
d. çantën    time
    'bag-theFEM ACC myFEM ACC'

2.2. Definiteness

As was mentioned before, one of the crucial characteristics of Albanian possessives is that they cannot occur in the absence of the definite article on the noun, independently of the position they occupy:

(31) a. libri    im
    'book-the my'
b. Gjoni    im
    'John-the my'
c. *libër    im
    'book my'
d. *Gjon    im
    'John my'
e. *im    libër
    'my book'
f. *im    Gjon
    'my John'
(31a-b) show that the use of the definite article on the noun is obligatory. It is impossible, then, to combine a possessive with a demonstrative or a quantifier if there is no definite article. Consider the contrast between (32) and (33):

(32) a. *ky libër im nuk më shërben më
   'this book my not me serves anymore'
   *This book of mine doesn’t serve to me anymore
b. *ky im libër nuk më shërben më
   'this my book not me serves anymore'
c. *një mik im u nis dje
   'a one friend my left yesterday'
   *A friend of mine left yesterday
d. *një im mik u nis dje
   'a one my friend left yesterday'

(33) a. ky libr im nuk më shërben më
   'this book-the my not me serves anymore'
   *This book of mine doesn’t serve to me anymore
b. një mik u im u nis dje
   'a friend-the my left yesterday'
   *A friend of mine left yesterday

In (33) the articles on the nouns libri and miku depend on the presence of the possessive. And, in fact, if we delete the possessive, the structures in (33) become ungrammatical:

(34) a. *ky libr nuk më shërben më
   'this book-the not me serves anymore'
   *This book doesn’t serve to me anymore
b. *një mik u nis dje
   'a friend-the left yesterday'
   *A friend left yesterday

---

5. I will present the internal structure of these constructions in (49).
Thus, the occurrence of the possessive forces the presence of the definite article, for reasons that are unclear.

2.3. **Distribution of Albanian possessives**

Let us consider now, in detail, the distributional properties of Albanian possessives. Consider the following paradigms, which contain singular and plural possessive forms respectively:

(35) a. libri im i ri
    'book-the my the new'
    My new book
b. libri yt i ri
    'book-the your the new'
    Your new book
c. libri i tj / i saj i ri
    'book-the the his / the he the new'
    His/her new book
d. libri ynë i ri
    'book-the our the new'
    Our new book
e. libri juaj i ri
    'book-the your the new'
    Your new book
f. libri i tyre i ri
    'book-the the their the new'
    Their new book

(36) a. librat e mi të ri
    'books-the the my-PL the-PL new'
    My new books
b. librat e tu të ri
    'books-the the your-PL the-PL new'
    Your new books
c. librat e tij / e saj të ri
    'books-the the his-PL / the her-PL the-PL new'
    His/her new books
As we can see by comparing the different forms of (35) and (36), third person singular possessives (35c,f) and most of plural possessives (36a, b, c, f) are characterised by the presence of an article. The presence of this element forces a distinction between 1/2 person singular and 3 person singular possessives on the one hand, and between singular possessives and plural possessives, on the other. Notice that a split between first/second person, form one hand, and third person, from the other, can also be found, for example, in languages having an ergative Case system, like Georgian (Nash 1995). Moreover, Poletto (1997), Manzini & Savoia (1998), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) give examples of this split from northern Italian dialects, which have subject clitics. In these dialects, 1/2 person subjects and 3 person subjects appear in two different positions with respect to the negation. 1/2 person subjects follow the negation, whereas 3 person subjects precede it. These data led Manzini & Savoia (1998), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) to postulate two different structural subject positions. Further evidence for such a split comes from some central and southern Italian dialects where the choice of auxiliary verb, in compound tenses, seems to be sensitive to the same split. In fact, these dialects select the auxiliary be with 1/2 person subjects and have with 3 person subjects (Kayne 1993). On the basis of these data Manzini & Savoia (1998), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) argue that, first and second person subjects occupy a P position, whereas third person subjects occupy a Q position.

To capture correctly the full range of the distribution of Albanian possessives, I will assume the analysis proposed by Manzini & Savoia (1998, 1999), Manzini & Savoia (forthcoming) that possessives are inflectional elements realizing the head inflectional positions of the string illustrated in (2) and repeated here as (37):

(37) \[ D_{OP} \quad D \quad R \quad Q \quad P \quad \text{Loc} \quad N \]
With this structure in mind, let us consider possessives without article, i.e. first and second person possessives, illustrated in (35a,b,d,e) and (36d, e) and repeated here as (38):

(38) a. libri im i ri
    'book-the my the new'
    My new book
b. libri yt i ri
    'book-the your the new'
    Your new book
c. libri ynë i ri
    'book-the our the new'
    Our new book
d. libri juaj i ri
    'book-the your the new'
    Your new book
e. librat tanë të ri
    'books-the our-PL the-PL new'
    Our new books
f. librat tuaj të ri
    'books-the your-PL the-PL new'
    Your new books

These first and second person possessives will be analyzed as elements lexicalising the P position of (37), whereas the noun moves to SpecCP in order to attach it to the definite article in D. The movement of the noun to SpecCP leaves the possessive element behind and this explains the post-nominal position of Albanian possessives. Then, the possessives without article have the structure in (39) which is the representation for all the structures containing possessive elements without article:

(39) C D R Q P Loc AGG N
    [libr-] i im/yt/ynë/juaj/tanë/tuaj [i ri] libr
    book the my/your/our/your/our/your new book

---

6. Under a N-raising analysis of the noun, the possessive element in P should block this movement as a HMC violation.
The agreement relation in gender, number and case between the possessive and the head noun will be analyzed as a reflex of the movement of NP which passes through the specifier of the P head determining the agreement on the possessive element.

As for the possessives of third person, illustrated in (35c, f) and (36c, f), we saw that they display the characteristic of being preceded by the article. This article agrees in gender and number with the possessed noun. So, when the possessed noun is masculine singular the article surfaces as \( i \); when the possessed noun is feminine the article surfaces as \( e \); when the possessed noun is plural the article surfaces as \( e \):

\[
\begin{align*}
(40) \quad & \text{a. libri} \quad i \quad \text{tij/} \quad i \quad \text{saj} \quad i \quad \text{ri} \\
& \quad \text{'book-theMASC. theMASC his/ theMASC her the new'} \\
& \quad \text{His/her new book} \\
& \quad \text{b. pena} \quad e \quad \text{tij/} \quad e \quad \text{saj} \\
& \quad \text{'pen-theFEM theFEM his/ theFEM her'} \\
& \quad \text{His/her pen} \\
& \quad \text{c. librat/penat} \quad e \quad \text{tija/} \quad e \quad \text{saja} \\
& \quad \text{'books-the/pens-thePL thePL his/ thePL her'} \\
& \quad \text{His/her books/pens}
\end{align*}
\]

What is the exact status of the particles which precede possessive pronouns? The examples given in (40) show that the article preceding the possessive element carries gender and number features, namely it conveys agreement information and, in fact, it cannot be deleted, as the ungrammaticality of (41) shows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(41) \quad & \text{a. * libri/pena} \quad \text{tij/saj} \\
& \quad \text{'book/pen-the his/her'} \\
& \quad \text{b. *librat/penat} \quad \text{tija/saja} \\
& \quad \text{'books-the/pens-the his/her'}
\end{align*}
\]

It is thus quite plausible to assume that the article which precedes the third person possessive is part of the possessive itself.

With respect to its position, I will assume that it lexicalizes a functional head position D inside the extended projection of the noun, whereas elements such as \( tij/saj/tyre \) are hosted in the Q position. The insertion of the possessive article in D implies a more complex structure of 3 person possessive constructions. In fact, besides the D position occupied by the possessive article, another D position is necessary for the realization of
the definite article which realizes the definiteness of the head noun. For constructions like (40), I will assume a DP structure containing more than one string of positions. In particular, I will assume that the possessive element and its article are realized in a lower string, whereas the noun raises to the SpecCP position of a higher string:

\[(42) \quad \text{C} \quad \text{D} \quad \ldots \quad \text{D} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{AGG} \quad \text{N} \]
\[
\text{[libr-]} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{tij/saj} \quad \text{[i ri]} \quad \text{libr}
\]

The agreement relation between the article and the head noun will be analyzed as a reflex of the movement of the noun libër which passes through the lower SpecDP head occupied by the possessive article determining the agreement on the article. I also extend this structure to plural possessives of first and second person which are preceded by the article. The examples in (36a, b) are repeated here as (43):

\[(43) \]
\[\begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{librat} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{mi} \quad \text{të} \quad \text{ri} \\
& \text{'books-the the my-PL the-PL new'} \\
& \text{My new books} \\
\end{align*}
\[\begin{align*}
b. \quad \text{librat} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{tu} \quad \text{të} \quad \text{ri} \\
& \text{'books-the the your-PL the-PL new'} \\
& \text{Your new books} \\
\end{align*}
\]

They have the structure in (44):

\[(44) \quad \text{C} \quad \text{D} \quad \ldots \quad \text{D} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{Q} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{AGG} \quad \text{N} \]
\[
\text{[libr-]} \quad \text{at} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{mi/tu} \quad \text{[të ri]} \quad \text{libr}
\]

The question now arises is: Why third person possessives (cf. (40)) and first and second plural possessives (cf. (43)) require the article, whereas first and second person singular (cf. (38)) do not allow it? I would suggest that the obligatory presence of the possessive article in D is due to the indefiniteness of the possessive forms displaying the article itself. That is, the first and second possessive elements, which are characterised by the Person feature and which appear without article, are definite elements, whereas Q possessives only are inflectional elements which lack the Definiteness feature. This feature must be therefore lexicalised by a D° element in the possessive string. Then, 3 person possessives and 1 and 2 plural possessives lexicalise D through the insertion of the article. The idea that P possessives are definite elements is supported by the fact that
in structures containing kinship nouns, P possessives can lexicalise the position $D^\circ$, whereas Q possessives never do that. Compare the behaviour of 1/2 person possessives with that of 3 person possessives in kinship nouns:

(45) a. im vëlla  
    'my brother'  

b. yt vëlla  
    'your brother'  

c. *i tij vëlla  
    'his brother'

Only first and second person possessives can precede the kinship noun, which appear in an indefinite form. The pre-nominal position of first and second person possessives in (45) suggests these possessives have moved to $D$, whereas the kinship noun is lexicalised in $N$:

(46)  

```
DOP  D  R  Q  P  Loc  N
```

```
im/yt      im/yt  vëlla
```

This possibility of lexicalising first and second person possessives in $D^\circ$ means that P possessives are definite elements. Under this analysis we expect all P possessives without the article to be able to lexicalise $D^\circ$. But this does not happen. Only 1/2 singular person possessives can raise to $D$ (see (45)). 1/2 plural possessive forms cannot appear in $D^\circ$, even if they do not have the article:

(47) a. *yne vëlla  
    'our brother'  

b. *juaj vëlla  
    'your brother'  

c. *tane vëllezër  
    'our-PL brothers-PL'  

d. *tuaj vëllezër  
    'your-PL brothers-PL'

How can we explain the contrast between (45) and (47)? I assume it can still be accounted for in terms of definiteness. As we know, in the domain of the discourse, the
first person singular corresponds to the speaker, whereas the second singular corresponds to the addressee. When first/second singular possessives combine with a kinship noun, they have the property of determining the reference of the kinship noun, namely the connection of first/second person possessive with a kinship noun denotes an individual rather than an open argument which needs to be saturated by a D element. And in fact, in (45) the presence of the P possessive of first/second person in D is sufficient to license a referential interpretation, preventing the insertion of the definite article on the noun. This can be taken to indicate that first/second singular possessives can play a definite determiner function. First and second person plural, instead, include in their reference individuals other than the speaker and the addressee; thus they cannot raise to D, since they are not able to license a definite interpretation. Then I take the elements in (47) to have the similar characteristics of pre-articulated possessives, namely they are indefinite elements, despite the absence of the article.

Let us now turn to the structure illustrated in (33), involving a demonstrative or a quantifier, a definite noun and a possessive element. (33) is repeated here as (48):

(48) a. ky librë im nuk më shërben më
   'this book-the my not me serves anymore'
   *This book of mine doesn’t serve to me anymore*

   b. një mikë im u nis dje
   'a friend-the my left yesterday'
   *A friend of mine left yesterday*

These structures may be given the same analysis assumed for structures containing a demonstrative and a definite noun (cf. (27)). Then, we can analyze the demonstrative ky or the quantifier një of (48) as elements lexicalizing a Loc or a Q position of a higher string, whereas the definite noun is realized in SpecCP. The possessive element is, instead, realized in P:

(49) a. …. Loc … C D R Q P Loc N
   ky [libr-] i im libr

   b. …. Q … C D R Q P Loc N
   një [mik-] u im mik
As we have seen, assuming (37) to be the representation of Albanian possessive structures, we can derive the particular properties of Albanian.

2.4. **Possessives and kinship nouns**

I will examine now the behaviour of possessives when they appear with definite kinship nouns. In structures containing definite kinship nouns the possessive pronouns are post-nominal, as is shown in the paradigm in (50):

(50) a. vël lái  im
    'brother-the  my'
    my brother
b. vël lái  yt
    'brother-the  your'
    your brother
c. vël lái  i  tij/ i  saj
    'brother-the  the  his/ the  her'
    his/her brother
d. vël lái  ynë
    'brother-the  our'
    our brother
e. vël lái  juaj
    'brother-the  your'
    your brother
f. vël lái  i  tyre
    'brother-the  the  their'
    their brother

The pre-nominal position of the possessive causes ungrammaticality:

(51)  *im/yt/i  tij/i  saj/ynë/juaj/i  tyre  vël lái
    'my/your/his/her/our/your/their  brother-the'
(52) a. *vëlla im
    'brother my'
    my brother
b. *vëlla yt
    'brother your'
c. *vëlla i tij/ i saj
    'brother the his/ the her'
    his/her brother
d. *vëlla ynë
    'brother our'
e. *vëlla juaj
    'brother your'
your brother
f. *vëlla i tyre
    'brother the their'
    their brother

The possessive examples in (50) can be given the same analysis as the possessive constructions with common nouns. I, thus, assume that kinship nouns with possessives illustrated in (50) have the structure in (53):

(53) a. C D R Q P Loc N
    [vëlla-] i  im/yt/ynë/juaj vëlla
b. C D ..... D R Q P Loc N
    [vëlla-] i  i  tij/saj/tyre vëlla

But as we saw in (45), kinship nouns allow the possibility of first and second person singular possessives to occur in pre-nominal position. In this case the definite article on the noun is not allowed:

(54) a. im vëlla
    'my brother'
b. yt vëlla
    'your brother'
As we can see in comparing (50) and (54), in Albanian there is no difference in form between pre-nominal and post-nominal possessives. For the pre-nominal occurrence of the possessives illustrated in (45) and repeated in (54), I assume that the possessive element raises to D, namely it moves to the position normally occupied by the definite article. The configuration is given in (55):

(55) D R Q P Loc N

\[ \mathrm{im/yt} \quad \mathrm{im/yt} \quad \mathrm{vëlla} \]

By moving to D, the possessive results in the pre-nominal position. As for the reason of such a movement, we have already shown that when P possessives of first and second person singular combine with a kinship noun, they act as definite determiners. The possessives in D lexicalise the definiteness and this is the reason why the possessive in D never co-occurs with the definite article. The occurrence of P in D prevents, in fact, the realisation of the definite article, as is shown in (54c).

Summing up so far, first and second person singular possessives can appear in two different positions. They can be post-nominal and this requires the presence of the definite article on the noun (50) or they can be pre-nominal; in this case the noun appears in its indefinite form (54).

Now consider again third person possessives. As we saw in (50) they appear in post-nominal position. Their occurrence in pre-nominal position is not allowed, either with definite or indefinite nouns:

(56) a. *i tij vëllai
   'the his brother-the'
   his brother

b. *i tij vëlla
   'the his brother'

Interestingly, Albanian also has a different strategy to realise third possessive elements, that of preposing only the article. This strategy is only limited to kinship nouns (57) and it requires the definite article on the noun (58):
What is the correct structure of Albanian constructions in (57)? To account for (57), I will assume that the possessive article preceding the NP is realised in the DOP position. DOP precedes a full DP and it can only be lexicalised by Q features. P features never can be realized in DOP:

\[(59) \quad *i/yt \ vëllai \quad 'my/your \ brother-the'\]

Thus, the structure of the examples in (57) is that in (60):

\[(60) \quad DOP \quad \ldots \quad C \quad D \quad R \quad Q \quad P \quad Loc \quad N \quad \text{vëllai} \]

In conclusion, we have accounted for the distributional characteristics of Albanian possessives by assuming a theory of possessives, according to which possessives are elements lexicalizing the inflectional head positions Q and P inside the extended projection of the noun phrase. A structure of the type illustrated in (37), involving distinct slots for first/second and third person possessives is clearly needed for Albanian possessives. This analysis, in fact, provides an elegant explanation either for the distribution of Albanian possessives or for certain their properties (the split between 1/2 person and 3 person possessives; the behaviour of possessives with kinship nouns; the particular realization of third person possessives through the preposing of the article)
which could be difficult to capture under the current approaches which analyze possessives as adjectives which are base-generated in SpecNP and subsequently move to SpecAgrP or to SpecDP when they combine with kinship nouns. Such as analysis, which is proposed for example, by Cinque (1990), Crisma (1990), Giorgi & Longobardi (1991), Giusti (1993), Longobardi (1992, 1996) for Italian possessives, seems to be inadequate for Albanian since it cannot derive the particular properties of Albanian possessives.

In the next section, I will extend the analysis proposed for possessives to the Albanian genitive structures, another construction type which, like the possessive, is characterised by the presence of the same article we will also find in pre-articulated adjectives. No generative study has ever been dedicated to this construction up to now.

3. Genitive constructions

As I said, there is another construction in Albanian which involves the same kind of article we found in some possessives. It is the genitive construction:

(61) libri i studentit

'b book-theNOM the student-theGEN'

The student’s book

Albanian genitives are always marked with genitive Case, which is morphologically realized on the definite article incorporated to the noun. So, the suffix -it in studentit in (61) is the genitive form for definite masculine singular nouns. Like in possessive constructions, also in genitive structures the article which precedes the genitival phrase agrees in gender and number with the head noun. So, for example, in (62a) the article i agrees with the masculine head noun libri, whereas in (62b) the article e agrees with the feminine head noun çanta.

(62) a. libri i studentit

'b book-theMASC theMASC student-theMASC'

The student’s book

b. çanta e studentit

'b bag-theFEM theFEM student-theMASC'

The student’s bag
The presence of the article is obligatory, as the ungrammaticality of (63) shows:

(63) *libri studentit
    'book-theNOM student-theGEN'

Thus, also the genitive construction in Albanian exhibits the article. So, possessives, genitives and adjectival phrases share two surface similarities: the fact that they are preceded by an article and the fact that they all appear in post-nominal position. Two questions arise: (i) How can we analyze the article in genitive constructions? (ii) It is possible to extend to genitive constructions the analysis assumed for possessives?

With respect to the possessive constructions, a number of proposals have been made in the literature to identify the structural position of the arguments (possessor and head noun) of a possessive clause. Kayne (1994), for example, for the English structure *Two pictures of John’s* adopts a raising analysis of the possessed noun to SpecDP with the subsequent insertion of the preposition *of* in D°. Thus, (64b) is derived from (64a):

(64) a. D° [ John [ ‘s [two pictures ]]]
    b. [two pictures], [D° of] [ John [ ‘s ] [ e ],]]

Kayne uses the same approach also for the French possessive construction in (65a), which is syntactically derived, as is shown in (65b):

(65) a. la voiture de Jean
    b. [D/PP voiture ] [ de [IP Jean [ I° [e]…

According to Kayne (1994) the element *de* is inserted in order to Case-license *Jean*. Finally, Kayne extends this analysis to the structures involving a predication interpretation. Then, a sentence like *that idiot of a doctor* is derived by fronting of the predicate NP *idiot*. The derivation is given in (66):

(66) that [D/PP [NP idiot ] [ of [IP a doctor [ I° [e]…

Two questions are unclear in Kayne’s analysis: What is the exact status of the English element *of* or the French element *de*? Kayne calls them prepositional complementizers or prepositional determiners and labels them as D/PP, but the author never specifies the properties of these heads. Also unclear are the reasons which force the movement of the
possessed noun to the specifier of D/PP. In the last version of minimalism (Chomsky 1995), movement of any element into any position is allowed only if it is required. Overt movement is triggered by reasons of feature checking. In genitive constructions, like (64) or (65), no visibly configuration of feature checking is present to justify the movement of the possessed noun to SpecDP. Also unclear are the reasons which force fronting of the predicate NP in (66).

A raising analysis for genitive constructions is also assumed by Den Dikken (1997, 1998). First of all, Den Dikken adopts a raising analysis for predicative structures such as (67).

(67) that idiot of a doctor

According to Den Dikken the structure of (67) is represented by a small clause (XP) containing the subject a doctor and the predicate that idiot:

(68) [DP that [XP doctor [Pred idiot]]]

A raising operation, which the author calls Predicate Inversion, moves the predicate of the Small Clause to the subject position FP:

(69) [DP that [FP idiot of [XP doctor t]]]

Den Dikken also assumes that the head X° of the Small Clause raises to F° in order to render equidistant the position of the subject and the SpecFP. In this way the predicate can skip the subject without violating Chomsky’s (1995) Minimal Link Condition:
The movement of $X^\circ$ to $F^\circ$ causes $F^\circ$ to be realized as *of*. In Den Dikken’s analysis *of* is considered as the counterpart of the copula in predicative structures. So, he analyses *of* as a copular element, rather than a complementizer, a preposition, or a determiner. Den Dikken extends then this analysis to English possessive constructions. According to the author, Predicate Inversion also applies in English Saxon genitive constructions. Then, for sentences like *John’s book*, Den Dikken assumes that *John* generates as the complement of a dative preposition which heads a small clause. The subject of this small clause is represented by the projection of the possessed noun:

(71) $[DP [D’ [D [FP [F’ [F [XP book [X’ X [PP P John ]]]]]]]]]$

In the course of the derivation the prepositional possessor raises to FP, whereas $X^\circ$ and $P^\circ$ raise to $F^\circ$. The complex $F+X+P$ is spelled-out as the Saxon genitive ‘s. The resulting structure is in (72):

(72) $[FP John, [F+X_j+P_k ‘s [XP book [X’ tj [PP tk ti ]]]]]]]$]

The same approach is taken by Den Dikken for post-nominal possessives of the type in (73):

(73) *a picture of a slender woman*
Since this structure has the same linear order we find in Predicate Inverted structures of the type in (67), Den Dikken hypothesizes that also in post-nominal constructions like (73) of is a copular element. But, since the insertion of of signals inversion, Den Dikken is forced to assume that inversion also applies in post-nominal structures like (73). To derive (73), Den Dikken assumes that first the possessor moves to SpecFP, like in Saxon genitive constructions, whereas P° an X° incorporate into F°:

\[
[FP [PP t_k \text{ possessor}]_i [F’ F+X_j+P_k [XP possessum [X’ t_j t_i ]]]] 
\]

then the small clause raises to SpecDP, whereas the complex F+X+P raises to D° and is realized as of:

\[
[DP [XP possessum [X’ t_j t_i ]] [D’ [F F+X_j+P_k (=of)] [FP [PP t_k \text{ possessor }]_i [F’ t_F t_{XP }]]]] 
\]

The problem with this analysis is that it requires repeated applications of the raising operation. But, once again, no one of these operations is motivated. So the movement operation assumed by Kayne (1994) and Den Dikken (1998) seems entirely unmotivated, then incompatible with Chomsky’s Last Resort.

A different line of analysis has been developed in Delsing (1998), Dobrovie-Sorin (1999). Delsing (1998) opts for a theory in which genitives are DP arguments of the head noun. They are base generated post-nominally, as complements of N:

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{genitival} \\
\text{head noun} 
\]

This analysis can account for the word order in sentences like two pictures of John’s without resorting to movement, but it cannot explain how the possessor can be considered a complement of the possessum. Then, Delsing’s (1998) approach poses the problem of the selection.

With regard to Romanian pre-articulated genitives, like (77), Dobrovie-Sorin (1999) proposes two options: they can be generated as a complement to N, an analysis which is
similar to that proposed by Delsing (1998), or they can be right-adjoined to DP. A genitive structure like (77) can have the representation in (78a) or in (78b):

(77) acest obicei al unei vecine
    'this habit of a neighbour’s'

(78) a. DP
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{D} \\
      \text{NP}
    \end{array} \]
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      acest \\
      \text{N}
    \end{array} \]
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{DP2} \\
      \text{obicei, al unei vecine}
    \end{array} \]

b. DP
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{D} \\
      \text{NP}
    \end{array} \]
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      acest \\
      \text{N}
    \end{array} \]
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{DP2} \\
      \text{obicei, al unei vecine}
    \end{array} \]

I will pursue a different approach. I will also extend to genitive constructions the analysis I adopted for possessives in such a way as to unify all the constructions containing the article. This is an interesting hypothesis both because a unifying analysis seems to be desirable and also because Albanian genitives present essentially the same superficial structure of possessives. Both, in fact, are post-nominal and, besides that, both lexicalize the gender and number features as articles under an independent functional head D. Thus, a joint analysis would be desirable. Thus, I assume that a genitive construction is assigned a representation like (37), repeated in (79):

(79) \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{DOP} \\
      \text{D} \\
      \text{R} \\
      \text{Q} \\
      \text{P} \\
      \text{Loc} \\
      \text{N}
    \end{array} \]

Let us now see how one can derive the genitive structure illustrated in (61). I assume that in a genitive structure like (61) the article which precedes the genitive is realized in the lower D head, whereas the genitive DP, which is a full DP, lexicalise the specifier position of R. Thus, an example like (61) has the representation in (80):

(80) \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{C} \\
      \text{D} \\
      \text{DOP} \\
      \text{D} \\
      \text{R} \\
      \text{Q} \\
      \text{P} \\
      \text{Loc} \\
      \text{N}
    \end{array} \]
    \[ \begin{array}{c}
      \text{[libr-]} \\
      \text{i} \\
      \text{i} \\
      \text{[studentit]} \\
      \text{libër}
    \end{array} \]

The agreement between the possessed noun and the article which precedes the genitival phrase can be analyzed, once again, as a reflex of the movement of the possessed noun
which, raising to SpecCP, passes through the intermediate SpecDP triggering agreement on the article. This analysis then provides an explanation for the properties of genitive constructions without resorting to movement operations. In fact, the only element which undergoes movement is the noun phrase *libēr* which raises to SpecCP in order to attach to the enclitic article in D. In brief, with this analysis nothing special needs to be involved.

4. Albanian adjectives

In this section, I will analyse the position and the internal structure of Albanian adjective phrases. In particular, I will concentrate on Albanian constructions like (1c), involving adjectives characterized by the realization of a definite article on the adjective. This article, as we will see, is the same article we found in possessive and genitive constructions.

4.1. Internal structure of Albanian adjective phrases

Albanian has two distinct classes of adjectives: pre-articulated adjectives, like *i bukur* ‘nice’ (81a) and adjectives which occur without article, like *përtac* ‘lazy’ (81b):

(81) a. djali  i  bukur  
   'boy-the the nice'
   
   *The nice boy*

b. djali  përtac  
   'boy-the lazy'
   
   *The lazy boy*

In pre-articulated adjectives, the prepositive definite article is an integral part of them; it expresses the agreement of the adjective with the head noun in gender and number. In fact, the article surfaces as *i* when the adjective modifies a masculine noun (82a), it surfaces as *e* when the adjective modifies a feminine noun (82b) and it surfaces as *tē* when the modified noun is plural (82c,d)⁷.

    ⁷. In Arbëresh dialects the article surfaces as *tē* when it modifies neutral nouns:

(i)  ujt  tē  mire
    
    'water-theNEUTER the good'
    
    *The good water*
(82) a. djali i bukur
    'boy-the theMASC nice'
    *The nice boy*

    b. vajza e bukur
    'girl-the theFEM nice'
    *The nice girl*

    c. djemtë të bukur
    'boys-the thePL nice'
    *The nice boys*

    d. vajzat të bukura
    'girls-the thePL niceFEM'
    *The nice girls*

The prepositive article must be immediately adjacent to the adjective: no element may appear between them:

(83) a. *një djalë i shumë bukur
    'a boy the very nice'
    *A very nice boy*

    b. një djalë shumë i bukur

(84) a. *një djalë i më bukur se ti
    'a boy the more nice that you'
    *A boy nicer than you*

    b. një djalë më i bukur se ti

The prepositive definite article is obligatory, whereby it cannot be deleted:

(85) *djali bukur
    'boy-the nice'

Article-less adjectives also agree both in gender and number with the head noun, but the agreement morphology only surfaces on the adjective:
Article-less adjectives cannot be combined with the prepositive article:

(87) *djali i përtac

Pre-articulated adjectives can also be found in Greek (Horrocks & Stavrou 1987; Androutsopoulou 1994, 1995, 2001; Giusti 1997; Alexiadou & Wilder 1998). (88) is a Greek example drawn from Alexiadou & Wilder (1998):

(88) to megalo to kokkino to vivlio
    'the big the red the book'

Relying on Androutsopoulou (1995), Alexiadou & Wilder (1998) call this multiple occurrence of the same article in the same NP *Determiner Spreading*. It is important to notice, however that the article of Modern Greek adjectives is crucially different from that of Albanian in various respects. First, in Modern Greek the pre-adjective article is optional for pre-nominal adjectives (89), whereas it is obligatory for post-nominal adjectives (90):8

(89) a. to megalo to kokkino to vivlio
    'the big the red the book'

(90) b. to megalo kokkino vivlio

---

8. All the Greek examples quoted in this section are taken from Alexiadou & Wilder (1998).
(90) a. to vivlio to megalo to kokkino
   'the book the big the red'
b. *to vivlio kokkino megalo

This does not hold for Albanian, where the article is always realized with pre-articulated adjectives, independently of the position of the adjective. (91) and (92) show that the article must be realized both in post-nominal adjectives and in focussed pre-nominal adjectives:

(91) a. libri i kuq
    'book-the the red'
   The red book
b. *libri kuq

(92) a. i kuqi libër
   'the red book'
b. *kuqi libër

Albanian and Modern Greek also differ in the following way: in Modern Greek, *Determiner Spreading* is only found with adjectives which can be used predicatively (93); in Albanian the occurrence of the article is also possible with adjectives which do not have a predicative use (94).

(93) o ipotithemenos (*o) dolofonos
   'the alleged (*the) murderer'

(94) vrasësi i supozuar
   'murderer-the the alleged'
   The alleged murderer

Another difference between Modern Greek and Albanian concerns the fact that in Modern Greek the presence versus the absence of the article correlates with a difference in word order. The structures in (95) show the six possible combinations of NP and APs, which show up in the presence of the articles. The structure in (96), instead, illustrates the only unmarked word order possible when articles are not realized.

(95) o ipotithemenos (*o) dolofonos
   'the alleged (*the) murderer'

(96) *vrasësi i supozuar
   'murderer-the the alleged'
   The alleged murderer
(95)  a. to vivlio to kokkino to megalo
    b. to vivlio to megalo to kokkino
    c. to kokkino to vivlio to megalo
    d. to megalo to kokkino to vivlio
    e. to megalo to vivlio to kokkino
    f. to kokkino to megalo to vivlio

(96) to megalo kokkino vivlio

In Albanian, except for focussed adjectives which precede the noun, adjectives always appear in post-nominal position. Thus, Albanian does not present any construction of the type illustrated in (95c, d, e, f) and (96).

(97)  a. libri i madh i kuq
       'book-the the big the red'
    b. libri i kuq i madh
    c. *i kuq libri i madh
    d. *i kuq i madh libri
    e. *i madh i kuq libri
    f. *i madh libri i kuq

Finally, in Modern Greek, but not in Albanian, the articles only appear in definite DPs. Compare the Greek example in (98), which shows that in the presence of an indefinite DP pre-adjectival articles are not realized, with the Albanian examples in (99) which show that, in indefinite DPs, pre-adjectival articles cannot be deleted:

(98) ena megalo kokkino vivlio
    'a big red book'

(99) a. një libër i madh i kuq
    'a book the big the red'
    b. *një libër madh kuq

Greek data seem to indicate that, in this language, adjectives are pre-articulated only when used predicatively and only in particular syntactic circumstances, namely when they appear in post-nominal position and when they modify definite nouns. In Albanian,
instead, the pre-adjectival article is always realized. It is thus reasonable to assume that the Albanian article on the adjective is an integral part of the adjective, so when a pre-articulated adjective is selected on the Lexicon, its article must always be inserted in the syntactic structure of the DP.

What is the status of the article in pre-articulated adjectives? Androutsoupoulou (1994) treats the article preceding Greek adjectives as an extra determiner which realizes a [+def] feature in the extended projection of the noun. This determiner heads a Definite Phrase. Following Kayne (1994), Alexiadou & Wilder (1998) analyze the adjectives as full clause CP which are complements of an external determiner, namely the article represents the head of a DP which stands in a clausal configuration with the AP. So, according to this analysis, the article which precedes the adjective is not a projection of AP, but just an external determiner. Androutsoupoulou (2001) considers the adjectival determiner which precedes Albanian and Greek adjectives as a head in the main structure of a DP modified by an adjective. In her analysis the adjective determiner is parallel to the D/P head in Kayne’s (1994) proposal for the analysis of relative clauses.

Albanian article seems difficult to analyze as an external determiner with respect to the adjective since, unlike Modern Greek, the Albanian article necessarily accompanies the adjective, as we saw in the examples above. If we take it to be an external determiner we would expect it to be absent on a par with the Modern Greek article in the same environments. But, the ungrammaticality of (91b) and (99b) show that in Albanian the article cannot be deleted. Besides that, as we saw in (83) and (84) no element can separate the article from the adjective. This strict adjacency requirement may be taken to indicate that the article belongs to the adjective, namely it is a kind of adjectival element. These data seem to indicate quite clearly that Albanian cannot be assigned the analysis proposed by Alexiadou & Wilder (1998) and Androutsoupoulou (1994, 2001) for Modern Greek. Instead, for Albanian, it is reasonable to analyze that article as a D° element which realizes part of the projection of the adjective phrase. In particular, D is the position where gender and number information features realize. According to this analysis, Albanian APs are full DPs, displaying a full extended projection incorporating a functional head D and a functional head I, where adjectival inflection is realized. This yields the following articulated structure:
4.2. The position of Albanian adjectives

In Albanian, adjectives normally appear in post-nominal position. Compare the grammatical sentences in (101a,c) and (102a,c) with the ungrammatical ones in (101b,d) and (102b,d):

(101) a. djali i bukur
    'boy-the the nice'
    The nice boy
b. *i bukur djali
c. një djalë i bukur
    'a boy the nice'
    A nice boy
d. *një i bukur djalë

(102) a. djali përtac
    'boy-the lazy'
    The lazy boy
b. *përtac djali
c. një djalë përtac
    'a boy lazy'
    A lazy boy
d. *një përtac djalë
In structures containing DPs modified by two adjectives, we only find the order Noun – adjectives, both in definite or in indefinite structures:

(103) a. mëkati i madh i pafalshëm
    'sin-the the big the unforgivable'
    *The big unforgivable sin
b. mëkati i pafalshëm i madh
c. *i madh mëkati i pafalshëm
d. *i pafalshëm mëkati i madh
e. *i madh i pafalshëm mëkati
f. *i pafalshëm i madh mëkati

(104) a. një vazo e bukur kineze
    'a pot the nice Chinese'
    *A nice Chinese pot
b. një vazo kineze e bukur
c. *një kineze vazo e bukur
d. *një e bukur vazo kineze
e. *një e bukur kineze vazo
f. *një kineze e bukur vazo

However, when Albanian adjectives are emphasized, they appear in pre-nominal position. In this case the definite article, which usually is attached to the noun and realizes definiteness, appears instead on the adjective, whereas the noun appears in its indefinite form:

(105) a. i bukur i djalë
    'theMASC nice-the boy'
    *The NICE boy
b. *i bukur djalë

(106) a. përtaç i djalë
    'lazy-the boy'
    *The LAZY boy
b. *përtaç djalë
In structures containing two adjectives, only one of the adjectives can appear in pre-nominal position:

(107) a. i pafalshëmë mëkatë i madh 'the unforgivable-the sin the big'
   The UNFORGIVABLE big sin
b. i madh mëkatë i pafalshëm 'the big-the sin the unforgivable'
   The BIG unforgivable sin
c. *i pafalshëmë i madh mëkatë
d. * i pafalshëmë i madh mëkatë
e. *i pafalshëm i madh mëkatë
f. *i pafalshëm i madh mëkatë

With respect to the position of the adjective inside the noun phrase, I follow ideas by Cinque (1995) that adjectives are specifiers of functional or aspectual heads dominating NP. So, there is at least another projection within the extended projection of the noun, whose specifier hosts the adjective. I will call this projection D AGG and I will assume that in Albanian D AGG immediately dominates NP. The reason for this assumption comes from the fact that in Albanian adjectives always follow first and second person possessives:

(108) a. libri im/yt i ri 'book-the my/your the new'
    My/your new book
b. *libri i ri im/yt

In section 2.3. I assumed that first and second person possessives realize the P position, thus for the derivation of (108) we are led to assume that the adjective is generated below P and above N:

(109)    C       D       R       Q       P       Loc       A_GG       N
    [libr-] i im [i ri] lib

The N-adjective order is derived by movement of the constituent containing the noun to SpecCP in order to incorporate the definite article.
As for (105), (106) and (107), I will assume that the emphasized adjective, generated in the specifier of AP, moves to the nominal C domain, presumably in a Focus projection, in order to check a strong [focus] feature:

\[(110) \quad \begin{array}{cccccccc}
  C & D_{OP} & D & R & Q & P & \text{Loc} & A_{GG} & N \\
  [i \text{ bukur}] & i & [i \text{ bukur}] & djalë \\
  [përtac] & i & [përtac] \\
\end{array}\]

In this case the definite article in D is attached to the adjective, whereby the overt movement of NP to SpecCP is not required, hence blocked by Procastinate^9.

Consider now the position of the adjective in genitive structures:

\[(111)\]

a. libri i ri i studentit

'bbook-the the new the student'

The student’s new book

b. *libri i studentit i ri

c. *i ri libri i studentit

As the examples in (111) show, in genitive structures the adjective modifying the possessed noun must follow it and precede the possessor. This is not surprising, since as saw in (101) and (102) in Albanian adjectives appear in post-nominal position.

Under the analysis sketched in this paper, the structure for genitive constructions is the one illustrated in (80) and repeated here as (112):

\[(112) \quad \begin{array}{cccccccc}
  C & \ldots & D & \ldots & D_{OP} & D & R & Q & P & \text{Loc} & N \\
  [\text{libr-}] & i & i & [\text{studentit}] & \text{libër} \\
\end{array}\]

I assumed that the genitive phrase lexicalizes the SpecQP position, whereas the possessed noun \textit{libër} moves to SpecCP in order to incorporate the definite article in D.

---

^9. This analysis is similar to the one proposed by Giusti (1996) and Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1998), although in Giusti (1996) it is assumed that the enclitic article which appears on the adjective is realized in Foc^o, whereas the adjective is in SpecFocP. In Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1998), instead, it is assumed that the enclitic article is directly generated on the adjective which occupies the SpecFocP. Their proposal is different from the one I follow here since I’m assuming that the definite article is always realized in D^o.
Under a derivation along these lines, the insertion of an adjective in a genitive structure seems to pose a problem:

\[(113)\quad C \quad \ldots D \quad \ldots D_{OP} \quad D \quad R \quad Q \quad P \quad \text{Loc} \quad \text{AGG} \quad N \quad \text{[libr-]} \quad i \quad \text{[studentit]} \quad \text{[i ri]} \quad \text{libër}\]

NP-preposing of the constituent containing \textit{libër} yields a sentence in which the adjective linearly follows the possessor. But, this structure, as (111b) shows is totally ungrammatical.

To account for the linear order in (111a), I will assume that in this structure the adjective moves along with the noun \textit{libër}. This is NP-raising assumed by Androutsopoulou (1994, 2001) for pronominal adjectives in Greek (see section 1.1). A structure like (111a) is then derived by the movement operations illustrated in (114):

\[(114)\quad \text{a. } C \quad \ldots D \quad I \quad \ldots D \quad R \quad P \quad I \quad \text{AGG} \quad N \quad \text{[libër]} \quad [i ri] \quad \text{libër} \quad \text{[studentit]} \quad i \quad \text{[libër]} \quad [i ri] \quad \text{libër} \]

\[\quad \text{b. } C \quad \ldots D \quad I \quad \ldots D \quad R \quad P \quad I \quad \text{AGG} \quad N \quad \text{[libër]} \quad [i ri] \quad \text{libër} \quad \text{[studentit]} \quad i \quad \text{[libër]} \quad [i ri] \quad \text{libër} \]

\[\quad \text{c. } C \quad \ldots D \quad I \quad \ldots D \quad R \quad P \quad I \quad \text{AGG} \quad N \quad \text{[libër]} \quad [i ri] \quad \text{libër} \quad \text{[studentit]} \quad i \quad \text{[libër]} \quad [i ri] \quad \text{libër} \]

First, the noun \textit{libër} moves to the IP projection which immediately dominates AP (113a). Then, the constituent containing \textit{libër} \textit{ i ri} moves to the higher IP projection (113b). Finally, the NP containing the noun \textit{libër} moves to SpecCP in order to incorporate the definite article in D (113c). This yields the final structure with the adjective between the two noun phrases.
Conclusion

To sum up, the purpose of this paper was to give a unified explanation of Albanian adjective, possessive and genitive structures, three construction types which display surface similarities in some respects. In fact, all the constructions under discussion contain an article which agrees with the head noun and in all these structures, adjectives, possessives and genitive phrases appear in post-nominal position. These facts suggest that the same type of derivation underlies the constructions under discussion. I have accounted for the peculiarities of Albanian pre-articulated adjectives, pre-articulated possessives and pre-articulated genitives in terms of a Determiner complementation, whereas I have accounted for the main distributional characteristics of possessives by analysing them as elements realizing the inflectional positions Q and P within the extended projection of the noun.
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