Chapter 7

On raising and copy raising in Maltese

Maris Camilleri
University of Essex

This paper seeks to describe and account for the (morpho)syntactic behaviour of lexically determined raising predicates and constructions, and will be considering a list of properties that characterise these. Different raising-to-SUBJ constructions available in Maltese are discussed, and eventually formalised within the Lexical Functional Grammar framework. We will argue that raising constructions in Maltese can be divided into two analyses: raising that involves a structure-shared dependency, and raising that involves an anaphoric binding dependency between the matrix SUBJ and any embedded grammatical function, subject to the identified constraints that will be discussed. We illustrate how in Maltese, raising structures are of the former type, while copy raising is of the latter.

1 Introduction

To date, there has not been any descriptive account of the different properties and behaviours that characterise raising constructions in Maltese, except initial discussions of various behaviours in Camilleri et al. (2014) and an account of the raising behaviours of various aspectual auxiliaries in Camilleri (2016), as well as a mention of these structures in Fabri (1993). The main aim of this study is to discuss alternations of the sort in (1), where (1a) involves a default 3SGM matrix form, while (1b) involves the raising of the 3PL embedded subject (SUBJ), and where in the latter structure, an overt DP/SUBJ in the embedded clause is not possible, hence the ungrammaticality of (1c).[1]

[1]Unless specified, the data should be understood as being provided by the author, a native speaker.

Maris Camilleri. On raising and copy raising in Maltese. In Patrizia Paggio & Albert Gatt (eds.), *The languages of Malta*, 171–201. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.1181795

(1) a. *Ʒ-i-dher (li) (it-tfal) sejr-in tajjeb*
3M-FRM.VWL-appear.SG COMP DEF-children go.ACT.PTCP-PL good.SGM
(it-tfal)[2]
DEF-children
'It seems that the children are doing well'

b. *It-tfal j-i-dhr-u (li) sejr-in*
DEF-children 3-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL COMP go.ACT.PTCP-PL
tajjeb
good.SGM
'The children seem to be doing well'

c. *J-i-dhr-u$_i$ li t-tfal/huma$_i$ sejr-in tajjeb

We here start our discussion with an example from the Culicover (2009: 244) textbook in order to better understand what we are to understand when we say that a verb is a raising predicate. In English, given the contrast in (2), the fact that 'something can be a subject of *appear to* VP whenever it can be a subject of a *that*-complement containing VP' suggests that *appear* is a raising predicate. When raising is not present, as in (2a), what we have is the formation of what is referred to as an *It*-Extraposition structure. While the sentences in (2) are syntactically distinct, the semantic composition is the same. This follows from the fact that since *appear* is a raising predicate and only selects for a clausal argument, the non-thematic external argument function is filled in by the semantically vacuous pronoun *it*, which in turn has no effect whatsoever on the semantic interpretation of the construction.

(2) a. It appears that I have forgotten to do my work
b. I appear to have forgotten to do my work

The predicates that are able to license raising structures are idiosyncratic, and one has to specifically determine these on the basis of a number of syntactic properties that may well be language internal. However, crosslinguistically one finds that similar and corresponding lexical items keep displaying the same behaviour (Stiebels 2007). In this study we aim to provide an overview of the raising predicates available, whilst identifying which syntactic properties are associated with raising predicates and structures in Maltese. Reference to the term *raising* with respect to the set of lexical items and constructions we will be discussing here comes from the transformational rule used in Rosenbaum (1967) to account

[2]The segmentation followed in this study is based on the account in Camilleri (2014).

for SUBJ-to-SUBJ raising construction alternations, such as the one illustrated in (2b). Postal (1974), on the other hand, generalised over this rule to account for all sort of raising constructions, including SUBJ-to-OBJ (ECM) constructions. Another term provided in the literature for verbs which display raising behaviours and involve a one-place predication that is a clausal argument, is that of 'aspectualisers' in Newmeyer (1975: 8).[3] While we choose to refer to the predicates under discussion as 'raising' predicates, we won't be employing any transformational sort of analysis. Rather, we will formalise our account within the Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) framework, where all constructions are assumed to be base-generated, and the relationship between the semantically equivalent but syntactically distinct sentences in the pairs in (1) and (2) in Maltese and English, respectively, boils down to the presence or absence of functional binding/structure-sharing via a functional equation that defines the equivalence between the SUBJ in the main clause and the embedded clause. Rather than movement, relations and dependencies in LFG are understood 'in terms of relations between functions' and not structural positions (Bresnan 1982: 400). In (1b) and (2b), there thus holds an interpretive/referential dependency between the SUBJ in the matrix and the unexpressed external argument of the predicate in the embedded clause. This relation is referred to as *control*. As we will discuss, raising constructions in Maltese differ as to whether they involve functional control or anaphoric control. The former involves structure-sharing between the SUBJ grammatical functions (GFS) across both clauses, while anaphoric control involves binding, i.e. a co-referential dependency.

The paper proceeds as follows: In §2 we provide a very brief overview of the framework of LFG and how raising is dealt with. In §3 we delve further into the details of the basic properties of raising constructions in Maltese, and the predicates involved. We provide evidence as to why it is believed that they should be analysed as raising predicates. §4 discusses copy raising and how it involves a distinct mechanism, when compared with non-copy raised structures. §5 then concludes the paper.

[3]Here we choose not to use this term, as "aspectualisers" elsewhere in the literature refer to a set of predicates, auxiliaries, light verbs and particles which provide information with respect to PHASAL ASPECT (Binnick 1991; Michaelis 1998); and Vanhove 1993 and Camilleri 2016 for specific reference to phasal verbs or aspectualisers in Maltese.

2 Raising in LFG

2.1 LFG: The theory

LFG employs a parallel architecture/correspondence (Kaplan & Bresnan 1982) and models a theory of language analysis. Such an architecture allows for distinct co-present projections that relate to one another via functional correspondences modelling different representations of linguistic analysis, each having their own rules and constraints. LFG is primarily a lexicalist theory that relies heavily on lexical entries and the information present in them. Lexicalist approaches are thus based on an underlying assumption that it is not syntax which should deal with a number of structures and relations. Rather, these are best left to the morphological domain and the lexicon, including the argument-structure. The argument-structure essentially represents predicate-argument relations. The arguments and their thematic roles are then mapped onto grammatical functions (GFs). What concerns us most, for the purpose of this study, is where in the model, syntactic analyses take place.

LFG employs two representational levels where syntactic analyses can be done, based on an important principle whereby syntactic functions are analysed independently of any sort of configurational structure (Bresnan 2001; Dalrymple 2001; Falk 2001; Bresnan et al. 2015). This split between function and constituency translates into the constituent-structure (*c*-structure) and the functional-structure (*f*-structure). The *c*-structure has to do with the external properties related with syntax, which allow and account for the variation that exists across languages. It takes into account word order considerations, constituency, syntactic categories, dominance and precedence. Through the use of phrase structure rules that build up syntactic trees, the surface linear order configurationality (or the lack of it), is represented. While X-Bar syntax (Chomsky 1970) is used for configurational or semi-configurational languages, flatter *c*-structures that do not need to be restricted to binary branched tree structures are also available. The other level of syntactic representation, i.e. the *f*-structure, is concerned with internal syntactic properties, which are believed to be more universal in nature. The *f*-structure thus represents the relevant GFs, i.e. SUBJ, OBJ etc., as well as other syntactically relevant features involved in any syntactic construction.

Every level of linguistic representation in the parallel architecture that constitutes the LFG model makes use of a distinct language. The *f*-structure, which is our main concern here, makes use of hierarchical attribute value matrices (AVMs). The information necessary for the *f*-structure comes from the lexical entry as well as information coming from the annotation on *c*-structure nodes. The functional

head of an *f*-structure is a PRED feature, which takes a list of semantic/thematic arguments represented through their enclosure in angle brackets. These are then mapped onto GFs on the basis of a default hierarchy of mappings (Kibort 2004; Kibort 2007) or through lexical specifications, if necessary. While these two levels of syntactic representation feed information into one another, agreement, binding, complementation, local dependencies including raising and control, long distance dependencies and other such constructions, are all done at the *f*-structure level, on the basis of a reference to the different relations and dependencies that are present across and amongst the GFs.

For what concerns us in this study, the relevant constraints include those related with the *f*-structure, which is constrained by the Uniqueness, Completeness and Coherence conditions. Uniqueness requires that there be no duplication in the *f*-structure, such that every attribute/feature is itself unique and takes its own unique value. In the case of unbounded discourse functions (UDFs) such as TOPic and FOCus and adjuncts (ADJs), set values for these do not violate Uniqueness. As a result, many of these could be co-present. The Completeness condition requires that the PRED's argument-structure requirements be satisfied within the *f*-structure, while Coherence checks that every GF present in the *f*-structure is one that is selected by the PRED. UDFs as well as other 'syntactic functions requiring that they be integrated appropriately into the *f*-structure' (Bresnan 2001: 63), partake in the Extended Coherence Condition (Bresnan & Mchombo 1987: 746), which states that: 'Focus and Topic must be linked to the semantic predicate argument structure of the sentence in which they occur, either by functionally or anaphorically binding an argument.'

2.2 The theory of raising in LFG

A constraint imposed on raising constructions in LFG is that the 'raised' GF be a *term*/core-argument, and should thus be an embedded SUBJ, OBJ, or OBJθ (Bresnan 1982: 419; Dalrymple 2001: 10) and that 'lexically controlled local dependencies […] involve simultaneous instantiations of two grammatical functions to a single *f*-structure value' (Asudeh & Toivonen 2012: 6). This is thus a 'functional predication relation' (Bresnan 2001: 270), and can be defined as a relation that 'involves a dual assignment of grammatical relations: a single NP functions as an argument of both the subordinate clause and the matrix clause, and bears a grammatical relation in both clauses' (Kroeger 2004: 107). This view of control thus entails a symmetrical relation between the GFs involved, and is referred to as functional-identity, token-identity or structure-sharing. Unlike unbounded distance dependency constructions, where one finds dependencies involving UDFs occupying

multiple instantiations, in the case of raising (and control), there is a limitation to the 'sentence node', and the dependency is hence bounded/local. Having said this, however, it is possible to also have 'multiple structure-sharing, resulting from […] further embedding' (Asudeh 2005: 491; Asudeh & Toivonen 2006: 22; Alsina 2008: 18), as long as the clauses proceed locally. See (3) for an illustration of chained raising cascades in Maltese.

(3) *Laħq-u* *dehr-u* *qis-hom* *donn-hom*
reach.PFV.3-PL appear.PFV.3-PL as.though-3PL.ACC as.though-3PL.ACC
ħa *j-i-bde-w* *j-e-rġgħ-u* *j-morr-u*[4]
PROSP 3-FRM.VWL-start.IMPV-PL 3-FRM.VWL-repeat.IMPV-PL 3-go.IMPV-PL
'They did happen to have appeared as though they will start going again.'

In raising constructions of the type in (1b) and (2b) the complement clause is mapped onto an XCOMP GF. A GF of this type, as opposed to the COMP GF is an open complement, and licenses structure-sharing between the relevant matrix and embedded GFs to take place. The XCOMP embodies distinct *c*-structure constituents that function predicatively, such that XCOMP ≡ {NP | VP | AP | PP} (and CP under Falk's (2001) view based on his account of *to*). The XCOMP clausal argument is thus the only GF which these raising verbs subcategorise for. The SUBJ's 'appearance outside the brackets' (Zaenen & Kaplan 2002: 12) represents the fact that the external argument is not selected by the predicate, i.e. ⟨XCOMP⟩SUBJ. The

[4] An anonymous reviewer questions the acceptability of this construction: 'The co-occurrence of *qis-hom* and *donn-hom* next to each other is unacceptable since one of them is redundant.' I assure the reader that this sentence is pretty acceptable for the author, with the presence of **both** the predicates *qis-* and *donn-*, although of course this chained cascade is not obligatory and indeed only one of them may be present. Furthermore, neither of them, for that matter, need be present, given that they simply reinforce the same interpretation which *deher* 'seem' itself renders in the overall structure. Data from the MLRS further support this claim (as in (a)), including data involving the reversed order of these same predicates.

(i) (MLRS; v3.0)
qis-u *donn-u* *in⟨t⟩esa*
as.though-3SGM.ACC as.though-3SGM.ACC forget.PASS.PFV.3SGM
koll-u
all-3SGM.GEN
'it's as though all has been forgotten'

Additionally I point out that redundancy at the syntactic level, which is what we have here, should not entail, or be equated to unacceptability, as is being implied by the reviewer. Redundancy can in fact be observed in several aspects of a language's grammar.

brackets are what would otherwise 'enclose the semantically selected arguments of the lexical form' (Bresnan 2001: 283). This formal distinction, i.e. between GFs within, or external to the brackets, functions as a means with which to represent whether the matrix imposes restrictions on such GFs or not.

In the absence of raising, the semantically vacuous position of the external argument is filled by dummy/expletive pronouns, since these lack a semantic PRED value (Bresnan 2001: 283). The availability of such pronouns is itself lexically specified (Kroeger 2004: 123). When raising is not available, and hence no structure-sharing is involved, the lexical entry is: ⟨COMP⟩SUBJ. This distinction at the lexical entry level is summarised as follows from Bresnan (1982: 404): 'Unlike XCOMPs, closed COMPs may undergo *It* Extraposition …' in English. The raising/non-raising ambiguity of English *seem* is in Asudeh & Toivonen (2012: 14) reduced to the following constraint in the lexical entry: (↑ SUBJ EXPLETIVE) = $_{c}$IT ∧ ¬ (↑ XCOMP) | (↑ SUBJ) = (↑ XCOMP SUBJ). This constraint states that we either have a constraining equation that requires the presence of an expletive *it* when the complement clause's function is not an XCOMP; or, in the absence of the expletive as the matrix SUBJ, equality between matrix SUBJ and XCOMP SUBJ applies.[5] With this brief introduction to the classic LFG treatment of raising, we can now proceed to characterise in more detail, raising in Maltese.

3 Raising in Maltese

In this section we first highlight the main raising predicates in the language, and then provide morphosyntactic behaviours that serve as evidence sustaining our claim that these predicates are raising predicates.

3.1 Raising predicates

The primary raising predicate in Maltese is *deher* 'appear, seem'. The data in (4), exemplified through the behaviour associated with *deher*, illustrates the array of phrasal categories that can function as a complement of *deher*: CP/VP (4a); NP (4b); AP (4c); PP (4d).

(4) a. *T-i-dher* *(li)* *miexj-a* *'l* *quddiem*
3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG COMP walk.ACT.PTCP-SGF ALL front
'She/It seems to be moving forward'

[5] Falk (2001: 137) approaches this ambiguity by positing a 'Functional Control Rule' which states that: 'If (↑XCOMP) is present in a lexical form, add the equation: (↑SUBJ|OBJ) = (↑XCOMP SUBJ). When this rule is not present, we get the non-thematic argument filled by an expletive (p. 138).

b. *Marija t-i-dher* *tifla bilgħaqal*[6]
Mary 3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG girl with.DEF.wisdom
'Mary seems to be a good girl'

c. *T-i-dher* *tajb-a*
3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG good-SGF
'She/It seems good'

d. *T-i-dher* *bil-bajda* *m-dawwr-a*
3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG with.DEF-egg.SGF PASS.PTCP-turn-SGF
Lit: She seems with the egg turned
'She seems to be grumpy (today)'

In this paper we will not delve into issues that have to do with finite raising, i.e. hyperraising, which Landau (2011) refers to as 'non-ordinary raising'. Maltese does employ finite morphological forms even in the embedded clause, apart from the predicate types just considered, which are also available in the embedded clause (as one may have already noticed in e.g. (3)). However, one should make it clear that as discussed in Sells (2006), there need not be an isomorphic relationship between morphological and syntactic finiteness. Clear, unambiguous instances of finite embedded clauses are (5), where the presence of *kont* in (5a) provides a TENSE feature with value PAST. In (5b), we then have an epistemic modal value realised syntactically. We take both these instances to suggest that the embedded complement in Maltese can map onto an IP, which is itself indicative of a finite clause. We will here say nothing more about such construction types and how they may be the same or different from non-finite raising structures. For more discussion on hyperraising in Maltese, refer to Camilleri (2017).

[6]It should be mentioned that if we had the construction in (i) instead, *hija* in this context would not be functioning as the SUBJ, but rather as the copula. This data should therefore not be confused with what has been said with respect to the ungrammaticality of (1c). Furthermore, it is clear from such a context that the XCOMP GF which maps onto a CP embeds a sentential complement (S) headed by the pronominal copula.

(i) *Marija t-i-dher* *li* *hija* *tifla bilgħaqal*
Mary 3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG COMP COP.3SGF girl with.DEF.wisdom
'Mary seems that she is a good girl'

(5) a. *N-i-dher (li) kon-t mor-t tajjeb,*
1-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG COMP be.PFV-1SG go.PFV-1SG good.SGM
id-darba l-oħr-a
DEF-once.SGF DEF-other-SGF
Lit: 'I seem that I had done well last time'
'I seem to have done well, the last time'

b. *Dehr-et (kien) kel-l-ha mnejn*
appear.PFV.3SGF be.PFV.3SGM be.PFV.3SGM-have-3SGF.GEN from.where
semgħ-et mingħand-hom, dakinhar
hear.PFV-3SGF from.at-3PL.GEN DEM.SGM.DEF-day
'She seemed she had perhaps heard from them that day'

On the basis of the overview of the analysis of SUBJ-to-SUBJ raising in LFG, presented briefly in the previous section, we provide the lexical entry associated with *deher* 'seem' that allows for the expletive and raising alternation. Following Berman (2003) we account for the default 3SGM agreement in the matrix as being itself indicative of a PREDless SUBJ analysis. Although never discussed previously, an expletive pronoun, namely *huwa*, which is equivalent in form to the long version of the 3SGM subject pronoun, alternating with the short form *hu*, could be said to exist in Maltese. In (6) it is not as controversial to assume that the pronoun *huwa* is functioning as a semantically vacuous pronoun filling in a non-thematic SUBJ position. In the data in (7), on the other hand, we find that *huwa* must have another function, and could well be some sort of clause force that provides an exclamative interpretation and sarcastic tone to this sort of construction.[7]

(6) *Huwa j-i-dher li/kemm sejr-a tajjeb!*
he.EXPL 3.M-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG COMP go.ACT.PTCP-SGF good.SGM
'It shows that she is doing well!'
'It shows how good she's going!'

(7) a. *Huwa t-i-dher kemm sejr-a tajjeb!*
he.EXPL 3F-FRM.VWL-appear.SG COMP go.ACT.PTCP-SGF good.SGM
'It is clearly showing how well she is going (sarcastic)'

[7]Parallel structures are mentioned in passing in Borg & Azzopardi-Alexander (1997: 195). For want of a better translation, I gloss *huwa* in such constructions as: he.EXPL so that it is not confused with the syncretic form *huwa* when being used referentially as the pronoun meaning 'he'.

b. *Huwa intom t-i-dhr-u li nisa,*
he.EXPL you.PL 2-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL COMP women
t-af-x!
2-know.IMPV.SG-NEG
Lit: 'It is clearly showing that you are women, don't you know'

The conflated lexical entry for *deher* is the following:

deher: I/V (↑ μ PRED VFORM) = Perfective
(↑ μ PRED VFORM POL) = POS
{(↑ PRED) = ⟨XCOMP⟩SUBJ
((↑ XCOMP COMPFORM) = LI)
(↑ SUBJ) = (↑ XCOMP SUBJ)
(↑ SUBJ PERSON) = 3
(↑ SUBJ NUM) = SG
(↑ SUBJ GEND) = M
|
(↑ PRED) = ⟨COMP⟩SUBJ
((↑ COMP COMPFORM) = LI)
{¬(↑ SUBJ PRED)
(↑ SUBJ PERSON) = 3
(↑ SUBJ NUM) = SG
(↑ SUBJ GEND) = M
|
¬(↑ SUBJ PRED)
(↑ SUBJ) = PRO
(↓PRONTYPE) = EXPLETIVE
(↓FORM) = *huwa*}}

(9) represents the SUBJ-to-SUBJ raising construction in (1b), repeated in (8) below.

(8) *It-tfal j-i-dhr-u (li) sejr-in tajjeb*
DEF-children 3-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL COMP go.ACT.PTCP-PL good
'The children seem to be doing well'

(9)
$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{PRED} & \text{‘}\textit{jidhru}\ \langle\text{XCOMP}\rangle\text{SUBJ’} \\ \text{SUBJ} & \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{PRED} & \text{‘}\textit{tfal}\text{’} \\ \text{PERS} & 3 \\ \text{NUM} & \text{PL} \\ \text{DEF} & + \end{array}\right][1] \\ \text{XCOMP} & \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{PRED} & \text{‘}\textit{sejrin}\langle\text{SUBJ}\rangle\text{’} \\ \text{SUBJ} & \left[\quad\quad\quad\right][1] \\ \text{ADJ} & \left\{\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{PRED} & \text{‘}\textit{tajjeb}\text{’} \end{array}\right]\right\} \end{array}\right] \end{array}\right]$$

The index [1] in the *f*-structure in (9) represents the functional identity between the SUBJ in the matrix and the SUBJ in the embedded clause. This dependency is therefore not achieved via movement, but rather via structure-sharing, i.e. where one and the same syntactic item takes on two distinct functions, which in this context are the matrix SUBJ and the embedded SUBJ. The Uniqueness constraint then ensures that the identical material only be overt in one position. Since (9) accounts for the forward raising present in (8), we observe how the expressed argument is in the matrix. This then controls the relation/dependency with the SUBJ in the embedded clause.

While *deher* and other raising predicates idiosyncratically display an alternation with the expletive construction, this is not necessarily the case for all raising predicates in the language. Similarly, it is neither the case that all raising predicates available in the language necessarily display the array of *c*-structure complement types listed in (4). Furthermore, the availability of a complementiser introducing the clausal complement is itself a lexical restriction imposed by the clause-taking raising predicate.[8] *Beda* ‘begin’, which has in Camilleri (2016) been shown to function as a raising predicate, along with other aspectualisers in the language, such as *qabad* lit. ‘catch, start’, *reġa’* ‘repeat’ and *qagħad* ‘fit, endure’, does not allow its embedded clause to be introduced by a complementiser. Syndetic marking is thus not allowed, as the ungrammaticality of (10a) illustrates. Nevertheless, changes in the canonical constituent order, such as the preposing of the ADJunct in (10b), results in the obligatory presence of the complementiser.

[8] See Camilleri (2016: 288-292) for additional discussion, including a reference to complementiser forms other than *li*, including *billi* and *biex*.

(10) a. **Bdie-t li t-mur*
start.PFV-3SGF COMP 3F-go.IMPV.SG
Intended: 'She started to go'

b. *Bdie-t li, kuldarba *(li) n-e-rsaq*
start.PFV-3SGF COMP every.time COMP 1-FRM.VWL-get.close.IMPV.SG
lej-ha, t-i-tlaq
towards-3SGF.GEN 3F-FRM.VWL-leave.IMPV.SG
t-i-ġri
3F-FRM.VWL-run.IMPV.SG
'She started that, every time I draw close to her, she runs away'
(Camilleri 2016: 242)

A parallel behaviour with respect to the obligatory or optional presence of the complementiser also follows for *deher*. Although *li* is optional, as in (4a), this becomes obligatory in contexts where there is a FOCUS discourse function in the embedded clause, as in (11a), or when there is a right-dislocation of the (matrix) SUBJ, as in (11b), for example, where here we observe how as a consequence, the complement clause itself becomes right-dislocated.

(11) a. *T-i-dher *(li) HI marr-et tajjeb*
3F-FRM.VWL-seem.IMPV.SG COMP she go.PFV-3SGF good.SGM
'She seems that as for her, she did well'

b. *T-i-dher, Marija, *(li) marr-et tajjeb*
3F-FRM.VWL-seem.IMPV.SG Mary COMP go.PFV-3SGF good.SGM
'As for Mary, she seems that she did well'

Apart from *deher* and aspectualiser predicates, other raising predicates in Maltese include the pseudo-verbs *qis-* and *donn-*, as discussed in Camilleri et al. (2014).[9] These two forms easily co-occur with, or substitute *deher* except in two identified contexts, as we will see. Other pseudo-verbs such as *għand-* 'have', *għodd-* 'almost', *għad-* 'still; just' and *il-* 'have', were also shown shown to display behaviours attributed to raising predicates in Camilleri (2016).[10] The set of rais-

[9] We do not here engage in a discussion on pseudo-verbs and what they are. For more information the reader can refer to Comrie (1982); Fabri (1987); Vanhove (1993); Peterson (2009); Camilleri (2016).

[10] Evidence includes agreement facts; subcategorisation-frame requirements; and other independent evidence that has to do with evidence that favours a matrix verb – complement clause analysis, as opposed to a complex predicate analysis, or an analysis where the pseudo-verbs simply come to render a feature value in the *f*-structure. Under this analysis, the lexical predicate does not function as a complement, but as the clause's head.

ing predicates which have not been described previously, are happenstance verbs. These include *inzerta* (12), *seħel* (13), *laħaq* (14) and *ħabat* (15).[11] The paradigm in (12) is made up of data from the MLRS Corpus (Gatt & Čéplö 2013). In (12a) we have a structure which can be interpreted as an *It*-Extraposition, (although one can argue that it is structurally ambiguous), while the constructions in (12b) and (12c) are SUBJ-to-SUBJ raising structures (SSR).

(12) a. *Inzerta li j-a-qa' taħt il-...*
happen/occur.PFV-3SGM COMP 3M-FRM.VWL-fall.IMPV.SG under DEF
'It happens that he falls under ... (He is managed by)' (MLRS v2.0)

b. *Inzertaj-t li ħdim-t ħafna fuq dak*
happen/occur.PFV-1SG COMP work.PFV-1SG a.lot on DEM.SGM
il-proġett u ...
DEF-project.SGM CONJ
'I happened such that I have worked a lot on that project' (MLRS v2.0)

c. *Inzertaj-t n-af xi ħud minn-hom*
happen/occur.PFV-1SG 1-know.IMPV.SG some some from-3PL.GEN
'I happened to know a few of them' (MLRS v2.0)

(13) *Ma sħel-t-x / ma seħil-x ġej-t*
NEG happen.PFV-2SG-NEG / NEG happen.PFV.3SGM-NEG come.PFV-2SG
magħ-na dakinhar, int.
with-1PL.GEN DEM.DEF.SGM.day you
'You didn't happen to have come with us that day' SSR
'It happened that you weren't with us that day' (*It*-Extraposition)

(14) *Laħq-et għaml-et lumi i-kbar, is-siġra*
achieve.PFV-3SGF do.PFV-3SGF lemons COMPAR-big, DEF-tree.SGF
Lit: 'She achieve she did bigger lemons, the tree'
'It happened that (at some point earlier in the past), the tree produced bigger lemons'

[11] Note that *ħabat* in Maltese also functions as an INCEPTIVE aspectualiser. See Camilleri (2016) for more detail.

(15) a. *Kien ħabat tajjeb li l-parlament*
be.PFV.3SGM crash.PFV.3SGM good.SGM COMP DEF-parliament.SGM
Malt-i beda j-i-ddiskuti …
Maltese-SGM start.PFV.3SGM 3M-EPENT.VWL-discuss.IMPV.SG …
'It happened well that the Maltese parliament started to discuss/started discussing …' (MLRS v2.0)

b. *għax ħbat-t qbad-t lilu*
because happen.PFV-1SG catch.PFV-1SG him
'because I happened to have caught him'

3.2 Evidence in favour of a raising analysis

Raising tests vary. Primarily, one needs to establish that a dependency exists between the matrix and the embedded clause. In instances of (forward) SSR, one needs to establish that the SUBJ is indeed present within the embedded clause, for this to then also function as the SUBJ of the matrix clause, which is where it is overtly expressed or pronominally incorporated. Additionally, one also needs to establish that the matrix SUBJ position is indeed non-thematic.

Establishing that the SUBJ of the embedded clause is still salient in the overall dependency, and that it in fact exists even though it may not be pronounced, would verify the expectation that if an embedded SUBJ is indeed available, then this should be able to reflexively bind a local direct object. This is the case in (16).

(16) *Aħna n-i-dhr-u* ***n-ħobb-u***$_i$ ***lilna nfus-na***$_i$
we 1-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL 1-love.IMPV-PL us self.PL-1PL.GEN
'We seem to love ourselves'

Another argument in support of the fact that the SUBJ is also available in the embedded clause comes from the behaviour of floating quantifiers: The quantifier *kollha* 'all.PL' can appear in the matrix or the embedded clause, as illustrated through (17).

(17) *(Kollha) j-i-dhr-u li (kollha) marr-u (kollha) flimkien*
all.PL 3-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL COMP all.PL go.PFV.3-PL all.PL together
'All appear to have gone together'

A piece of evidence that suggests that the SUBJ in the matrix *is* non-thematic, as expected of the external argument of a raising predicate, is the fact that it is possible for the SUBJ to be PREDless as a consequence of the raising of the 3SGM impersonal morphology of the embedded impersonal verb. Instances such as (18) are in principle ambiguous as to whether this sort of raising is involved, given that the raising predicates *donn-* 'as though', *seħel* 'happen' and *deher* 'appear' all allow for an alternation with the *It*-Extraposition construction.

(18) a. *Hawn donn-u/donn-ok qiegħd-a*
EXIST as.though-3SGM.ACC/as.though-2SG.ACC PROG-SGF
j-fettil-l-ek għaċ-ċikkulata
3M-decide.abruptly.IMPV.SG-DAT-2SG for.DEF-chocolate
'Here it seems/you seem to be craving for chocolate all of a sudden'

b. *Jekk seħel/sħil-t irnexxie-l-ek,*
if happen.PFV.3SGM/happen.PFV-2SG manage.PFV.3SGM-DAT-2SG
għala ma ħad-t-x iċ-ċans?
why NEG take.PFV-2SG-NEG DEF-chance
'If it/you happened to have managed, why didn't you take the chance?'

c. *J-i-dher/t-i-dher*
3M-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG/2-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG
għand-ek/kel-l-ek bżonn ftit mistrieħ
have-2SG.GEN/be.PFV.3SGM-have-2SG.GEN need a.little rest
'You seem to need/have needed some rest'

On the other hand, if we consider what takes place in the case of aspectualiser predicates such as REPETITIVE-expressing *reġa'* and INCEPTIVE-expressing *qabad* lit. 'catch' and *beda* 'start', the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (19), shows that they are not able to display an alternation with an *It*-Extraposition, i.e. they do not take an alternative non-raised structure involving a default 3SGM form.

(19) a. **J-e-rġa' n-a-għmel xi ħaġa*
3M-FRM.VWL-repeat.IMPV.SG 1-FRM.VWL-do.IMPV.SG some thing
Intended: 'I do something again'

b. **J-a-qbad/j-i-bda*
3M-FRM.VWL-catch.IMPV.SG/3M-FRM.VWL-start.IMPV.SG
n-a-għmel xi ħaġa
1-FRM.VWL-do.IMPV.SG some thing
Intended: 'I start to do something'

Due to the inability of aspectualiser predicates to alternate with the Expletive construction, the availability of the data in (20), consisting of sentences involving a number of stacked aspectualisers, clearly suggests that what is taking place is the chained raising of the default non-referential 3SGM morphology of the impersonal verb at the bottom of the dependency. We take this to imply that aspectualisers also allow for PREDless non-thematic SUBJs, at least in specific constrained contexts such as this, i.e. ones involving impersonal verb-forms in the embedded clause (and predicates with non-canonically indexed SUBJs more broadly).

(20) a. *Qorob/qrob-t* *biex*
draw.close.PFV.3SGM/draw.close.PFV-1SG in.order.to
j-e-rġa' *j-a-qbad*
3M-FRM.VWL-repeat.IMPV.SG 3M-FRM.VWL-catch.IMPV.SG
j-i-bda *j-kol-l-i* *mara*
3M-FRM.VWL-start.IMPV.SG 3M-be.IMPV.SG-have-1SG.GEN woman
t-għin-ni *fid-dar*
3F-help.IMPV.SG-1SG.ACC in.DEF-house
Lit: 'He was close/I was close in order to he repeats he starts he be to-me woman she helps me in the house'
'I am close to once again start having a woman helping me in the house' (Camilleri 2016: 294)

b. *Rama/ħasel* *qis-u* *ħabat*
arm.PFV.3SGM/wash.PFV.3SGM as.though-3SGM.ACC crash.PFV.3SGM
ħa *j-i-ftil-l-i* *għal biċċa*
PROSP 3M-EPENT.VWL-decide.abruptly.IMPV.SG-DAT-1SG for piece
ċikkulata
chocolate
Lit: 'He started as though he was on the verge of long.for.all.of.a.sudden for piece of chocolate'
'I started as though I was on the verge of craving for a piece of chocolate' (Camilleri 2016: 294)

Additional evidence in support of the non-thematic status of the matrix SUBJ comes from the free availability of idiom chunks in this position.[12]

[12]Differing behaviours will be discussed in §4 with respect to the data in (42).

(21) a. *Daqqa t'id t-i-sħel t-a-għmel*
hit.SGF of.hand 3F-FRM.VWL-happen.IMPV.SG 3F-FRM.VWL-do.IMPV.SG
il-ġid, kultant
DEF-benefit sometimes

Lit: 'A hit of hand happens it does the benefit sometimes'

'Providing help or advice does well every now and then'

b. *Naħqa ta' ħmar dehr-et (li) qatt m'hi se*
bray.SGF of donkey appear.PFV-3SGF COMP never NEG.COP.3SGF PROSP
t-i-tla' s-sema, biss, żied-u
3F-FRM.VWL-go.up.IMPV.SG DEF-sky, however add.PFV.3-PL
j-i-sfida-w, u rnexxie-l-hom.
3-EPENT.VWL-defy.IMPV-PL CONJ manage.PFV.3SGM-DAT-3PL

Lit: 'A bray of a donkey appeared that never it is going to reach the sky/heaven, but/however they increased they defy, and they managed'

'The cry of the poor or someone insignificant appeared that it was not going to reach far, however, they increased in their defiance, and they managed (to get what they wanted)'

c. *Riħ ta' siegħa deher għodd-u*
wind.SGM of hour appear.PFV.3SGM almost-3SGM.ACC
naddaf qiegħa
clean.CAUSE.PFV.3SGM trashing.floor

Lit: 'Wind of an hour appeared almost cleaned the place where wheat is scattered'

'An instant/moment can and may seem to result in more important things'

As discussed in the literature (e.g. Davies & Dubinsky 2008), if the matrix predicate is a raising one, semantic equivalence is expected, irrespective of whether the predicate in the (deepest) embedded clause is active or passive. Observe this behaviour through the constructions below.

(22) a. *Beda/baqa'* *j-i-ġbor*
start.PFV.3SGM/remain.PFV.3SGM 3M-FRM.VWL-collect.IMPV.SG
l-iltiema
DEF-orphan.PL
'He started/continued gathering the orphans' (Active)

b. *Bde-w/baqgħ-u* *j-i-n-ġabr-u*
start.PFV.3-PL/remain.PFV.3-PL 3-EPENT.VWL-PASS-gather.IMPV-PL
l-iltiema
DEF-orphan.PL
'The orphans started/continued to be gathered' Passive: (Alotaibi et al. 2013: 20)

(23) a. *T-i-dher* *donn-ha/donn-u*
3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG as.though-3SGF.ACC/as.though-3SGM.ACC
ta-t *xi* *flus* *għall-karitá*
give.PFV-3SGF some money for.DEF-charity
'She seems as though she gave some money to charity' (Active)

b. *Ʒ-i-dhr-u* *donn-hom/donn-u*
3-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL as.though-3PL.ACC/as.though-3SGM.ACC
n-għata-w *xi* *flus* *għall-karitá*
PASS-give.PFV.3-PL some money for.DEF-charity
'Some money for charity seem to have been given' (Passive)

Passivisation data also provides yet another context where idiom chunks can come to function as the matrix SUBJ, once passivisation promotes the idiom from OBJ to SUBJ position.

(24) a. *T-i-dher/donn-ha*
3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG/as.though-3SGF.ACC
daħħl-et *fellus* *f'moħħ-ha*
enter.CAUSE.PFV-3SGF chick.SGM in.brain-3SGF.GEN
Lit: 'She seems/She's as though she caused to enter a chick in her brain'
'She seems to have fixed an idea/doubt in her mind'

b. *Fellus kbir j-i-dher*
chick.SGM big.SGM 3M-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG
d-daħħal f'moħħ-ha
PASS-enter.CAUSE.PFV.3SGM in.mind-3SGF.GEN
Lit: 'A big chick appears to have been entered in her mind'
'A fixed idea seems to have got to her mind'

(25) a. *Hawn donn-u qatgħa-l-hom iż-żejża*
here as.though-3SGM.ACC cut.PFV.3SGM-DAT-3PL DEF-breast.SGF
Lit: 'Here it seems he cut on-them the breast'
'It seems that their illegal source has been cut'

b. *Hawn iż-żejża donn-ha*
here DEF-breast.SGF as.though-3SGF.ACC
n-qatgħ-et-i-l-hom
PASS-cut.PFV-3SGF-EPENT.VWL-DAT-3PL
Lit: 'Here the breast seems it has been cut on-them'
'The illegal source has been cut'

Further evidence in support of the claim that the constructions under discussion involve raising predicates comes from scoping effects and the availability of both a narrow and wide reading of a quantified SUBJ. A narrow reading would not have been available for a control/equi predicate, since the SUBJ of such predicates does not originate in the embedded clause, but is in fact a thematic argument of the matrix itself.

(26) *ħadd ma j-i-dher/qis-u*
no.one NEG 3M-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG/as.though-3SGM.ACC
j-o-qgħod hemm
3M-FRM.VWL-live.IMPV.SG there
'It seems to be the case that no one lives there'
(*seem* scopes over *no one*: Narrow Scope)
'There is no one such that he/she seems to live there'
(*no one* scopes over *seem*: Wide Scope)

Having established a number of properties that provide evidence for raising constructions, there remains another, which essentially deals with meteorological SUBJs. The availability of such SUBJs (as in (27)) uncontroversially implies a non-thematic SUBJ status.

(27) a. *Ix-xita donn-ha ma t-rid-x*
DEF-rain.SGF as.though-3SGF.ACC NEG 3F-want.IMPV.SG-NEG
t-e-hda
3F-FRM.VWL-relent.IMPV.SG
'The rain appears as though it does not want to relent'

b. *Il-kesħa t-i-dher qiegħd-a ż-żid*
DEF-cold.SGF 3F-FRM.VWL-seem.IMPV.SG PROG-SGF 3F-increase.IMPV.SG
'The cold seems to be increasing'

Such constructions appear to be the usual forward raising constructions we have been considering up till now, i.e. raising constructions where the expressed SUBJ, be it overt or an incorporated pronoun, is in the matrix. It however seems to us that backward raising also exists in Maltese, as argued in Camilleri (2016: 292), following data such as that in (28) below.

(28) a. *Baqgħ-et nieżl-a ħafna xita*
remain.PFV-3SGF down.ACT.PTCP-SGF a.lot rain.SGF
Lit: 'She remained downing the rain'
'It kept raining'

b. *Bdie-t t-a-għmel xebgħa sħana*
begin.PFV-3SGF 2-FRM.VWL-do.IMPV.SG smacking heat.SGF
Lit: 'She started she does smacking heat'
'It started being very hot' (Alotaibi et al. 2013: 19)

In both instances in (28), the phrases *ħafna xita* and *xebgħa sħana*, which are the respective SUBJs shared between the matrix aspectualiser and the lexical predicate, are not able to neutrally occur in front of the aspectualiser in the matrix, and can thus only ever surface in the embedded clause. We suggest in passing that this data may display instances of backward raising structures (Potsdam & Polinsky 2012), where only 'covert' raising to the matrix is involved. Linearly, on the other hand, the SUBJ is retained as an overt DP in the embedded clause. If our hypothesising of a backward raising analysis is on the right track, then it would account for why we are not able to get neutrally ordered pre-verbal SUBJs in (28), but yet we still get the agreement matching on the aspectualiser in the matrix. The agreement available comes about as a result of the structure-sharing of the SUBJ in the embedded clause with that in the matrix.

4 Copy raising

We consider another type of raising structure in Maltese: copy raising. Copy raising (CR) involves 'a construction in which some constituent appears in a non-thematic position with its thematic position occupied by a pronominal copy' (Potsdam & Runner 2001). In English, unlike what is the case 'in infinitival SSR, in CR, the predicate takes a tensed clause complement introduced by one of the particles *like*, *as if*, or *as though*' (Potsdam & Runner 2001: 433) which, following Maling (1983) and Heycock (1994), are prepositions. The same view is upheld in Asudeh & Toivonen (2012) and Landau (2011). Such prepositions are then assumed in Fujii (2007) to take a complement clause, given that these complements display the same conditions as the *that*-trace effect (p. 301). A CP complement analysis is motivated, and is in turn taken to imply an account where 'copy raising involves overt raising out of a finite CP' (p. 302). In Asudeh & Toivonen (2012) the *in-situ* copy pronouns are analysed just as other resumptive pronouns. As stated in Asudeh & Toivonen (2012: 325), the difference between resumptives in copy raising constructions vs. those in unbounded discourse dependency structures is that the relation between the matrix non-thematic SUBJ and the embedded copy pronoun is 'lexically-controlled', as opposed to what is the case in unbounded discourse dependencies. Illustrations of CR constructions in English are provided in (29), with the copy pronoun represented in bold.

(29) a. There seems like **there** are problems (Potsdam & Runner 2001: 454)
b. Tom seemed to me as if **he** had won (Asudeh & Toivonen 2012: 332)
c. Tom seemed like Bill hurt **him** again (Asudeh & Toivonen 2012: 346)

Apart from the presence of a pronoun in the embedded clause, and the finiteness of the clause (at least in English), another property that distinguishes raising or *it*-expletive constructions from copy raising ones is that the SUBJ in the latter must be obligatorily interpreted as a perceptual source (PSOURCE): 'a copy raising subject is interpreted as the PSOURCE – the source of perception – and ascribing the role of PSOURCE to the subject is infelicitous if the individual in question is not perceivable as the source of the report' (Asudeh & Toivonen 2012: 334). *It*-expletive and non-CR constructions allow for both an Individual or Event Psource reading. In (30) below, where we have a usual non-copy raised construction, the available Event Psource reading is made obvious by the ADJ complement involved.

(30) *Donn-hom/-u / qis-hom/-u qed*
as.though-3PL.ACC/-3SGM.ACC / as.though-3PL.ACC/-3SGM.ACC PROG
j-a-qra-w ktieb tajjeb xi kwiet hawn!
3-FRM.VWL-read.IMPV-PL book.SGM good.SGM what silence EXIST
'It's as though they are reading a good book, how quiet it is!/They're as though they're reading a good book' (Camilleri 2016: 181)

A CR structure with an obligatory PSOURCE rendering of the SUBJ is (31). 'This is infelicitous if inferred from a pile of files on the desk, but fully appropriate if she is present and looking panicky and stressed. That is, this sentence is only appropriate then if 'she' is the direct source of perception' (Camilleri et al. 2014: 193).

(31) ***T**-i-dher ġà ta-w-**ha** xebgħa*
3F-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG already give.PFV.3-PL-3SGF.ACC smacking
xogħol x'-t-a-għmel
work what.3F-FRM.VWL-do.IMPV.SG
'She seems as though they already gave her a lot of work to do' (COMP OBJ; Camilleri et al. 2014: 192)

While Maltese copy raising constructions can simply involve the 'seem; appear; as though' predicate(s) discussed so far, it is also possible to have a structure that is closer to CR constructions in English, in the presence of the (optional) preposition *bħal* 'like' or the preposition-headed complementiser *bħallikieku* 'as though', built out of the preposition *bħal* 'like', the usual complementiser *li* and the counterfactual complementiser *kieku*, as illustrated in (32).[13]

(32) *Qis-**ha** (bħal(likieku)) ta-w-**ha** xebgħa*
as.though-3SGF.ACC as.if give.PFV.3-PL-3SGF.ACC smacking
'She's as though they gave her a smacking'

[13] One could argue that *li kieku* is the full form of the counterfactual complementiser. This complementiser without the P head is not able to occur in CR constructions, as the ungrammaticality of (i) below, suggests.

(i) **It-tifla qis-ha (li) kieku ma ta-t-x kas*
DEF-girl as.though-3SGF.ACC COMP COMP NEG give.PFV-3SGF-NEG notice
Intended: 'The girl's as though she didn't bother'

In the presence of this fused grammatical form, which provides an evidential-like interpretation, it becomes possible to even drop the raising predicate itself, as in (33), for example.

(33) a. *It-tifla bħal(likieku) ma ta-t-x kas*
DEF-girl as.though NEG give.PFV-3SGF-NEG notice
'The girl's as though she did not bother'

b. ***It-tifla*** *bħal ta-w-**ha** xebgħa*
DEF-girl like give.PFV.3-PL-3SGF.ACC smacking
'The girl's as though they gave her a smacking'

CR in Maltese comes in two flavours. It is not necessarily the case that it should always include an embedded clause that maps onto a COMP GF, which is otherwise what we have when anaphoric-binding is involved. If a P like *bħal* or its fusion with the counterfactual complementiser *(li)kieku* is present, then we can argue that this is functioning as the PRED of the complement that mediates between the matrix raising predicate and the clausal COMP GF argument which the P then subcategorises for. In such an instance we would then have an analysis where *deher*$_{\text{bħal}}$ is associated with the lexical entry: ⟨XCOMP⟩SUBJ, but where the SUBJ is in an anaphorically-bound relation, which in this case would be: (↑SUBJ)σ= ((↑XCOMP COMP GF)σ Antecedent). Independent proof that suggests that *bħal* can function as a PRED that in turn subcategorises for an embedded clause comes both from examples such as (33) as well as from data such as (34), where raising is not even involved.

(34) *Ġ-i-dher bħal(likieku) marr-u weħid-hom*
3M-FRM.VWL-seem.IMPV.SG like go.PFV.3-PL alone-3PL.GEN
'It seems they went on their own' (No raising)

Additional evidence in favour of our account that *bħal* does indeed function as a PRED comes from the availability of verbless constructions such as the one in (35). The difference between (35) and (33) simply boils down to the fact that *bħal* displays a distinct subcategorisation frame in each: An OBJ argument in (35) and a complement clause in (33). (See Dalrymple & Lødrup (2000) for a discussion of such sorts of alternations in English).

(35) *It-tifla bħal-ek*
DEF-girl like-2SG.GEN
'The girl is like you'

The data in (36) illustrate a number of CR constructions with copies in different GFs within the structure.[14]

(36) a. ***T**-i-dhr-**u*** *bħallikieku xi ħadd*
2-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV-PL like.that some no.one
*qal-i-**l**-**kom** biex t-i-tilq-u*
say.PFV.3SGM-EPENT.VWL-DAT-2PL in.what 2-FRM.VWL-leave.IMPV-PL
'You appear as if someone told you to leave'
(Embedded COMP OBJ;$_\theta$ Camilleri et al. 2014: 192)

b. *Dehr-**et** qis-**ha** donn-**ha***
seem.PFV-3SGF as.though-3SGF.ACC as.though-3SGF.ACC
*għajt-u magħ-**ha***
shout.PFV.3-PL with-3SGF.GEN
'She seemed as though they shouted at her'
(Chained raising + Embedded COMP OBL OBJ; Camilleri et al. 2014: 193)

c. ***Marija** qis-ha bħal t-i-dher li*
Mary as.though-SGF.ACC as 3F-FRM.VWL-seem.IMPV.SG COMP
*żewġ-**ha** reġa' lura d-dar, x'inhi*
husband-3SGF.GEN return.PFV.SGM back DEF-house, what.COP.3SGF
ferħan-a
happy-SGF
'Mary's as though her husband returned back to the house, how happy she is'
(Embedded COMP SUBJ POSS)

(37) illustrates a CR construction with the presence of the happenstance predicate *seħel* 'happen'.

(37) *Kollha seħl-**u** qabad-**hom** in-ngħas*
all.PL happen.PFV.3-PL catch.PFV.3SGM-3PL.ACC DEF-sleepiness.SGM
'All happened to be overcome by sleepiness' (Alotaibi et al. 2013: 24)

The *f*-structure in (38) is the one associated with (36a), and illustrates an instance of a mediated CR structure, along with an anaphoric dependency between the matrix SUBJ and the XCOMP COMP OBJ$_\theta$ that is accounted for at the semantic-structure.

[14]Note that it is not possible to have a SUBJ copy in the highest embedded SUBJ. See Camilleri et al. (2014) for more detail.

(38)
$$\begin{bmatrix}
\textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textit{tidhru}\ \langle \textsc{xcomp} \rangle \textsc{subj}\text{'} \\
\textsc{subj} & \begin{bmatrix} \textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textsc{pro}\text{'} \\ \textsc{pers} & 2 \\ \textsc{num} & \textsc{pl} \end{bmatrix} [1] \\
\textsc{xcomp} & \begin{bmatrix}
\textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textit{bħal}\ \langle \textsc{subj}, \textsc{comp} \rangle\text{'} \\
\textsc{subj} & \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} [1] \\
\textsc{comp} & \begin{bmatrix}
\textsc{comp form} & \text{`}\textit{likieku}\text{'} \\
\textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textit{qal}\ \langle \textsc{subj}, \textsc{obj}_\theta, \textsc{xcomp} \rangle\text{'} \\
\textsc{subj} & \begin{bmatrix} \textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textit{ħadd}\text{'} \\ \textsc{spec} & \begin{bmatrix} \textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textit{xi}\text{'} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \\
\textsc{obj}_\theta & \begin{bmatrix} \textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textsc{pro}\text{'} \\ \textsc{pers} & 2 \\ \textsc{num} & \textsc{pl} \\ \textsc{case} & \textsc{dat} \end{bmatrix} [2] \\
\textsc{xcomp} & \begin{bmatrix} \textsc{comp form} & \text{`}\textit{biex}\text{'} \\ \textsc{pred} & \text{`}\textit{titilqu}\ \langle \textsc{subj} \rangle\text{'} \\ \textsc{subj} & \begin{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} [2] \end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}$$

Constraints on the path of the anaphoric dependency in CR constructions are present. As identified in Camilleri (2016: 179), the availability of optionally up to three 'seem/as.though/as.if' predicates simultaneously, as in (39), allow us to clearly demonstrate their existence. The ungrammaticality of (39) illustrates that it is not possible to have the matrix SUBJ being anaphorically bound with the COMP XCOMP (XCOMP) non-SUBJ GF when a local or optionally chained SUBJ-to-SUBJ raising is nested within.

(39) **Dehr-**et** donn-hom (qis-hom) qed*
appear.PFV-3SGF as.though-3PL.ACC as.though-3PL.ACC PROG
*j-kellm-u-**ha** ħażin*
3-talk.IMPV-PL-3SGF.ACC bad.SGM
Intended: 'She seemed as though they talked badly to her'

(Camilleri 2016: 179)

CR is not only available with *deher* and happenstance verbs. It is also present with aspectualiser predicates. The restriction identified in Camilleri (2016) with respect to such constructions is that for the SUBJ of aspectualisers to display anaphoric binding, the PRED value of the highest embedded clause must be either the pseudo-verb *qis-* or *donn-*. The path for the anaphoric dependency associated with aspectualiser predicates as opposed to the 'seem/appear/as.though' and 'happenstance' predicates obligatorily involves a COMP|XCOMP^{+} path, and where the PRED of the highest COMP|XCOMP must be *qis-* or *donn-*, and cannot be substituted by *deher*. Alternatively, the CR structure can be mediated through *bħal*. These facts can be compared and contrasted through the data in (40).

(40) a. **Bde-w j-i-dher qabad-hom*
start.PFV.3-PL 3M-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG catch.PFV.3SGM-3PL.ACC
in-ngħas
DEF-sleepiness.SGM
Intended: 'They started seeming as though sleepiness came on-them'

b. *It-tfal* ***bde-w*** *qis-u/-hom /*
DEF-children start.PFV.3-PL as.though-3SGM.ACC/-3PL.ACC /
donn-u/-hom dejjem qed ***j-a-sl-u***
as.though-3SGM.ACC/-3PL.ACC always PROG 3-FRM.VWL-arrive.IMPV-PL
tard
late
'The children started as though they are arriving always late' (SUBJ)

c. *Reġgħ-**et** bħal qabad-**ha** uġigħ*
repeat.PFV-3SGF as.though catch.PFV.3SGM-3SGF.ACC pain.SGM
fl-istonku
in.DEF-stomach
'She again started feeling pain in her stomach' (OBJ)

Another property associated with CR constructions, at least in English, is that idiom chunks as matrix SUBJs are not possible, as the ungrammaticality of (41) illustrates, unlike normal raising constructions (Lappin, 1984, p. 241).

(41) a. *Much headway appears as if **it** had been made on the project
b. *Advantage seems as if **it** has been taken of John

Parallel facts are also present in Maltese, except that instead of being ungrammatical, the idiomatic reading of an idiom chunk is entirely lost in CR constructions, giving way to a literal reading only, as illustrated in the data in (42), since the matrix SUBJ must itself be a PSOURCE, in such constructions.

(42) a. *Iż-żejża* *donn-ha* *qatgħ-u-**hie**-l-hom*
DEF-breast.SGF as.though-3SGF.ACC cut.PFV.3-PL-3SGF.ACC-DAT-3PL
'The breast seems as though they cut-it on-them'
(Literal interpretation)
*'The illegal source appears as though they cut-it on-them'
(*Idiomatic interpretation)

b. *Il-fellus* *j-i-dher*
DEF-chick.SGM 3M-FRM.VWL-appear.IMPV.SG
*daħħl-u-**hu**-l-ha* *f'moħħ-ha*
enter.CAUSE.PFV.3-PL-3SGM.ACC-DAT-3SGF in.mind-3SGF.GEN
'The chick seems like they put it inside her mind'
(Literal interpretation)
*'The doubt seems like they put it inside her head'
(*Idiomatic interpretation)

c. *Qalb-hom* *qis-ha* *qatgħ-u-**ha***
heart.SGF-3PL.GEN as.though-3SGF.ACC cut.PFV.3-PL-3SGF.ACC
'They seem to have cut their heart' (Literal interpretation)
*'They seem to have lost hope' (*Idiomatic interpretation)

With this we conclude our discussion on CR in Maltese, and how it is distinct from SSR.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we concentrated on raising-to-SUBJ structures in Maltese highlighting the (morpho)syntactic properties and the constraints that characterise raising and copy raising in the language. Working within the LFG framework, we analysed SSR differently from copy raising at the *f*-structure level. Broadly speaking, the former always involves functional control, while the latter will always have to resort to anaphoric binding, at some level, even if the matrix raising predicate can associate its clausal complement with an XCOMP GF, and not a COMP GF, in CR contexts, especially as a result of our discussion of what *bħal(likieku)* imparts to the structure.

In this overview of raising-to-SUBJ in Maltese we have considered various raising predicate types available in the language, whilst highlighting how their

behaviour is not necessarily homogeneous, and the different predicates themselves impose distinct (morpho)syntactic constraints. While we have left questions unanswered, such as whether Maltese does indeed have backward SUBJ raising structures, or whether raising-to-non-SUBJ constructions exist, our aim in this paper was to provide a first approximation and advance our knowledge on the broad behaviour of raising in Maltese.

Acknowledgements

The research work disclosed in this work is partially funded by the REACH HIGH Scholars Programme – Post Doctoral Grants. The grant is part-financed by the EU, Operational Programme II – Cohesion Policy 2014 - 2020 "Investigating in human capital to create more opportunities and promote the well being of society" – ESF.

References

Alotaibi, Yasir, Muhammad Alzaidi, Maris Camilleri, Shaimaa ElSadek & Louisa Sadler. 2013. Psychological predicates and verbal complementation in African. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2013 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Alsina, Alex. 2008. A Theory of Structure Sharing: Focusing on Long-Distance Dependencies and Parasitic Gaps. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2008 Conference*, 5–25. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Asudeh, Ash. 2005. Control and semantic resource sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 41. 465–511.

Asudeh, Ash & Ida Toivonen. 2006. Expletives and the syntax and semantics of copy raising. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2006 Conference*, 14–29. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Asudeh, Ash & Ida Toivonen. 2012. Copy raising and perception. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30(2). 321–380.

Berman, Judith. 2003. *Clausal syntax of German*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Binnick, Robert I. 1991. *Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Borg, Albert & Marie Azzopardi-Alexander. 1997. *Maltese (Descriptive Grammar)*. London: Routledge.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982. Control and complementation. In Joan Bresnan (ed.), *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, 282–390. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical Functional Syntax*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Bresnan, Joan, Ash Asudeh, Ida Toivonen & Stephen Wechsler. 2015. *Lexical-functional syntax*. Vol. 16. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Bresnan, Joan & Sam Mchombo. 1987. Topic, pronoun and agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63. 741–82.

Camilleri, Maris. 2014. *The stem in inflectional verbal paradigms in Maltese*. University of Surrey dissertation.

Camilleri, Maris. 2016. *Temporal and aspectual auxiliaries in Maltese*. University of Essex dissertation.

Camilleri, Maris. 2017. *Hyperraising in Maltese*. Manuscript, University of Essex. To appear in *Journal of Linguistics*.

Camilleri, Maris, Shaimaa ElSadek & Louisa Sadler. 2014. Perceptual reports in (varieties of) Arabic. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2014 Conference*, 179–199. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In Roderick Jacobs & Peter Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*, 143–160. Waltham, MA: Ginn & Company.

Comrie, Bernard. 1982. Syntactic-morphological discrepancies in Maltese sentence structure. *Communication and Cognition* 15. 281–306.

Culicover, Peter W. 2009. *Natural language syntax*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dalrymple, Mary. 2001. *Lexical functional grammar* (Syntax and Semantics). New York: Academic Press.

Dalrymple, Mary & Helge Lødrup. 2000. The grammatical functions of complement clauses. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2000 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Davies, William D & Stanley Dubinsky. 2008. *The grammar of raising and control: A course in syntactic argumentation*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Fabri, Ray. 1987. *An analysis of grammatical agreement in Maltese*. University of Düsseldorf MA thesis.

Fabri, Ray. 1993. *Kongruenz und die grammatik des Maltesischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Falk, Yehuda. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Grammar: An introduction to parallel constraint-based syntax*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Fujii, Tomohiro. 2007. Cyclic chain reduction. In Norbert Corver & Jairo Nunes (eds.), *The copy theory of movement*, 291–326. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gatt, Albert & Slavomír Čéplö. 2013. Digital corpora and other electronic resources for maltese. In. Lancaster, UK.

Heycock, Caroline. 1994. *Layers of predication*. New York: Garland.

Kaplan, Ronald M. & Joan Bresnan. 1982. Lexical-Functional Grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. In Joan Bresnan (ed.), *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, 173–281. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kibort, Anna. 2004. *Passive and passive-like constructions in English and Polish*. University of Cambridge dissertation.

Kibort, Anna. 2007. Extending the applicability of Lexical Mapping Theory. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2007 Conference*, 250–270. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kroeger, Paul. 2004. *Analyzing syntax: A Lexical-Functional approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, Idan. 2011. Predication vs aboutness in copy raising. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29(3). 779–813.

Maling, Joan. 1983. Transitive adjectives: A case of categorial reanalysis. In Frank Heby & Barry Richards (eds.), *Linguistic categories: Auxiliaries and related puzzles, volume 1*, 253–289. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Michaelis, Laura A. 1998. *Aspectual grammar and past-time reference*. New York: Routledge.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. 1975. *English aspectual verbs*. Vol. 203. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Peterson, John. 2009. "Pseudo-verbs": An analysis of non-verbal (co-)predication in Maltese. In Bernard Comrie, Ray Fabri, Elizabeth Hume, Manwel Mifsud, Thomas Stolz & Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Introducing Maltese linguistics*, 181–205. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On raising*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Potsdam, Eric & Maria Polinsky. 2012. Backward raising. *Syntax* 15(1). 75–108.

Potsdam, Eric & Jeffrey T Runner. 2001. Richard Returns: Copy Raising and Its Implications. In *Papers from the 37th Chicago Linguistic Society, Main Session*, vol. 1. Chicago, Ill: CLS.

Rosenbaum, Peter. 1967. *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Sells, Peter. 2006. Using subsumption rather than equality in functional control. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2006 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Stiebels, Barbara. 2007. Towards a typology of complement control. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 47. 1–80.

Vanhove, Martine. 1993. *La langue maltaise: Etudes syntaxiques d'un dialecte arabe "périphérique"*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zaenen, Annie & Ronald M. Kaplan. 2002. Subsumption and equality: German partial fronting in LFG. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2002 Conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.