Case and Clausal Architecture: Evidence from Maltese

Matthew A. Tucker
NYU Abu Dhabi

88th ANNUAL MEETING OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA
2 January 2014

1 Introduction

1.1 Today’s Themes

The PERIPHRASTIC CAUSATIVE in Maltese, shown in (1):¹

(1) ...għalhekk ġieghel lil kullhadd jitghallem il-lingwa Għarbija.
...thus make.3.SG.MASC DOM everyone learn.3.SG.MASC DEF-language Arabic
“...thus [it/he] made everyone learn Arabic.” (Borg et al., 2012:parl1775)

Basic claims:
• This construction involves a vP “reduced” clausal complement.
• ġieghel is thus like an ECM or Restructuring predicate.
• This complement must be large enough to host negation.
• The theory of agreement must allow tense-less clauses with subject agreement.
• MULTIPLE SPELL-OUT (Chomsky, 2000, et seq.) is needed for these cases.

1.2 Language Excursus

The Language of Interest: Maltese (Semitic; Republic of Malta).
• ~ 400,000 native speakers in Maltese Archipelago.
• But: more in diaspora communities (including San Francisco & Toronto)
• A Semitic language, same sub-family as Hebrew/Arabic
• Most like Moroccan Arabic, but with heavy influence of Italian and English
• Verbal morphosyntax mostly Semitic-like, though with less nonconcatenativity

¹Thanks to my consultants, Frank Agius, Hon. Consul General Louis Vella, and Sam Ċetcuti for judgments and teaching me (about) Maltese. Thanks to Jim McCloskey, Sandy Chung, and Jorge Hankamer for support throughout the project. Thanks are also due to Karlos Arregi, Bern Samko and audiences at the University of California, Berkeley and University of California, Santa Cruz for feedback on the material presented here. None of these fine people are responsible for what I have made of their advice.

1. In the glosses for Maltese data, I use the following abbreviations: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, SG = singular number, PL = plural number, NOM = nominative case, ACC = accusative case, DAT = dative case, MASC = masculine gender, FEM = feminine gender, DEF = Semitic definite article, CAUS = causative, COMP = complementizer, DOM = differential object marking, NEG = negation, IMPF = imperfect aspect, and PERF = perfect aspect. All examples without citation of the provenance are from my personal field notes. Data from Borg et al. (2011; 2012) is presented with spelling errors corrected but otherwise unaltered. References to data from the corpus are identified by corpus identifier tag for the text they appear in.
Where does the data come from?
- Fieldwork with SF Bay Area Maltese speakers
- Conversations with native-speaker linguists
- The descriptive literature (especially Aquilina, 1959 and Borg & Azzopardi-Alexander, 1997)
- The Maltese Language Resource Server’s KORPUS MALTIT v.1.0 & v.2.0 (Borg et al., 2011; 2012) from the University of Malta

1.3 Terminological Excursus

Brief Terminological Excursus: Considering the bolded arguments in (2):³

(2) Lester made/had/let McNulty leak the story.

- Lester is the CAUSER = pro/it in (1)
- McNulty is the CAUSEE = kullhadd in (1)
- The story is the THEME = il-lingwa Għarbija in (1)

Road map:
1. Data supporting a reduced-clause analysis of ġiegħel (§2)
2. What that syntactic analysis must look like (§3)
3. Conclusions, further directions, etc. (§4)

2 Clausal Causation in Maltese: The Data

Central Claim: The ġiegħel-causative is a reduced clausal complementation structure.

2.1 Biclausal Properties

Two “biclausal” properties:
1. BINDING: The causee acts like a “Subject” for binding (§2.1.1).
2. NEGATION: There can be two instances of clausal negation (§2.1.2).

2.1.1 Binding

Quick background on binding in Maltese:
- The reflexive in Maltese is lil+Pronoun innif(i)s+Pronoun.
- E.g.: lilu innifsu, “himself;” lilha innifisha, “herself.”
- C-command is relevant insofar as linear order is not sufficient for binding (Tucker, 2013).

With this in mind, we can observe the binding patterns in (3):
- Causer → causee binding: OK.
- Causee → theme binding: OK.

2. Thanks are due to Maris Camilleri, Ray Fabri, and Michael Spagnol for these conversations.
3. By using these terms, I’m not trying to argue for a θ-role analysis (e.g., Doron, 1999 and Doron, 2003) of causation more generally. See, e.g., Parsons (1990). These terms are employed here simply to help pick out particular argument positions.
• Causer → theme binding: Not OK.

(3)a. Marku ġieghel lil ġieghel ġieghel jiftah il-bieb.
Mark made.3.SG.MASC himself open.3.SG.MASC DEF-door
“Mark made himself open the door.”
b. Marku ġieghel lil Pietru jara lil ġieghel ġieghel fil-mera.
Louis made.3.SG.MASC DOM Peter see.3.SG.MASC himself in.the-mirror
“Mark made Peter see himself in the mirror.”
Maria made.3.SG.FEM DOM Peter see.3.SG.MASC herself in.the-mirror
“Maria made Peter see herself in the mirror.”

This is the same pattern we observe in English make/have/let causatives:
(4) *The veterinary nurse i made/let/had the zebra cool herself i in the shade.

Normal interpretation of patterns like these:
• Causer and theme are “too far apart” for binding to take place.
  – The causee could be a SUBJECT in the sense of the Chomsky (1986) Binding Theory.
  – The causer and theme could be in different PHASES (Chomsky, 2000).
  – The causee could be an INTERVENER on a direct relationship between causer and theme.

2.1.2 Negation

Some background on Maltese negation:
• Negation comes in two forms:
  1. Clausal negation: ma...x verbal circumfix.
  2. Constituent/nonverbal negation: m...x circumfix on a pronominal copula.
• /-x/ portion does not appear when an NPI is present (Haspelmath & Caruana, 1996).
• Only clausal negation can license NEGATIVE POLARITY ITEMS.

The clausal negation can appear on either verb in a ġieghel-causative (5):
(5)a. Tano ma ġieghel lil hadd jiekol il-fażola.
Tano NEG made.3.SG.MASC DOM anyone eat.3.SG.MASC DEF-beans.
“Tano did not make anyone eat the beans.”
b. Tano ġieghel lil Xandru ma jiekol lil hadd.
Tano made.3.SG.MASC DOM Xander NEG eat.3.SG.MASC DOM anyone
“(lit.)Tano made Xander not eat anyone.”

Normally, negation is high in the clause; it appears as the outermost morphology on the verb, outside tense, aspect, and object clitics.

2.2 Monoclusal Properties

Four monoclusal properties:
  1. MISSING PROJECTIONS: No evidence of independent tense/aspect in the complement.
  2. CLITIC PLACEMENT: the causee cliticizes to ġieghel.
  3. CASE: The causee is exceptionally case-marked by ġieghel.
2.2.1 Missing Projections

Three projections one needs more generally for the Maltese clause are demonstrably absent: T(ense), M(ood), and Asp(ect) (see Tucker, 2013 for some discussion of these categories).

- Things which realize those heads morphologically cannot appear in the complement.
- Adverbs which require the semantic content of these heads only have matrix scope.

Aspect  
For Aspect, there are two observations to make:

1. Perfect aspect verbal morphology cannot appear on the complement verb (6).
2. Adverbs which require a particular aspectual interpretation (like the perfect) can’t have embedded scope (7).

(6)a. Luqa ġiegħl = u jitlaq mill-belt.
   Luke made.3.SG.MASC = 3.SG.MASC leave.3.SG.MASC.IMPF from.the-city
   “Luke made him leave from the city.”

   Luke made.3.SG.MASC = 3.SG.MASC leave.3.SG.MASC.PERF from.the-city
   “Luke made him leave from the city.”

- Jitlaq is the imperfect and telaq the perfect.4
- Imperfect is arguably a morphological default (Benmamoun, 2003).
- Only the former is ever possible in the ġiegħel causative.

(7) Pietru kien ġiegħel lil Marku jiekol l-ikel digà.
   Peter had.3.SG.MASC made.3.SG.MASC DOM Mark eat.3.SG.MASC DEF-food already.
   Impossible: “Peter made Mark already eat the food.”

   Only: “Peter already made Mark eat the food.”

Tense  
The same thing is true of the tense and mood positions:

(8)a. *Pietru se ġiegieħel lil Marku se jiekol l-ikel.
    Peter will make.3.SG.MASC DOM Mark will eat.3.SG.MASC DEF-food
    “Peter will make Mark eat the food (in the future).”

b. Pietru se ġiegieħel lil Marku jiekol l-ikel.
    Peter will make.3.SG.MASC DOM Mark eat.3.SG.MASC DEF-food
    “Peter will make Mark eat the food (in the future).”

Kien in T normally combines with verbs to form complex tense expressions.

- Kien is impossible in the complement of ġiegieħel (9).

(9) *Pietru ġiegieħel lil Marku kien jiekol l-ikel.
    Peter made DOM Mark had ate DEF-food
    Intended: “Peter made Mark have been eating the food.”

---

4. Ġiegieħel itself can appear in either the perfect (ġiegieħel) or imperfect (iġiegieħel), depending upon the tense and aspect of the matrix clause.
Similarly, temporal adverbs such as il-bieraħ, “yesterday” are impossible w/embedded scope (10).

(10) Marju ġiegħel lil Matthew jiekol l-ikel tiegh = u il-bieraħ.
Mario made DOM Matthew eat DEF-food of = him the-yesterday

Possible: “Yesterday, Mario made Matthew eat his food.”

Impossible: “Mario made Matthew eat his food yesterday.”

2.2.2 Clitic Placement

Clitics in Maltese attach to the verb which immediately c-commands them provided that there is no intervening complementizer.

(11) * Irrid = ek li t-hobb l-ghalliem il-ġdid.
want.1.sg = 2.sg COMP 2.sg-love DEF-teacher DEF-new
“(lit.) I want that you love the new teacher.”

(based upon Haspelmath & Caruana, 2000:(6b))

In ġiegħel causatives, there are two cliticizations of note:
1. Any internal arguments of the embedded verb cliticize to it (12a–b).
2. The causee cliticizes to ġiegħel (12a,c).

(12)a. Louis ġiegħl = u jiekol = ha.
Louis made = 3.sg.masc.acc eat = 3.sg.fem.acc
“Louis made him eat it.”

b. * Louis ġiegħl = u = (l)ha jiekol.
Louis made = 3.sg.masc.acc = 3.sg.fem eat

Intended: “Louis made him eat it.”

c. * Louis ġiegħel jiekol = u = (l)ha.
Louis made eat = 3.sg.masc.acc = 3.sg.fem

Intended: “Louis made him eat it.”

2.2.3 Case

Normally, Maltese verbs don’t allow more than one accusative-marked argument (13): 5

(13)a. Fausto bagħat ktiel lill-kmandant.
Fausto sent book to.the-commander

“Fausto sent a book to the commander.”

b. ?? Fausto bagħat (lill)-kmandant ktiel.
Fausto sent to.the-commander book

“Fausto sent a book to the commander.”

Comment: “Sounds like the speaker also knows English.”

5. I say “normally” here because there is a rather unprincipled exception involving five or so high-frequency verbs. See Comrie & Borg (1985) and Ch. 4 of the dissertation, or feel free to ask me about this in the Q&A. Also, the double question mark diacritic is used instead of * because as the theme gets heavier, the word order in (13b) becomes more acceptable.
Despite this, the causee is demonstrably *accusative* in these constructions (14):

(14) Louis ġieghl = u/* = lu jiekol il-ġağin.
Louis made.3.SG.MASC = 3.SG.MASC.ACC/ = 3.SG.MASC.DAT eat.3.SG.MASC DEF-pasta
“Louis made him eat the pasta.”

- The bolded clitic *u* is an accusative object clitic.
- Can’t be any other case (e.g., nominative or dative)

The most reasonable interpretation here is that this accusative comes from ġieghel. We understand this and the cliticization as analogous to English Exceptional Case-Marking (ECM):

(15) Picard wanted her to be on the away team.

### 3 A Restructuring-like Analysis

**Central Claim:** We can understand most of this if ġieghel embeds a polarity projection.

**Auxiliary Ideas:**
- This projection also needs to host subject agreement $\varphi$–features.
- The polarity head itself embeds a $\varphi P$ of the normal kind.
- Case and agreement need to be dissociated — the embedded verb has agreement.

#### 3.1 The Selectional Architecture

**Starting point:** $\varphi P$-internal subject hypothesis as implemented in Kratzer (1996).
- This means that both ġieghel and the embedded verb project a $\varphi P$.
- I will call the $\varphi$ of ġieghel $\varphi_{caus}$ and the embedded one $\varphi_{ag}$.
- This already accounts for the binding facts:
  - Causer and theme are in different $\varphi P$s, separated by the causee in $[\text{Spec}, \varphi_{ag}]$
  - Causer and theme are thus in different PHASES (Chomsky, 2000; 2001; 2008).

**Question:** Where is negation?
- Following Laka (1994), I assume polarity is hosted in a $\Sigma P$.
- *Claim:* there is a polarity projection in the complement of ġieghel.
- Embedded verb undergoes HEAD MOVEMENT to $\Sigma$ for affixal purposes.
- Preliminary $\varphi P$ structure shown in Figure 1, without head movement.

**Observation:** This account already predicts several of the documented properties:
- **MISSING PROJECTIONS** (C, T, Asp, M) are simply not selected by ġieghel.
- ECM-like properties of causee are a result of $\varphi_{caus}$ being the only head with which the causee can AGREE, given that the causee is in the domain of $\varphi_{caus}$.

#### 3.2 Agreement and Finiteness

**Question:** How does agreement work in this construction?
- ġieghel agrees with the causer.
- There is no object agreement, so the theme does not trigger overt agreement.
- The causee obligatorily controls subject agreement on the embedded verb (16):
(16)a. Louis ġiegħel lit-tfal jieklu fażola.
   Louis made.3.SG.MASC DOM.DEF-children eat.3.PL beans
   “Louis made the children eat the beans.”
b. *Louis ġiegħel lit-tfal jiekol fażola.
   Louis made.3.SG.MASC DOM.DEF-children eat.3.SG.MASC beans
   “Louis made the children eat the beans.”

Challenge: This is difficult for theories which take case and agreement to be inexorably linked.6
   • Normally, these theories take accusative case to tie to object agreement.
   • Subject agreement and nominative case are taken to be linked.
   • Cashed out theoretically by AGREE from T valuing both.
   • BUT: there is no embedded T or nominative case, yet there is subject agreement!

Proposal: Case and agreement are computed separately.

Components of the proposal:7
   • ΣP hosts a set of φ-features which can probe.
   • Agreement is split:
     1. T agrees with causer, triggering subject agreement on ġiegħel.
     2. vcaus agrees with causee, valuing case, but not agreement features.
     3. Proposal: Σ provides φ-features for embedded subject agreement.
   • Complete relations inside vcausP shown in Figure 2.8

3.3 M-Case

Question: what about case in the ġiegħel-causatives?

---

6. The modern implementation of this idea which I have in mind is that proposed in Chomsky (1995), but the idea predates the Minimalist Program.
7. For other approaches which separate subject agreement from nominative case assignment, see McFadden (2004), Bobaljik (2008), McFadden & Sundaresan (2011), Bhatt & Walkow (To Appear), and references therein.
8. In this tree: (1) I abstract away from head movement of the verb, (2) I denote the base site of movement with t for simplicity only — I am not assuming that traces exist, (3) dotted lines represent AGREE relations which value φ-features only, (4) dashed lines represent AGREE relations which provide structural Case, and (5) solid lines represent AGREE relations which involve both.
Here we need to augment the theory with MULTIPLE SPELL-OUT and disjunctive case assignment Marantz (1991).9

Crucially, we can assume vP to be a phase (solid lines in Figure 3).

Then the causee in these constructions is simultaneously part of two case domains:

1. It is in the complement domain because it is inside $v_{ag}$P.
2. But the specifier of that $v_{ag}$P is not in the spell-out domain (SOD) of that phase, meaning that this nominal is still visible at the higher $v_{caus}$P phase (dashed lines in Figure 3).

9. See the papers by Chomsky (2000; 2001; 2008) for initial discussion of this approach.
In this theory, accusative is assigned by a principle like (17):

(17) Accusative case is assigned to a nominal $\alpha$ when a distinct position $\beta$ in the same phase as $\alpha$ not marked by lexical case. In this instance, assign the lower of $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ accusative case.

(18) $\text{Louis} \begin{array}{c} \text{gieghel} \\ \text{made.3.SG.MASC} \end{array} = u \begin{array}{c} \text{jiekol} \\ \text{eat.3.SG.MASC} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{il-ghaġin} \\ \text{DEF-pasta} \end{array}$

“Louis made him eat the pasta.”

- The theme appears in a $vP$ with a nominal not assigned lexical case ($u$).
- It therefore qualifies for and receives dependent case.
- At the $v_{caus}$ phase, there are still two nominals without lexical case ($\text{Louis}$ and $u$).
- The lower of the two ($u$) qualifies for and receives accusative.
- The higher of the two ($\text{Louis}$) receives unmarked nominative.

4 Conclusions

These proposals give an understanding of Maltese causation without causative-specific derivations.

- This is in contrast to early work on causatives which posited lexical derivations or causative-specific transformations (e.g., Aissen, 1979, among many others).
- This is possible because of the way the reduced clausal structure interacts with universal properties of $\text{AGREE}$ and their determination of case and agreement morphology.
- The resulting picture is one where the causative shares analytical similarities with modern treatments of infinitives and restructuring predicates (Wurmbrand, 2001).

If we admit that there are no null $T$'s/$M$'s/$C$'s/$\text{Asp}$'s in Maltese, then there are consequences for the theory of agreement:

- The agreement in the complement of Maltese causatives is problematic for theories which make case and agreement morphology two sides of the same coin.
- The most minimal change is to simply separate case from agreement.
- Case and agreement are thus only related insofar as both are computed by the same relation ($\text{AGREE}$), but do not bundle together in that operation.

Future Directions:

- Do causatives in closely-related Arabic varieties behave similarly?
- How does the formation of these causatives relate to morphological causatives in Maltese?
- What are the ramifications of treating case and agreement as separate derivational entities?
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