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1 Introduction: Why Clitics?

Pressing Question: where is linguistic variation located in theories of grammar?

- CHOMSKY-BORER CONJECTURE: syntactic variation is limited to the featural structure of functional elements. The architecture of syntax is universal

If we see variation at the syntax-morphology interface, where is it to be located in the grammar?

Today’s Plan: a look at a series of clitic restrictions in Maltese and related dialects of Arabic that looks syntactic but needs a morphological account.

- Question: How do we know when a clitic restriction is syntactic or morphological?

1 The PERSON CASE CONSTRAINT in French:

a. *Paul me = lui = présentera.
   Paul 1.acc = 3.dat = introduce.fut
   “Paul will introduce me to him.”

b. Paul me = présentera à lui.
   Paul 1.acc = introduce.fut to 3.dat
   “Paul will introduce me to him.”

(1) 3-3 INTERACTIONS in Spanish:

a. *A Pedro, el premio, le lo dieron ayer.
   to Pedro the prize 3.dat 3.acc gave-pl yesterday
   “They gave Pedro the prize yesterday”

b. A Pedro, el premio, se lo dieron ayer.
   to Pedro the prize se 3.acc gave-pl yesterday
   “They gave Pedro the prize yesterday.”

---

*Thanks to my consultants, Hon. Consul Louis Vella and Sam Ėlcutti for judgments and teaching me (about) Maltese. Thanks are due to Judith Aissen, Karlos Arregi, Sandy Chung, Amy Rose Deal, Ray Fabri, Boris Harizanov, Jim McCloskey, Mark Norris, Bern Samko, Anie Thompson and Adam Ussishkin for helpful discussion of syntax, morphology, and/or Maltese as they pertain to this project. Finally, partial funding for this project was graciously provided by a grant from the Institute for Humanities Research at UCSC to the Crosslinguistic Investigations in Syntax-Prosody Cluster at UCSC and Stanford University. Of course, none of those individuals or entities are in any way responsible for the result.

1. See Chomsky (1995) and Borer (2005a;b) for proposals of this sort.
2 **Clitics in Maltese**

Maltese has the clitic inventory shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>φ</th>
<th>POSS</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ek</td>
<td>(e)k²</td>
<td>lek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.m</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>hu</td>
<td>lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.f</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>lha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.pl</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>lna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.pl</td>
<td>kom</td>
<td>kom</td>
<td>lkom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.pl</td>
<td>hom</td>
<td>hom</td>
<td>lhom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Clitics in Maltese

In general, doubling is not permitted with these clitics (3a–b).

- Examples with co-occurrence are plausibly clitic dislocation constructions.³

(3) No Clitic Doubling:

a. (Jien) rajt(* = ha) Ĉettina.
   (I) see.PERF.1.SG(* = 3.SG.FEM.ACC) Ĉettina
   “I saw Ĉettina”

b. (Jien) rajt = ha (*Ĉettina).
   (I) see.PERF.1.SG = 3.SG.FEM.ACC (*Ĉettina)
   “I saw her.”

c. Ĉettina, (jien) rajt*(= ha).
   Ĉettina (I) see.PERF.1.SG*(= 3.SG.FEM.ACC)
   “Ĉettina, I saw her.”

Clusters of enclitics are possible with ditransitives:

(4) Maltese Double Stacking (ACC > DAT):

a. Ta = hu = li.
   give.PERF = 3.SG.MASC.ACC = 1.SG.DAT
   “He gave it to me.”

b. *Ta = li = hu.


d. *Hu = li = ta.

e. *Li = hu = ta.

f. *Li = ta = hu.

3 **Similar Restrictions in Clitic Clusters**

**This section:** Demonstrate a series of restrictions on clitic clusters in Maltese reminiscent of the Person-Case/me lui Constraint found in Romance languages.

---

2. /e/ is present after consonant-final stems.
3. See Cinque (1977) and Cinque (1990) for initial discussion and Anagnostopoulou (2005a) and the papers in Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997) for an overview.
### 3.1 French and Maltese

French is known to disallow clitic clusters containing a dative clitic and any first/second/reflexive accusative clitic — this is the PERSON-CASE CONSTRAINT (PCC):\(^4\)

(5) **PCC Effects in French (from Kayne, 1975):**

- a. *Paul **me = lui** = présentera.  
  Paul **1.ACC = 3.DAT** = introduce.FUT  
  “Paul will introduce me to him.” (Kayne, 1975:173–4)

- b. Paul **me = présentera à lui.**  
  Paul **1.ACC = introduce.FUT to 3.DAT**  
  “Paul will introduce me to him.” (Kayne, 1975:173–4)

- c. *Paul **vous = leur** = recommandera.  
  Paul **2.ACC = 3.DAT** = recommend.  
  “Paul will recommend you to them.” (Kayne, 1975:173–4)

- d. Paul **vous = recommandera à eux.**  
  Paul **2.ACC = recommend.FUT to 3.DAT**  
  “Paul will recommend you to them.” (Kayne, 1975:173–4)

A very similar set of restrictions holds of Maltese, namely the generalization:

**In Maltese ACC-DAT clusters, ACC must be 3rd person.**

Whenever this restriction is violated (6a,c), the result is a periphrastic PREPOSITIONAL DATIVE construction with the preposition li (6b,d):

(6) **Maltese Clitic Restrictions:**

- a. *Pietru **wera = ni = lu.**  
  Peter **show.PERF = 1.SG.ACC = 3.SG.MASC.DAT**  
  “Peter showed/revealed me to him.”

- b. Pietru **wera = ni li = lu.**  
  Peter **show.PERF = 1.SG.ACC to = 3.SG.MASC.DAT**  
  “Peter showed/revealed me to him.”

- c. *Xandru **bagħat = kom = lha.**  
  Xander **sent = 2.PL.ACC = 3.SG.FEM.DAT**  
  “Xander sent y’all to her.”

- d. Xandru **bagħat = kom li = lha.**  
  Xander **sent = 2.PL.ACC to = 3.FEM.SG.DAT**  
  “Xander sent y’all to her.”

One difference arises in combinations of local person clitics. These are ungrammatical in Maltese:

(7) **Local Person Combinations Are Bad:**

- a. *Louis **bagħat = ni = lek**  
  Louis **sent.3.MASC.SG = 1.SG.ACC = 2.SG.DAT**  
  “Louis sent me to you.”

- b. Louis **bagħat = ni li = lek**  
  Louis **sent.3.MASC.SG = 1.SG.ACC to = 2.SG.DAT**  
  “Louis sent me to you.”

---

4. Restrictions like those called the PCC here are widely documented and discussed: see Perlmuter (1971); Hale (1973); Kayne (1975); Harris (1981); Rosen (1990); Bonet (1991; 1994); Albizu (1997); Ormazabal (2000); Anagnostopoulou (2005b; 2003); Nevins (2007); Béjar (2003); Béjar & Rezac (2003); Haspelmath (2008; 2004); Săvescu (2006); Adger & Harbour (2007); Arregi & Nevins (2012); Kalin & McPherson (2012); Sturegon *et al.* (To Appear); Walkow (2012b;a); *i.a.*
c. *Louis baghat =ek =li
   Louis sent.3.MASC.SG = 2.SG.ACC = 1.SG.DAT
   “Louis sent you to me.”

d. Louis baghat =ek li=li
   Louis sent.3.MASC.SG = 2.SG.ACC to=1.SG.DAT
   “Louis sent you to me.”

These combinations are acceptable in some Romance languages; Greek forbids them entirely (8):

(8) Greek Local Person Combinations:

a. *O Kostas mu se sistise.
   the Kostas 1.GEN 2.ACC introduced
   “Kostas introduced you to me.”

   (Bonet, 1991:178)

b. *O Kostas su me sistise.
   the Kostas 2.GEN 1.ACC introduced
   “Kostas introduced you to me.”

   (Bonet, 1991:178)

This pattern is sometimes called the STRONG PERSON CASE CONSTRAINT and is schematized in Table 2 — number is irrelevant for this restriction in Maltese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Clitic Restrictions Schema — Maltese

3.2 Other Arabic Varieties

Modern spoken varieties of Arabic from N. Africa have these same restrictions.

1. Egyptian (Woidich, 2006)
2. Moroccan (Harrell, 2004:136–9)

(9) Moroccan Arabic Clitics: 1 > 3:

a. *qeddem = na = lhom
   introduced.3.SG = 1.PL.ACC = 3.PL.DAT
   “He introduced us to them.”

b. qeddem = na li = lhom
   introduced.3.SG = 1.PL.ACC to = 3.PL.DAT
   “He introduced us to them.”

   (Harrell, 2004:140)

(10) Moroccan Arabic Clitics: 2 > 3:

a. *qeddemt = kom = lha
   introduced.1.SG = 2.PL.ACC = 3.FEM.SG.DAT
   “I introduced y’all to her.”

b. qeddemt = kom li = lha
   introduced.1.SG = 2.PL.ACC to = 3.FEM.SG.DAT
   “I introduced y’all to her.”

   (Harrell, 2004:140)
The Classical Arabic language allowed stacked clitics, but in the opposite order:\(^5\)

(11) Classical Arabic Stacked Clitics (DAT > ACC):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zawwajnaa} & = \text{ka} = \text{haa}. \\
\text{CAUS.marry.1.PL} & = \text{2.MASC.SG} = \text{3.FEM.SG}
\end{align*}
\]

“We married her to you (lit., we had you marry her).”

The Classical language also allowed a clear applicative construction called the DOUBLE ACCUSATIVE; this construction exists today in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA; see Ryding, 2005:69–72):

(12) MSA Equivalent of CA Double Accusatives:

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{ʔaʕtay-tu} & \quad \text{l-ṭaalib-a} \quad \text{kitaab-a} = \text{hu}. \\
& \quad \text{gave-1.SG} \quad \text{DEF-student-ACC} \quad \text{book-ACC} = \text{his} \\
& \quad \text{“I gave the student his book.”} \\
& \quad \text{(Ouhalla, 1994:57)}
b. \quad *\text{ʔaʕtay-tu} & \quad \text{ṣaahib-a} = \text{hu} \quad \text{l-kitaab-a}. \\
& \quad \text{gave-1.SG} \quad \text{OWNER-ACC} = \text{its} \quad \text{DEF-book-ACC} \\
& \quad \text{“I gave the owner its book.”} \\
& \quad \text{(Ouhalla, 1994:57)}
\end{align*}
\]

This construction is subject to the same restrictions when both internal arguments are accusative clitics, a fact overtly called a PCC by Bonet (1991) and Nevins (2007).^7

- Periphrastic host ʔiyya is not a preposition.
- Teeple (2011) and Walkow (2012b) both treat it as a dummy host.

(13) Clitic Restrictions in CA:

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad *\text{ʔaʕṭaa} & \quad =\text{ka} = \text{nii}. \\
& \quad \text{gave.3.MASC.SG} = \text{2.MASC.SG} = \text{1.SG} \\
& \quad \text{“He gave you me.”} \\
& \quad \text{(Siibawayhi, 1881:§211)}
b. \quad \text{ʔaʕṭaa} & \quad =\text{ka} \quad ʔiyyaa = \text{yaa}. \\
& \quad \text{gave.3.MASC.SG} = \text{2.MASC.SG} \quad \text{ʔIYYA} = \text{1.SG} \\
& \quad \text{“He gave you me.”} \\
& \quad \text{(Siibawayhi, 1881:§211)}
\end{align*}
\]

4 A Syntactic Account?

Recently, syntactic approaches to restrictions like these have gained popularity.

- Initial morphological approaches treated these restrictions as a syntax-morphology mapping problem.
- Syntactic approaches locate this restriction in the architecture of AGREE (Chomsky, 2000 et seq.).
- See Albizu (1997); Anagnostopoulou (2003; 2005b); Béjar & Rezac (2003); Adger & Harbour (2007); Nevins (2007); Rezac (2008); Arregi & Nevins (2012).

Could the Maltese/Arabic facts be modeled in syntactic approaches to the PCC?

---

5. How often it allowed these is a matter of some controversy. See Shlonsky (1997:262ff) and Gensler (1998) for some discussion, or ask me about it in the Q&A.
6. References to portions of the Qur'an follow the western numbering system where \(x:y\) denotes surah (chapter) \(x\), ayah (verse) \(y\).
7. This fact is well-documented; see Wright (1889a;b); Fassi Fehri (1993; 1988); Ryding (2005); Nevins (2007) and Walkow (2012b; 2010). I will depart from these authors in characterizing the effect in CA as identical to that in Maltese and Spoken Arabic in disallowing local person combinations and allowing 3-3 clusters. I am happy to field questions about this simplification.
4.1 What The Account Looks Like

These effects are a kind of intervention (Chomsky, 2001).

![Diagram](image)

Figure 1: Intervention Model of the PCC

For CA/French, needed feature makes 1/2 intervene but not 3. From Harley & Ritter (2002), this would be [PART], which picks out the current discourse participants.

1st: [SPEC(EA)E(H)E, PART(ICIPANT), π]
2nd: [PART, π]
3rd: [π]

(14) **PERSON LICENSING CONDITION:**
Interpretable 1st and 2nd person features must be licensed by entering into an AGREE relation with an appropriate functional category.

(Béjar & Rezac, 2003:53)

When [PART] appears on DAT, this either exhausts or interrupts the AGREE relation and makes subsequent agreement with ACC impossible.

(15)a. *ʔaʕțaa =ka =nii.
gave.3.MASC.SG =2.MASC.SG =1.SG
“He gave you me.”

b. \[\text{pro} \text{ [Appl [PART,π] [Appl [VP V [SPKR,PART,π ] ] ] ]}\]

(16)a. Yasʔal =kumu =haa.
ask.3.MASC.SG =2.MASC.PL =3.FEM.SG
“He should ask it of you.”

b. \[\text{pro} \text{ [ [Appl [PART,π] [Appl [VP V [π ] ] ] ]}\]

Two effects follow:
- PCC is a kind of AGREE failure, leaving ACC unlicensed.
- Prepositional Dative “repairs” are insertion of a preposition which licenses DAT.
- But in theory anything that takes one argument out of the domain of v qualifies as a repair.

For licit examples, the relevant feature is not present on [Spec,ApplP] and AGREE beyond that position is possible without intervention. There are three distinct approaches to how ACC gets Case:

1. Third person DAT does not exhaust the AGREE relation (Anagnostopoulou, 2005b; 2003).
2. **MULTIPLE AGREE** occurs in all cases but is subject to uniformity constraints (Nevins, 2007).
3. Third person ACC does not require agreement for licensing (Béjar & Rezac, 2009; 2003).
**Prediction:** the ACC argument should intervene if prominence is reversed (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Intervention Model — Different Prominence](image)

Problematic configurations allowed:
1. ACC = 2, DAT = 3 (17a–b)
2. ACC = 1, DAT = 3 (17c–d)

(17)a. *Pietru we ra = ni = lu.  
   Peter  show.PERF = 1.SG.ACC = 3.SG.MASC.DAT  
   “Peter showed/revealed me to him.”
   c. *Xandru bagh at = kom = lha.  
   Xander  sent = 2.PL.ACC = 3.SG.FEM.DAT  
   “Xander sent y’all to her.”

4.2 Issues for Maltese

Unfortunately, Maltese does seem to instantiate this problematic case for syntactic accounts.\(^8\)

Maltese does not, in general, allow the prominence relation DAT > ACC.

One obvious argument often overlooked: the order in Maltese is fixed at ACC > DAT (18a–b):

(18) Maltese Double Stacking (ACC > DAT):

a. Ta = hu = li.  
   give.PERF = 3.SG.MASC.ACC = 1.SG.DAT  
   “He gave it to me.”
   b. *Ta = li = hu.

This same order is found with lexical DPs, regardless of whether or not the dative argument is marked with the dative LIL (19):

---

8. I will not discuss the spoken Arabic varieties at this level of depth, both for space reasons and because that work is ongoing. I am happy to field questions on this.
(19)a. Matthias bagħat kiteb lill-kmandant.
  Matthew sent book to.the-commander
  “Matthew sent a book to the commander.”
b. *Matthias bagħat (lill)-kmandant kiteb.
  Matthew sent (to.the)-commander book
  “Matthew sent the commander a book.”
  Comment: “Sounds like the speaker probably also knows English.”

Furthermore, there can’t be short A’ of either argument to derive ACC > DAT, since this would not predict the observed pattern of WEAK CROSSOVER (WCO; Postal, 1971).
  • ACC → DAT binding is possible.
  • This is not changed under A’-movement of ACC.
  • A’-movement of DAT, however, does cause a WCO effect.

(20) Weak Crossover in Maltese:
  a. Bgħat-t il-ktieb i lil sid = u_{ij}.
     set-2.SG DEF-book to owner = 3.SG.MASC_{ij}
     “You sent the book to its_{ij} owner.”
  b. Liema ktieb bghat-t lil sid = u_{ij}?
     which book sent-2.SG to owner-3.SG_{ij}
     “Which book did you send to its_{ij} owner?”
  c. Lil liema sid i bagħt-t il-ktieb tiegħ = u_{ij}?
     to which owner sent-2.SG DEF-book of = 3.SG.MASC_{ij}
     “To which owner did you send his_{ij} book?”

Question: could the accusative DP be undergoing short A-movement?
  • The language does have possessor datives (Sadler, 2012b).
  • Something like that is presumably needed to account for those anyway.9
  • Movement could be to [Spec,ApplP] (Marantz, 1993; Pylkkänen, 2008).

Problem: Passives and Principle A/anaphoric binding don’t show the predicted patterns:
  • Passive only allows raising of theme/patient; goal/source passives not permitted (21).10
  • Backwards binding from DAT → ACC not found, but reconstruction should be possible (22).11

(21)a. (Huwa) bagħat il-ittra lil-Marija.
  He sent DEF-letter to-Maria
  “He sent the letter to Maria.”
  b. Il-ittra nt-bagħat lil-Marija.
     the-letter PASS-sent to-Maria.
     “The letter was sent to Maria.”
  c. *(Lil-)Marija nt-bagħat il-ittra.
     (to-)Maria PASS-sent the-letter
     “To Maria was sent the letter.”

(22) No Backwards Binding in Maltese Ditransitives:
  a. *Oskar bagħat ritratti ta’ xulxin lil Marija u Pawlu.
  Oscar sent pictures of each.other to Maria and Paul.
  “Oskar sent pictures of each other to Maria and Paul.”

9. For more on possessor datives and possessor raising, see Szabolcsi (1994; 1983); Borer & Grodzinsky (1987); Landau (1999); Lee-Schoenfeld (2006); Deal (To Appear); and references therein.
10. For most passives in the language; see Comrie & Borg (1985) and below for discussion. Cf., also, (Marantz, 1993; Baker, 1988) for discussion of expected passivization patterns.
11. See Belletti & Rizzi (1988); Pesetsky (1995); among others.
b. *Oskar bagħat pitturi ta’ innfishom lil Marija u Pawlu.
Oskar sent pictures of themselves to Maria and Paul.
“Oskar sent pictures of themselves to Maria and Paul.”

**Question:** Could applicative syntax be limited to dative pronouns only?
- A very sensible proposal — one made quite often for Romance languages
- Would explain why cliticization of datives is possible (23) despite the presence of lexical DP accusatives, assuming that cliticization has an A-movement precondition.

(23) Marija kitb-it = lu l-ittra.
Maria wrote-3.SG.FEM = 3.SG.MASC.DAT DEF-letter
“Maria wrote the letter to him.”

(Comrie & Borg, 1985:115)

**Problem:** Quantifiers associated with the dative pronoun can only float to the right of the accusative (24b), not to the left (24c).
- Two theories of floating quantifiers: STRANDING BY MOVEMENT or BINDING.
- Both theories place VP-internal floated quantifiers near/at argument position.
- Quantifier position is thus diagnostic of the argument position of DAT.

(24) Floating Quantifiers in Maltese Ditransitives:

a. Mathias bagħat ittri lil kull wieħed minn=hom.
Mathias sent letters to each one of=them
“Matthew sent a letter to each one of them.”

b. Mathias baghati=lhom ittri kull wieħed.
Mathias sent=3.PL.DAT letters each one
“Matthew sent them each letters.”

Mathias sent=3.PL.DAT each one letters
“Matthew sent them each letters.”

In fact, it is because French patterns in precisely the opposite way that Kayne (1975:153) proposes the DAT > ACC structure for French ditransitives with dative clitics (25).

I 3.PL.DAT have all everything showed.
“I showed them all everything.”

b. *Je leur ai tout tous monté.

Finally, it’s actually possible to show that there is limited applicativity in Maltese:

There is a double object construction in Maltese with a limited set of verbs.

Verbs like this include (see (Comrie & Borg, 1985; Camilleri, 2011; Sadler, 2012a)):
1. ta/jagħti, “he gave/gives”
2. wera/juri, “he showed/shows”
3. ghalliem, “he taught”

These verbs allow cliticization of the applied argument as an accusative clitic (26a), as opposed to the majority of verbs, which allow only the dative clitic option (26a):

---

12. See Kayne (1975); Demonte (1995); Anagnostopoulou (2003); Cuervo (2003); Rezac (2011); and references therein.
13. This is a recent idea which is gaining in popularity. See Roberts (2010); Nevins (2011); Harizanov (Under Review); Kramer (To Appear); and Tucker (In Prep.) for some discussion.
14. For proposals involving movement, see Kayne (1975); Sportiche (1988; 1996); Shlonsky (1991); Merchant (1996); McCloskey (2000); Starke (2001) and Bošković (2004); among others. For proposals involving binding, see Klein (1976); Williams (1980); Dowty & Brodie (1984); Kayne (1984); Déprez (1989); Miyagawa (1989); Doetjes (1992; 1997); Bobaljik (1995; 1998); Baltin (1995); Torrego (1996); Brisson (1998); Morzycki (1998); de Cat (2000) and Fitzpatrick (2006); among others.
Clitic Restrictions in Maltese

(26) Cliticization of the Indirect Object:

a. Marija kitb-it =lu l-ittra.
   Maria wrote-3.SG.FEM =3.SG.MASC.DAT DEF-letter
   “Maria wrote the letter to him.” (Comrie & Borg, 1985:115)

b. Marija ta-t =u / urie-t =u l-ittra.
   Maria gave-3.SG.FEM =3.SG.MASC.ACC / showed-3.SG.FEM =3.SG.MASC.ACC DEF-letter
   “Maria gave/showed him the letter.” (Comrie & Borg, 1985:117)

Moreover, these verbs allow passivization of either internal argument (27):

(27) A Different Kind of Passive Behavior:

a. L-ittra n-għata-t / nt-werie-t lil Pawlu.
   DEF-letter PASS-gave-3.SG.FEM / PASS-showed-3.SG.FEM to Paul
   “The letter was given/shown to Paul.” (Comrie & Borg, 1985:118)

b. Pawlu n-għata / nt-wera l-ittra.
   Paul PASS-gave / PASS-showed DEF-letter
   “Paul was given/shown the letter.” (Comrie & Borg, 1985:118)

When both arguments are clitics, these verbs only allow the goal/source to appear as a dative clitic.
• Further evidence that these verbs allow both possible structures.
• Clitic clusters arise from the same structure as “regular” ditransitives.
• Since the majority of verbs don’t behave like ta/wera/għalliem, then we have further evidence they
don’t have this DAT > ACC structure.

These clitic restrictions hold independent of internal argument prominence.

(28) One More PCC Example in Maltese

a. *Ġorġ ta =k =lhom.
   George give.PERF =2.SG.ACC =3.PL.DAT
   “George gave you to them.”

b. Ġorġ ta =k li=lhom.
   George give.PERF =2.SG.ACC to =3.PL.DAT
   “George gave you to them.”

5 A Morphological Account

Proposal: This is actually a morphological phenomenon.¹⁵

Three major classes of morphological approaches in the literature:
1. MORPHOLOGICAL TEMPLATES (Perlmutter, 1971).
2. MORPHOLOGICAL MAPPING (Bonet, 1991; 1994).
3. MORPHOLOGICAL DERIVATION CANCELLATION (Chung, 2012).

Any of these can putatively work for Maltese, but...
• Morphological templates would have to vary quite wildly cross-linguistically.¹⁶
• Derivation cancellation requires TRANSDERIVATIONAL COMPARISON — in some languages the repair
  is not otherwise grammatical.¹⁷

¹⁵. See Preminger (2011:184) for speculation that just such an approach is needed based on different argumentation than what is
given here.
¹⁶. See the surveys in Haspelmath (2004) and Nevins (2007) for some sample of the space of variation on this point.
¹⁷. This is a fact explicitly acknowledged and defended in Rezac (2011).
Instead: Resurrect the idea of Bonet (1991:ch.4) that a repair is a *failure of cliticization*.

5.1 Analysis Details

The analysis one wants depends a great deal on what the theory of cliticization is. For concreteness, I will assume that a cliticized argument became cliticized by two separate yet equally important operations:\(^{18}\)

1. **Movement** to a verbal specifier position.
2. **M(orphological)-Merger** of a clitic specifier with the functional head hosting clitics (Marantz, 1988).

**Claim:** Movement of the clitic occurs regardless of PCC configurationality and creates a movement chain. For a given clitic, two Spell-Out operations are possible:

1. Cliticization via M-Merger at Spell-Out (the usual case).
2. Realization in the foot of the movement chain (the repair case).

**Example:** Well-formed (30):

(30)a. Karistu bagħat =u = lha.
    Chris sent letter to = 3.SG.FEM.ACC
    “Chris sent it to her.”

b. Syntactic Representation:

\[
\]

c. M-Merger 1:

\[
\]

d. M-Merger 2:

\[
\]

**However,** it is not enough to simply spell the clitic out in the base position in PCC violating contexts.

- Clitics require a host — satisfied at PF via insertion of à/li.
- Repairs don’t require transderivationality — they are a *last resort* mapping.
- Repair prepositions thus more akin to DO SUPPORT than true prepositions.

**Example:** PCC-Violating (31):

(31)a. Dumniku wera =ni li=lu. (*wera = ni = lu)
    Dominique showed = 1.SG.ACC to = 3.SG.MASC.DAT
    “Dominique showed me to him.”

b. Syntactic Representation:

\[
\]

c. M-Merger 1:

\[
\]

18. For recent proposals of this kind, see Roberts (2010); Nevins (2011); Harizanov (Under Review); and Kramer (To Appear).
d. M-Merger 2 Fails:
\[
\]
e. PF Insertion of li:
\[
\]

5.2 What Makes a Dative Clitic?

The PCC is known not to apply to just any dative clitic.

![The PCC does not apply to datives generated outside vP](insert image)

This fact predicts that ETHICAL DATIVES should not show the PCC.\(^\text{19}\)

- They do not in French.

(32) **ETHICAL DATIVES Don't Obey the PCC:**

demain je (me) vous (me) emmène en vacances.
tomorrow I 1.SG 2.PL 1.SG take in vacations
“Tomorrow I will take you on vacation.”

(Jouitteau & Rezac, 2007:100)

**Interesting Observation:** Ethical datives in Maltese do trigger the Maltese clitic restriction.

- Dative argument cannot be realized as a lexical DP — hallmark of EDs (33d).
- Third person ACC is fine (33b).
- Yet we still see the prohibition on local themes (33c)

(33) ED's in Maltese:

a. Lawrenz hasel = ili il-kelb.
Laurence washed = 1.SG.DAT the-dog
“Laurence washed the dog for me.”

b. Lawrenz hasel = u = li.
Laurence washed = 3.SG.MASC.ACC = 1.SG.DAT
“Laurence washed it for me.”

Laurence washed = 2.SG.ACC = 1.SG.DAT
“Laurence washed you for me.”

d. ?Lawrenz hasel = ek ghalija.
Laurence washed = 2.SG.ACC for.me
“Laurence washed you for me.”

6 Conclusions

Not all clitic restrictions with identical surface distributions of clitics have the same properties, upon deep examination.

- French and Maltese/Moroccan/Egyptian have *a priori* identical restrictions on clitic clusters.
- But they do not have the same underlying syntax.
- Nor do datives pattern identically in the two cases.

**Potential Worries:**

- How is a constraint like this learned?
- How stipulative is this constraint? Does it need to be?

19. See Kayne (1975); Postal (1990); Bonet (1991); and Jouitteau & Rezac (2007) for more on this.
Pressing Followup: What is do be done with variation in clitic restrictions?

- Least interesting option: not everything which looks like a PCC is a PCC.
- More interesting option: argument person-based restrictions where the repair is otherwise grammatical are distinct from those where the repair is not licit otherwise.
- Most interesting option: person-based restrictions like those discussed by Aissen (1997) and Chung (2012) are the agreement correlates of this clitic-based restriction.
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