
Italian and Arbëresh (Albanian) causatives: Case and Agree

M. Rita Manzini
University of Florence
mariarita.manzini@unifi.it

Anna Roussou
University of Patras
aroussou@upatras.gr



Received: 14-03-2023
Accepted: 25-10-2023
Published: 01-03-2024

How to cite: Manzini, M. Rita, & Anna Roussou. 2024. Italian and Arbëresh (Albanian) causatives: Case and Agree In *New perspectives on the syntax of causative and restructuring verbs in Romance*, eds. Jan Casalicchio & Peter Herbeck. Special issue of *Isogloss. Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 10(4)/4, 1–34.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.310>

Abstract

Causative verbs in the Albanian variety of Arbëresh take a finite complement clause, with the causee realized as a nominative or as an oblique (like the dative/instrumental causee in Italian). We argue that causatives are biclausal and that their complement is non-phasal, of different sizes (e.g., vP in Italian and IP/CP in Arbëresh). Being non-phasal, it is transparent to ϕ -Agree with the matrix v*. The non-phasal vP-complement in Italian triggers an ergative alignment, with the causee realized as an oblique in transitives (or accusative with intransitives/unaccusatives). This option is also available in Arbëresh under contact with Italian, although with a finite complement. The option of a nominative causee in Arbëresh is directly accounted for as ϕ -Agree with the embedded I. Standard Albanian (and Greek) have an accusative causee, as in

English. Given that the embedded I is finite in Albanian, ϕ -Agree with matrix v^* is an instance of hyper-raising. We argue that this option is linked to the null-subject property of Albanian. Finite I is ‘strong enough’ to label by itself (Chomsky 2015), freeing the DP to enter Agree with a higher ϕ -probe.

Keywords: Agree, ergative alignment, Form Copy, hyper-raising, phase.

1. Introduction: Arbëresh in the Romance and Balkan context

Arbëresh varieties of Albanian, spoken in contact with Italian,¹ have a Romance-like Case alignment in causatives, while still maintaining finite complementation. In the example in (1) (variety of Vena di Maida, from Manzini and Savoia 2007), three realizations of the embedded subject (the causee) are seen to alternate, apparently freely: a nominative subject, as expected in a finite sentence, or a dative subject, or a *by* phrase. The latter two represent the possible realizations of the (transitive) causee in Romance languages, e.g., Italian (2).

(1) Causatives in Arbëresh (Vena di Maida)

subj – make – finite verb – acc object – nom / dat / by-phrase
 u bërë tə piçə krumišt-inə buʃtr-i / buʃtr-itə / ŋga buʃtr-i
 I made.1SG PRT drank.3SG milk-ACC dog-NOM dog-DAT by dog-NOM
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk.’

¹ Arbëresh is spoken mainly in Calabria, though some communities are found in neighboring regions, numbering around 100.000 residents overall. Depending on the community, between 10% and 60% of the population speaks Arbëresh, within a situation of extended bilingualism ([www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/comunita-albanese_\(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/comunita-albanese_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/)). In the Arbëresh examples, we use morpheme-by-morpheme glosses only to a limited extent, essentially to mark Case and agreement. We follow the Leipzig conventions, with some additions, namely PRT = (subjunctive) particle, MP = middle-passive.

Our reviewers mention Romanian and Italo-Romance varieties with subjunctive particles as languages that we should also consider. Space limitations and the theoretical (rather than descriptive) focus of the contribution prevent us from addressing these languages. For a description and analysis of Eastern Romance in comparison with Albanian and Italo-Romance see Manzini and Savoia (2018) and references quoted there.

Crucially, contact in this article refers to patterns that arise under bilingualism, and not to some generic areal Sprachbund. One reviewer seems to take Griko as a ‘contact language for Arbëresh’; hardly so, since they are spoken by two different groups of speakers, in the Salento area (Ledgeway et al. 2018: 96) and in the area mentioned above. The same holds for ‘Grecanico’, spoken in the Aspromonte area, residually (Ledgeway et al 2018: 96).

‘Calabrese’, by which the reviewer presumably means Italo-Romance varieties of Calabria, are indeed in-contact languages. However, Manzini and Savoia (2018: 307) warn the reader that “some of the correspondences between Albanian and Romance varieties in Arbëresh areas are not due to the specific contact between them. For example, the absence of the infinitive and the use of subordinate sentences introduced by a particle ... is a general Balkan feature, shared by Romance varieties of the extreme South of Italy” – in other words, these are in fact areal Sprachbund characters.

(2) Causatives in Italian

make – *infinitive* – *acc object* – *dat* / *by-phrase* / **nom subj*
 Feci bere il latte al cane / dal cane / *il cane.
 made.1SG drink.INF the milk to.the dog by.the dog the dog
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk’

The theoretical significance of the Arbëresh data for models of generative grammar has been perceived early on, by Savoia (1989a, b) who first published the data, Brandi and Savoia (1990), and Guasti (1993). Specifically, within the Government and Binding (GB) framework, the theoretical question concerns government and Case assignment on the causee argument. Studies of causatives in Romance account for the Case of the causee in terms of movement of the embedded VP (Kayne 1975, Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980) and/or incorporation of the embedded V into the causative verb (Baker 1988). Early theories of Arbëresh are characterized by the attempt to apply the same kind of solutions to data like (1).

More or less at the same time, standard Balkan causatives are also considered in the generative literature, as in Greek for example (cf. Iatridou 1993). Standard Greek causatives take the form in (3a), where the causee is accusative. Turano and Rrokaj (1998) and Turano (2015: 139ff.) document standard Albanian causatives taking the same form as the Greek ones, as in (3b). This is also similar to English, where a process of raising-to-object (Postal 1974) or Exceptional Case Marking (ECM, Chomsky 1981) is assumed to be responsible for the accusative Case seen on the embedded subject, for instance in (4).

(3) a. Greek

Evala ton Kosta na tighanisi psaria
 made.1SG the Kostas.ACC PRT fry.3SG fishes.ACC
 ‘I put (made) Kostas fry fish.’

b. Albanian

Unë e bëra të pinte qumësht-in qen-in
 I it.ACC made.1SG PRT drank.3SG milk.ACC dog.ACC
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk.’

(4) I made him fry fish

In English (4), raising-to-object/ECM is made possible and necessary by the fact that the embedded subject cannot be assigned nominative by the infinitival verb. But what prevents nominative Case assignment to the causee in Greek or Albanian (3) and makes accusative necessary, despite the finiteness of the embedded I? Using a terminology inaugurated by Ura (1994), causatives in standard Greek and Albanian instantiate hyper-raising, i.e., raising (to object) out of a finite clause. Alternatively, if the causee remains in situ, as it most obviously does in (3b), hyper-Agree is instantiated (Long Distance Agree in the terms of Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2021). The same languages also display hyper-raising to subject, see Greek (5a). Turano (2018) casts doubts on the existence of hyper-raising with matrix ‘seem’ in Albanian. Manzini and Savoia (2007) on the other hand, point out that progressive periphrases with matrix ‘be’ involve a subjunctive complement, e.g. (5b) from

Arbëresh (Civita variety), pointing to the application of hyper-raising/Agree, if the structure is biclausal, as it seems to be.²

- (5) a. Greek
 Ta pedhja fenonde na aghapun tin Maria
 the children seem.3PL PRT love.3PL the Maria
 ‘The children seem to love Maria.’
- b. Arbëresh (Manzini and Savoia 2007: 316)
 jan t ε bëjin
 be.3PL PRT it do.3PL
 ‘They are doing it.’

In short, the problems posed by Arbëresh causatives in (1) connect, on the one hand, to those posed by Romance causatives and specifically by their oblique causees, and on the other hand, to those posed by finite raising (to object or to subject) in Balkan languages. Importantly, though our discussion of causatives will focus on the classical Arbëresh data in (1), similar data displaying convergence with Italian have recently been published for Italiot Greek varieties by Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri (2018, 2020), see for instance (6) (note that ‘dative’ is morphologically expressed as genitive) from Gallicianò (Calabria).³

- (6) Italiot Greek, Ledgeway *et al.* (2018: 166)
make – *finite verb* – *acc object* – *nom/ dat subj*
 Êcama na tragudí enan tragudi o/tu Giorgio
 made.1sg PRT sing.3SG a song NOM/GEN Giorgio
 ‘I made Giorgio sing a song.’

The organization of this article reflects the multifaceted nature of the issues at hand. In section 2, we present an approach to Romance causatives, in section 3 we

² Another correlate of hyper-raising in Balkan languages is finite control, i.e., control into finite clauses. Control is connected to raising in movement theories of control (Hornstein 1999) and also in the recent Form Copy (FC) theory of Chomsky (2021), where control and raising are essentially two interpretations of otherwise similar FC sequences (cf. also Manzini and Roussou 2000). We leave control aside here.

³ A reviewer takes Ledgeway *et al.* (2018: 114, 117) to exemplify sentences of the form *fare* ‘make’ + *che* ‘that’ + *finite IP* in Italian. But Ledgeway *et al.* only use these forms as headers of tables. They are not present in the text as Italian examples. An informal search of standard dictionaries confirms the judgement of the Italian author (Manzini) that causative *fare* is restricted to infinitival complements and the only attestation of finite complements is with *fare sì che* ‘do in such a way that’ (e.g. <https://www.treccani.it/vocabolario>); this judgement is also confirmed by one of the editors. In other words, in normative and spoken Italian the judgement in (i) holds.

- (i) Italian
 Lucia fa *(sì) che andiamo.
 Lucia does so that go.1PL

What is more, the meaning of (i) is closer to ‘enable’ than to ‘make’. Since this does not give rise to a causative reading, it’s irrelevant to the present discussion.

address standard Balkan causatives (hyper-raising/Agree), as well as the issue of contact. We mainly discuss Albanian varieties, which allow a range of patterns regarding the realization of the causee as nominative or accusative or oblique. This variation has important implications for language contact as well as for theories of parametric variation. Section 4 concludes the discussion.

2. Romance causatives

2.1. Basic evidence and previous literature

We focus on Italian data (Burzio 1986, Guasti 2017), but the core facts reported in this section are the same in French (Kayne 1975, Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980 a. o.) and Spanish (e.g., Tubino Blanco 2010), with the exceptions noted in fn. 5 and 6.⁴ The causative verb *fare* ‘make’ embeds an infinitival complement characterized by impoverished functional structure. Complementizers are absent throughout the examples in (7)-(10). No nominative case is assigned to the embedded subject (deficient I), which turns up as an accusative if the embedded verb is intransitive in (7), or as a PP if the embedded verb is transitive in (8). In this second instance the PP can be either a *to* phrase (so called *Faire Infinitive*, FI), or a *by* phrase (so called *Faire Par*, FP).

- (7) Italian
- a. Feci correre / partire Gianni.
made.1SG run.INF leave.INF Gianni
‘I made Gianni run/leave.’
- b. Lo feci correre / partire.
him made.1SG run.INF leave.INF
‘I made him run/leave.’
- (8) a. Feci pulire la stanza a / da Gianni.
made.1SG clean.INF the room to by Gianni
‘I made Gianni clean the room.’
- b. Gli feci pulire la stanza.
to.him made.1SG clean.INF the room
‘I made him clean the room.’

Further cues as to the impoverished structure of causative complements come from the fact that a number of functional elements are excluded from the embedded infinitival, as Guasti (1993, 2017) especially emphasizes. These include pronominal clitics, which must climb to the matrix causative verb, as in (9).⁵ Furthermore the

⁴ A reviewer objects to this generalization. It seems to us that in an internalist perspective, the crucial reason to study variation is precisely to be able to converge on statements as to the limits of this variation – which are therefore an integral part of an accurate description of the evidence.

⁵ Some variation is observed in the Romance languages with respect to clitic climbing. Most clearly, Spanish and French present the *se* clitic on the embedded verb when its antecedent is the causee. Italian disallows even this instance of low cliticization.

negation and ‘have/be’ auxiliaries are also excluded from the embedded predicates of causatives, as in (10). The latter are also excluded in English, cf. the translation of (10).

- (9) a. Lo faccio comprare a / da Gianni.
it make.1SG buy.INF to by Gianni
‘I make Gianni buy it.’
b. *Faccio comprarlo a / da Gianni.
make.1SG buy.INF-it to by Gianni
‘I make Gianni buy it.’
- (10) a. *Faccio non correre / partire Gianni.
make.1SG not run.INF leave.INF Gianni
‘*I make Gianni not run/leave.’
b. *Faccio esser pulita la stanza da Gianni.
make.1SG be cleaned the room by Gianni
‘*I make the room be cleaned by Gianni.’

The lack of complementizers, of embedded Agree/nominative case and of embedded cliticization (in I) points to the absence or deficiency of the embedded C-I phase. More strikingly, causatives allow long passivization, namely movement from the embedded object position to the subject position of the causative verb, as shown in (11a) with a periphrastic passive and in (11b) with a *si*-passive (or middle-passive).⁶ This seems to point to the absence of an embedded v^* phase as well. Here and throughout, we use a standard minimalist notation, differentiating v (a defective phase head) and v^* (a phase head proper).⁷

- (11) a. Feci pulire la stanza a/da Gianni.
made.1SG clean.INF the room to/by Gianni
‘I made Gianni clean the room.’
b. Le stanze si fanno pulire a/da Gianni.
the rooms MP make.3PL clean.INF to/by Gianni
‘One makes Gianni clean the rooms.’
c. Gianni fu fatto correre/venire.
Gianni was made run.INF/leave.INF
‘Gianni was made to run/to come.’

Most current analyses of Romance causatives belong to one of two major

⁶ French needs to be set apart here, in that all passives of causatives are reported to be ungrammatical, including passivization of the accusative causee (Kayne 1975, Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980, Sheehan 2020). There is overall consistency between the Italian and Spanish data (e.g., Tubino Blanco 2010: 335-336). Folli and Harley (2007: 226-227) explicitly exclude passivization of the accusative subject of unergatives embedded under *make*, using random Google searches for *fare-V_{unerg}* as supporting evidence. Replicating the method used by Folli and Harley, we found several hits for instance for *far correre* ‘make run’ (atelic).

⁷ (Non-defective) phase heads are involved in Transfer to the interfaces. Merge of phase head X triggers Transfer of the complement of the next (non-defective) phase head down, yielding the PIC (more on this in section 3).

schools of thought. One school of thought holds that Romance causatives are biclausal and involve movement of the embedded VP either to the embedded sentential node (Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980) or to the matrix VP (Burzio 1986), eventually followed by V incorporation (Baker 1988). In GB terms, after VP movement, the matrix causative verb governs the embedded object causing transparency to cliticization and movement. A recent version of this analysis is provided by Belletti (2020), who constructs the VP movement occurring in the derivation of causatives as a type of a smuggling operation. Smuggling was originally introduced for movement of VP to Pass(ive) Voice as a step towards passivization (Collins 2005). For Belletti, similarly, causativization involves movement of the embedded VP to a matrix Caus(ative) Voice. In her analysis, the notion of locality is defined by Minimality. Following smuggling, the embedded object no longer finds the embedded external argument on its path and that triggers transparency effects like long cliticization and passive.

The main alternative to VP-movement analyses of Romance causatives is monoclausal analyses, under which the causative verb *fare* ‘make’ is a functional head *v*. Therefore, there is a single lexical verb, namely the embedded verb, and a single argument structure – as well as a single set of sentential functional categories. This type of analysis is predominant in the minimalist framework, starting at least with Wurmbrand (2001) and is developed in considerable detail by Folli and Harley (2007), followed by Tubino Blanco (2010), Sheehan (2020) and others. Since in monoclausal analyses a single sentential domain is involved, transparency issues (passive, clitic climbing) are automatically resolved.

A detailed discussion of the literature on Romance causatives is beyond the scope of the present article (see Guasti 2017 for a review). However, the Arbëresh (or Italiot Greek) evidence briefly mentioned in section 1 obviously creates problems for both approaches quoted. Let us first consider the VP movement analysis, as it would apply to (1a), reproduced below in (12). The embedded finite verb implies an IP constituent. What is more, a long and complex literature positions the so-called subjunctive particle (*tə*) no lower than I and possibly as high as a low C (Dobrovie Sorin 1994, Hill 2013 for Romanian, Roussou 2000 for Greek, Manzini and Savoia 2007, 2018 for Albanian/Arbëresh). The VP-movement analysis does not work in (12), at least not immediately, because the constituent adjacent to the causative verb, being headed by *tə* or by the finite embedded verb, is at least an IP. Crucially, this IP constituent cannot exclude the external argument; so that movement cannot be motivated by smuggling (*contra* Belletti 2020).

- (12) u bərə tə piə krumiʃt-inə buʃtr-i / buʃtr-itə / ŋga buʃtr-i (Arbëresh)
 I made PRT drank.3SG milk-ACC dog-NOM dog-DAT by dog-NOM
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk.’

Consider then possible monoclausal analyses of (12). Ledgeway *et al.* (forthcoming) do in fact suggest such an analysis for Italiot Greek in (6). Their proposal implies that the position of the subjunctive particle (*tə*) in (12) is at the edge of *vP*, contrary to what is assumed by the Balkan literature (see immediately above (12)). Independently of the position of the particle, the problem arises that two inflected verbs cooccur in what should be the same sentence. To our knowledge, the possibility of a monoclausal analysis is entertained only within cartographic models of the type proposed by Cinque (2006, 2018). The work of Ledgeway and his

colleagues on Italiot Greek causatives is quite recent, but a long running discussion in the literature involves progressive and motion Doubly Inflected Constructions (DICs) in South Italo-Romance. In the relevant literature (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2003, Ledgeway 2016) the claim is that the lower lexical verb picks up the sole I of the sentence while the functional verb is higher than I and merely displays a “parasitic” inflection.⁸ It is quite difficult to see how one would transfer such assumptions to the causative construction (*pace* Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri). Although motion or progressive specifications may be high enough in Cinque hierarchies, the causative verb is *v* according to Folli and Harley (2007) and related literature.

In short, Romance causatives present evident theoretical challenges, which have been met in more than one way in generative frameworks. In the GB framework the dominant approach has been in terms of VP movement (and incorporation), while in minimalist/cartographic approaches a monoclausal approach has become preeminent (see references below (11)). Both approaches meet problems when one attempts to transfer them from Romance causatives to the Romance-like causatives of Italo-Albanian and Italiot Greek dialects.

2.2. Analysis

In the previous section we argued that VP-movement and monoclausal approaches to Romance causatives are challenged by the presence of similar phenomena in infinitive-less Balkan varieties. In this section we propose an alternative account for Romance data which does not have recourse either to VP movement or to a functional status for the causative verb. We come back to how such an analysis applies to Balkan/Romance contact in section 3.

Approaches to Romance causatives alternative (or complementary) to those already mentioned have never reached their systematicity or influential status. Specifically, reduced complementation structures have also been proposed, taking ‘make’ to be a lexical verb, that nevertheless embeds a VP (or rather a *vP* in current terms) rather than a sentence (IP or CP). Burzio (1986), Folli and Harley (2007) propose that the causative verb embeds a VP in FP. As far as we can tell, only Manzini (1983), proposes structures like (13) for both FI and FP, where the lexical verb ‘make’ takes a VP complement inclusive of the external argument (hence a *vP*).

(13) ... [_{VP} feci [_{vP} [_{VP} pulire la stanza] a/da Gianni] cf. (8a)

Manzini (2022), adopting pretty much the structure in (13), goes on to argue that the special Case array of causatives (both FI and FP) is an ergative alignment, as first

⁸ For instance, in (i) *mmandʒu* ‘I eat’ would be the verb in I, and *vaju* ‘I go’ a higher functional node with parasitic inflection. The role of *a* ‘to’ remains unclear in this analysis.

(i) *vaju* *a* *mmandʒu* (Sicilian; Calascibetta)
go.1SG to eat.1SG
‘I am going to eat.’

General criticisms concerning the cartographic framework and specific criticisms to the treatment of DICs, as well as an alternative biclausal analysis, are presented by Manzini and Lorusso (2022); see also Bidese and Manzini (2022) on progressives.

suggested by Postal (1977: 341). Ergative alignment and reduced clause size are related in many formal approaches to ergativity, as are ergatives and passives (e.g., Hale 1970, Bittner and Hale 1996, Laka 2006, Mahajan 2017). Below, we take the crucial connection between ergatives, passives and complements of causative verbs to simply be lack of a phasal v^* .⁹

In standard minimalist terms, Case is a reflex of Agree (Chomsky 2001).¹⁰ For instance, in the simple English transitive sentence in (14), the internal argument enters Agree (i.e., ϕ -feature matching) with phasal v^* , while the external argument enters Agree with I, as indicated below. Nominative corresponds to Agree with I and accusative to Agree with v^* .

- (14) a. He loves her.
 b. [IP I [v^* P he v^* [VP loves her]]]

The English causative Case pattern in (4) (repeated as (15) below) is unproblematic within this schema. The embedded infinitival I is not a ϕ -feature probe, so the embedded external argument cannot Agree with I and be associated with Case. Assuming that the infinitival C is not a phase head (or is altogether absent, hence the CP/IP notation below), the embedded subject is rescued by Agree with the matrix v^* , resulting in accusative Case.

- (15) a. I made him fry fish.
 b. ... [v^* [VP made [CP/IP I [v^* P him v^* [VP fry fish]]]]]

In short, in accusative languages like English, objects of transitives are singled out by accusative Case and other non-oblique arguments are nominative. In ergative languages, on the other hand, external arguments of transitives are singled out by ergative case, cf. Punjabi *kurĩāne* ‘the girls’ in (16a), while internal arguments of transitives, cf. *dərvaddza* ‘the door’ in (16a), are nominative (also called absolutive). Nominative/absolutive is also the case of the sole argument of intransitives (or at least unaccusatives), e.g., *muṇḍe* ‘the boys’ in (16b).¹¹

⁹ The parallelism between causatives and passives is also present in Belletti’s (2020) VP movement/smuggling analysis. Likewise, the extremely impoverished nature of the embedded structure in (13), i.e., v P, is a point of convergence between present assumptions and the monoclausal analysis. However, lack of v P movement is an irreducible difference between the present analysis and smuggling analyses. Furthermore, the lexical (not functional) nature of the verb *fare* differentiates us from monoclausality. As briefly reviewed in section 1, these differences are crucial when accounting for Romance-Balkan contact.

¹⁰ Alternative theories of Case are also entertained in the generative literature, with crucial consequences for the treatment of ergativity. See Baker (2015) and references quoted there for a critical stance on the Agree theory of Case and an endorsement of the dependent theory of Case (more on this below in section 3).

¹¹ Indo-Aryan languages are split ergative languages, where only perfects display the ergative alignment. Furthermore, they have a so-called active alignment, rather than an ergative one *stricto sensu*; this means that unergative verbs are systematically treated as concealed transitives, rather than as intransitives – namely their (external) argument is ergative rather than nominative (and the verb has default agreement). These are all well-known facts and important in their own right, but essentially irrelevant for present purposes.

(16) Punjabi, Manzini, Savoia and Franco (2015: 300, 303)

- a. *kuṛĩã-ne dərɤvaddʒ-a kolt-a a*
 girls-ERG door-M.SG open.PRF-M.SG be.PRS
 ‘The girls opened the door.’
- b. *muŋɖe depp-e*
 boys fall.PRF-M.PL
 ‘The boys fell.’

From a purely descriptive point of view, it is evident why Postal (1977) would have suggested that Romance causatives display an ergative pattern. The subject of intransitives (7) (S) and the object of transitives (9a) (O) display the same Case when embedded under *fare*, namely accusative. Vice versa, the agent of transitives (A) displays a special oblique Case (‘ergative’), realized in Romance as a possessor (*a* DP) or as an instrumental (*da* DP), as in (8). In turn, Palancar (2008: 7-8 *passim*) points out that “instrument is by far the most common semantic category found in ergative syncretisms”. Furthermore, “possessor is another semantic category that ergative markers also express crosslinguistically”; in some languages “the ergative case has been treated as an ‘oblique’ marker ... they may even express a dative participant”. In short, though ergative may be a specialized case (e.g., Punjabi *-ne* in (16)), it is as often or more often syncretic, with instrumental (the case of instrument and causer) and with dative (goal, possessor) – namely the cases of Romance causees.

For the sake of the argument let us run the derivation of (16), assuming that the crucial property of ergative alignments is the presence of a non-phasal *v* (as in passives). Consider transitive verbs first. The defective *v* phase head is not a ϕ -feature probe, and it does not enter Agree with the internal argument.¹² Rather, the internal argument is probed by I and enters Agree with it, so that it is realized as nominative (absolutive), i.e., the I Case. The external argument is rescued by embedding under an oblique Case or postposition, namely ergative *-ne*, as shown in (17a). In intransitive (unaccusative) sentences, the sole argument of the intransitive is probed by I, enters Agree with it, and surfaces as nominative (absolutive), as in (17b). In essence this is also the derivation provided by Mahajan (2017) for Hindi.

- (17) a. [IP [VP *kuṛĩã-ne* [VP *dərɤvaddʒ-a kolt-a*] *v*] *a*]
 b. [IP [VP [VP *muŋɖe depp-e*] *v*] *I*]

Following Manzini (2022), the case array of Italian causatives in (7)-(9) can be

¹² A reviewer correctly points out that if *v* does not enter Agree with the internal argument, we do not expect morphological agreement between the participle and the internal argument. The same objection holds of agreement of the passive participle with the internal argument in Italian (or French). In other words, non-alignment of Case and agreement patterns is not a problem specific to the present analysis but a general problem of the Agree theory of Case (Baker 2015), requiring an integrated approach which cannot be provided here. Hyper-raising is an instance of the reverse problem. For instance, in (5) there is overt agreement between the embedded I and the embedded subject, and no nominative Case assigned; more on this in section 3.

derived simply by assuming that the complements of causative verbs are *v*Ps headed by a non-phasal *v*, as in (13). Similarly, in (17) we have derived the case array of Punjabi by assuming the non-phasal nature of the perfect *v*. Consider first causatives embedding transitive verbs, as in (8a), repeated in (18) for ease of reference. The relevant structure is as in (18b). Since the *v*P embedded under the causative verb is non-phasal, the embedded object *la stanza* ‘the room’ is probed directly by the matrix *v**, it enters Agree with it and is therefore accusative (the *v* case). The external argument follows the fate of external arguments in ergative alignments, namely it is turned into an oblique, hence in Italian into a PP, either a dative/possessor PP (*a Gianni*) or an instrumental/causer PP (*da Gianni*).¹³

(18) Italian

- a. Feci pulire la stanza a/da Gianni
 made.1SG clean.INF the room to/by Gianni
 ‘I made Gianni clean the room.’
- b. [_{VP} *v**[_{VP} feci [_{VP} [_{VP} pulire la stanza] a/da Gianni]]]

The same approach also predicts the facts for embedded intransitive verbs in (7), repeated in (19a) for ease of reference. The structure for the embedded unaccusative *venire* ‘come’ is as in (19b). In the absence of any locality obstacles (Minimality or the Phase Impenetrability Condition, PIC), the matrix *v** probe enters Agree with the embedded internal argument *Gianni*, which is therefore accusative (the *v* Case). In (19c), the embedded verb is unergative and *Gianni* is therefore an external argument. It is nevertheless probed by the matrix *v**, it Agrees with it and displays accusative (the *v* Case).¹⁴

¹³ Chomsky (1986) treats oblique Case as inherent Case, i.e., Case defined by a thematic configuration. However, some oblique cases/PPs are clearly structural, in the sense that they depend on purely structural configurations. The typical example is genitive (cf. *of*-insertion in Chomsky 1981). We view causee PPs as structural obliques, and ergative subjects as well (*pace* Woolford 1997 among others, taking the latter to be inherent obliques).

A reviewer considers the oblique status of ergative case disputable. Hardly any dispute is possible at the morphological level. Technically, the specialized ergative *-ne* of Indo-Aryan is a postposition (selecting for an oblique inflected DP) – and see the text below (16) for syncretisms. Syntactically, the reviewer has a point, to the extent that the dependent theory of Case treats ergative as parallel to the accusative of accusative alignments as they both are the dependent cases of their respective systems. A comparison of the Agree and the dependent theory of Case is beyond the scope of the present article; see also section 3.

¹⁴ A reviewer enquires about the word order within the complement of the causative verb in (19c) or in (22c) below. It seems that the reviewer favors the analysis of causatives via movement, namely that *v*P fronting is required to yield the correct postverbal order of the subject. Here we embrace the framework of Chomsky (2013), where word order is determined as part of the Externalization procedure (EXT); see Chomsky (2021, to appear) for recent statements as to the theoretical costs associated with enforcing word order in the syntax. The Linearization algorithm needs a more precise formulation but for a head-initial language it seems to amount to heads to the left and phrases to the right. The exception is the ‘left periphery’ on which Chomsky (to appear) has this to say: “SPEC is to the left. Note that there is no hierarchical reason for this. The {SPEC, INFLP} structure is symmetric... a broad

- (19) a. Feci correre/venire Gianni
 made.1SG run.INF/come.INF Gianni
 ‘I made Gianni run/come.’
- b. [_{VP} v* [_{VP} feci [_{VP} [_{VP} venire Gianni]]]]
- c. [_{VP} v* [_{VP} feci [_{VP} [_{VP} correre] Gianni]]]]

Let us sum up so far. VP movement or a monoclausal structure are not necessary to account for the case array of Romance causatives. The latter follows from the reduced nature of the causative complement, i.e., a non-phasal vP, the lack of an embedded accusative case and the result of potential violations of the Case Filter by the obliquization of the external argument of transitives. The same kind of structural configuration can surface in extremely varied circumstances, which are unified by it, though traditional labels for the configurations vary misleadingly. For instance, in Indo-Aryan languages, like Punjabi in (16), there is an aspectually determined switch triggering non-phasal v in the perfect; this is termed ergativity (a typological property of a language, though sometimes aspect-based). In English, as in Italian, the alternation between a phasal v* and a defective v characterizes voice alternations with transitive verbs; the result is again the promotion of the internal argument to IP and the oblique embedding of the external argument, in what is now called a passive (a type of voice).

Still, the same transitive construction, characterized by a defective v, seems to be lexically selected when embedded under a causative verb. We then reasonably expect that the same case alignment should show up in other lexically determined contexts. This is indeed what we find. It is well known that oblique *a*-subjects are forced by certain lexical classes, the most famous of which are experiencer verbs. Thus, *John likes apples* can perfectly well be construed with a straight accusative syntax, as in English, but is construed with an unaccusative syntax and a so-called quirky subject in many languages including Italian (20a). Note that oblique subjects are not necessarily connected to experiencer verbs only; another domain where they are found is that of verbs of necessity, as in Italian (20b). Again, English constructs the predicate *to need* with a straightforward accusative syntax, as we of course expect it to be possible.

- (20) a. A Gianni piacciono le mele
 to Gianni like-3PL the apples
 ‘Gianni likes apples.’
- b. A Gianni necessitano dei permessi
 to Gianni need-3PL some permits
 ‘Gianni needs some permits.’

2.3. Some basic predictions

The derivations in (18)-(19) depend on the assumption that the complement of the

linearization principle, then, could be that all the non-theta elements, not just those of the clause, are to the left”.

causative verb is a vP, transparent to the ϕ -feature probe of the matrix v^* . If passivization applies to the matrix verb, then the matrix phase head v is itself defective. The result is that we predict transparency all the way from the embedded object to the matrix subject, in other words long passive, from the embedded object to the matrix subject. As one may expect, the embedded subject (the causee) can also be passivized, with both unergative and unaccusative verbs. The relevant data in (11) are repeated in (21).¹⁵

- (21) a. La stanza fu fatta pulire (a/da Gianni)
 The room was made clean.INF to/by Gianni
 ‘One made Gianni clean the room.’
 b. Gianni fu fatto correre/venire
 Gianni was made run.INF/come.INF
 ‘Gianni was made to run/come.’

The derivations for (21) are given in (22). In (22a) it can be seen that in the absence of any intervening phases (or goals) the matrix I probes directly for the embedded internal argument, licensing nominative case on it (with possible subsequent movement to matrix subject position). Long passivization of the subject of an embedded intransitive embedded predicate is similarly derived, as shown in (22b) for unaccusatives and in (22c) for unergatives.

- (22) a. [IP I [TP fu [vP fatta [vP [VP pulire la stanza] (a/da Gianni)]]]]
 b. [IP I [TP fu [vP fatto [vP [VP venire Gianni]]]]]
 c. [IP I [TP fu [vP fatto [vP [VP correre] Gianni]]]]]

We conclude that passivization is derived on the basis of the same assumptions as case alignment; there is again no need for VP movement or monoclausality. The other fundamental fact that a theory of Romance causatives must derive is clitic climbing. Not only is it possible for clitics lexicalizing arguments of the embedded verb to surface on the matrix causative verb it is also obligatory. This holds for the embedded subject of transitives (8b), repeated as (23a), for the sole argument of intransitives as in (7b), repeated as (23b), and for the object of transitives (9a), repeated

¹⁵ A reviewer enquires as to the possibility of adding a *by* phrase corresponding to the external argument of the passivized causative to the oblique causee. This is indeed possible, as in (i). A *by*-phrase causee does not seem to be wholly excluded to the Italian author (Manzini), but it is not really natural according to Jan Casalicchio (p.c.), who also points out that similar sentences are judged ungrammatical by Salvi and Skytte (Salvi et al. 1991:503).

- (i) La stanza fu fatta pulire a/da un'impresa dal capufficio
 the room was made clean.INF to/by a firm by the office boss
 ‘The boss made a cleaner’s firm clean the room’

As the data themselves are little discussed in the literature and somewhat unclear, the matter is best left open.

as (23c).

- (23) a. Gli feci pulire la stanza
to.him made.1SG clean.INF the room
'I made him clean the room.'
- b. Lo feci correre/partire
him made.1SG run.INF/come.INF
'I made him run/leave.'
- c. Lo faccio comprare a/da Gianni
it make.1SG buy.INF to/by Gianni
'I make Gianni buy it.'

A brief aside on clitics is needed at this point. A widely held analysis has clitics moving from argument position to IP-adjoined position (Kayne 1991). Alternatively, clitics may first merge as functional heads in the v field, where they license a *pro* in argument position, moving then to IP-adjoined position (Sportiche 1996). Manzini and Pescarini (2022) argue for External Merge (EM) of clitics with the C/I phase head and for the lack of a *pro* associate. Nothing much hinges on the choice among these analyses, since what is crucial for present purposes is the association of clitics with I. In any event, we adopt the analysis of Manzini and Pescarini, as shown in (24b) for the simple sentence in (24a).¹⁶

- (24) a. Gianni la pulisce
Gianni it cleans
'Gianni cleans it'
- b. [Gianni [IP <la, pulisce> [vP ...

Let us then go back to the examples in (23). Due to the transparency of the embedded complement (base generated or derived by VP movement), the possibility of clitic climbing is automatically predicted. What is more, the only I projection available is that of the matrix sentence, so that clitic climbing is forced.¹⁷

Before concluding the survey of Romance causatives, it is worth recalling that both FI and FP are analyzed here in terms of vP complementation and ergative/unaccusative Case alignment, differing only in the choice of oblique case for the causee. This again differs from several generative studies that associate FI and FP with different sizes of verbal complements, richer for FI and more impoverished for FP (e.g., Burzio 1986, Folli and Harley 2007). In reality, the various phenomena reviewed so far FI and FP behave in a parallel fashion (e.g., clitic climbing and passive). Subtler aspects of causativization in Romance are of course interesting in themselves, but do not substantially modify the picture (of Case patterns, locality etc.)

¹⁶ The angled brackets notation means that the verb and the clitic form an ordered pair as opposed to a set (as under ordinary Merge). The reason for this is that Manzini and Pescarini model the clitic cluster by means of the operation Form Sequence (Chomsky 2021), rather than having resort to incorporation via movement (Kayne 1975).

¹⁷ In some Italo-Romance varieties (Borgomanero), there is evidence for clitics merged within the v phase. We then expect clitics to be associated with the lexical verb in causatives. This prediction is borne out (Tortora 2015: 154-156).

relevant for comparison with Balkan causatives.¹⁸

3. Albanian causatives

3.1. Hyper-raising/Agree in Albanian

In the previous section, we proposed an analysis of Italian causatives based on two ideas. First, the causative verb takes a reduced complement (a non-phasal vP). Second, given this configuration, the Agree theory of Case forces an ergative alignment of the embedded arguments, with S and O in the accusative and A (the causee of transitives) in some oblique (‘ergative’) Case. In itself, this approach makes use of very conservative assumptions. Nevertheless, it runs against the grain of most accounts of Romance causatives, either in terms of movement (incorporation) or in terms of cartographic hierarchies (monoclausality). The Arbëresh varieties have been crucial in our rejection of the latter approaches in section 1.

We assume without further discussion that sentences like (1) are biclausal and do not involve V(P)-movement. The conservative Arbëresh structure in (1) with an embedded nominative causee is immediately consistent with both these assumptions and with the standard minimalist theory of Agree/Case, as shown in (25). In (25) ‘make’ is a lexical verb embedding a finite CP complement with ordinary nominative-accusative agreement and Case patterns. Recall the brief discussion preceding (12) above, stressing how a large and complex literature has associated the subjunctive particle with practically any position comprised between C and I. In (25) we assume that the inflected verb is in I and the particle that precedes it is in C or to be more precise in Fin in the sense of Rizzi (1997).¹⁹

¹⁸ Two of the three reviewers requested more discussion of both the data and the literature concerning FI vs FP. One of them states that *a/da* phrases do not alternate freely, but “depending on the degree of agentivity, animacy, etc”; the reference is to Donazzan (2017). The only question relevant for the present study is whether the relevant differences are encoded in types of FI and FP complements, as Burzio (1986) and Folli and Harley (2007) suggest – or whether they involve “semantic constraints that determine the mapping of semantic roles into thematic positions” (Donazzan 2017). We take that the involvement of interface notions of agentivity, animacy, etc. points to the second conclusion.

The question then is how the interface mapping is defined. We take a skeptical view of the explanatory value of functional sequences encoding semantics into the syntax (e.g. cartography, see Chomsky, Gallego and Ott 2019: 250-251). In any event, nothing prevents us from stipulating a Voice head encoding the relevant properties of *a* and *da* causees (Donazzan 2017), as long as that does not interfere with phases.

¹⁹ We introduce these assumptions at the request of two reviewers, who asked for more details about the subjunctive particle. There is a very long discussion in the literature of Balkan languages, see for example the MoodP of Rivero (1994) and more recently the Linker-like projection of Manzini and Savoia (2018). Almost all the available accounts agree that the subjunctive particle is in the left periphery and in a position distinct from ordinary complementizers. Further variation amongst the Balkan languages can be attested. For present purposes and in line with the literature, we assume that the subjunctive particle is low enough that no material can intervene between it and the verb. We embrace the idea that in Null Subject Languages (NSLs) the subject is topic-like (Poletto 2000) and therefore higher than the particle.

(25) Arbëresh

- a. bërë tə piçə krumiʃt-inə buʃtr-i
 made-1SG PRT drank.3SG milk-ACC dog-NOM
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk’
- b. ... [VP bërë [CP tə [IP I [v*P v* [VP piçə krumiʃt-inə] buʃtr-i]]]]
-

Before considering Arbëresh oblique causees, let us turn to standard Albanian (3b) repeated below in (26) for ease of reference. As pointed out in introducing the data in section 1, examples of the type in (26) are problematic for the Agree theories of Case, being instances of hyper-raising/Agree (Zyman 2023 for a review). Consider the structure in (26b). The embedded I enters ϕ -feature Agree with the subject *qenin* ‘the dog’. This yields the fact that *qenin* agrees in person and number features with the embedded verb *pinte* ‘drank’. However, based on the Agree theory of Case we would expect nominative Case, as opposed to accusative. Accusative case on *qenin* can of course be explained as a reflex of Agree with the matrix v^* phase head. However, Case is an obligatory reflex of Agree and we do not expect a second application of Agree to be able to overwrite the original nominative Case.²⁰

(26) Albanian

- a. Unë e bëra të pinte qumësht-in qen-in
 I it.ACC made.1SG PRT drank.3SG milk-ACC dog-ACC
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk’
- b. [VP v* [VP bëra [CP të [IP I [v*P [VP ...] qenin]]]]
-

In technical terms, the relation between ϕ -feature Agree and Case is regulated by the Activity condition, formulated by Chomsky (2001) as in (27). Under ϕ -feature Agree, the interpretable/valued ϕ -features of a DP activate it as a goal of the uninterpretable/unvalued ϕ -features of a phase head probe (C-I or v^*). The checking of the uninterpretable/unvalued Case feature of DP is parasitic on this process, crucially deactivating the DP for further Agree.

(27) *Activity Condition* (Chomsky 2001: 6)

- a. Goal as well as probe must be active for Agree to apply.
- b. N is active only when it has structural Case. Once the Case value is determined, N no longer enters into agreement relations and is “frozen in place” (under (a)).

In (26) then, the causee should surface with nominative, as in (25), since its Case should be determined by Agree with I. Once it becomes inactive for Agree, it

²⁰ To answer a reviewer’s query, the accusative causee can also be found between the causative verb and the subjunctive particle (e.g., Manzini and Savoia 2007: 351) – this is also the case in Greek for example. We prefer to use examples with the causee in situ so as not to have to deal with the exact position of the causee ex situ (i.e., periphery of CP, see fn. 19, or periphery of matrix v^*P , i.e., raising to object). Therefore, we study the theoretical problem from the viewpoint of hyper-Agree.

cannot enter a relation with matrix v^* – which is what accusative case on *qenin* ‘dog’ would require. In English, the accusative causee is straightforwardly accounted for, due to the non-finite embedded I. However, in Albanian, one would expect that there is no ECM, since the embedded I is finite. This is precisely what is meant by hyper-raising.

Hyper-raising/Agree is attested crosslinguistically, but (for the moment) we will focus on analyses proposed for Balkan languages.²¹ Starting with the work of Iatridou (1993), Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002) on Greek, a connection is made between Balkan hyper-raising and lack of (semantic) Tense in the embedded sentence. According to their approach, this is what turns I into a defective head, despite the presence of finite inflection (ϕ -features realized as a verbal affix). In standard minimalist terminology, the defective C-I phase head does not check Case on the embedded subject and the latter remains active under (27). This enables movement (Internal Merge, IM) of the embedded subject to matrix object position (i.e., raising to object).

Unfortunately, lack of Tense cannot be extended from Greek to other Balkan languages. The Arbëresh and Albanian examples that we have provided display normal sequence-of-tense phenomena in the subjunctive; for instance, in (26a) above, both the matrix causative verb and (crucially) the embedded verb are in the past Tense – a point also explicitly discussed for Arbëresh by Manzini and Savoia (2007). Note that sequence of tenses cannot be sufficient to define a defective C-I phase head. If that were the case, Italian (or French or Spanish) subjunctives should allow hyper-raising – and they don’t. The Albanian examples do not constitute a direct counterexample to the Iatridou or Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou analyses of Greek. However, they represent a serious challenge to it since they show that it does not extend to structurally close languages like Albanian.²²

An alternative analysis of Greek hyper-raising to subject (or Long Distance Agree, if the embedded subject remains in situ) is provided by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2021: 23-24), as summarized by the derivational steps in (28). To begin with, they argue that “only DPs bearing nominative are accessible for agreement in Greek, i.e., Agreement is case discriminating and possible only with nominative arguments”. In other words, nominative is the unmarked Case, cf. (28a) prior to Agree,

²¹ For Halpert (2019), writing on Zulu, the embedded CP enters Agree with a matrix probe and this Agree relation deactivates C as a phase head. For Zyman (2023) the hyper-raised DP passes through the embedded CP. For den Dikken (2017) the hyper-raised DP is externally merged in the matrix clause, as the subject of a Relator Phrase, mediating a predication relation between it and the complement clause.

²² A reviewer queries the category of finiteness and its application to (Albanian) subjunctives. Our characterization of finiteness is strictly syntactic. A CP/IP (or a C/I head) qualifies as finite only if it presents (i) a ϕ -features probe and (ii) Tense properties. This is why in (1), and (25)-(26) we specifically used examples that embed a morphological and interpreted past tense verb. As stated in the text, a dependent Tense (i.e., a Tense in a sequence of tense relation with the matrix verb) is not sufficient to define tenselessness/non-finiteness. This is the standard notion of finiteness both in descriptive and in generative literature – and the burden of proof is on the reviewer to show why different criteria would apply. Incidentally, the reviewer hypothesizes a “gradual scale between finite and non-finite forms”, but we don’t see how such a construct would work, unless some OT style constraints are invoked. For these reasons we do not share their view. It should be clear from the discussion so far, that we take the morphosyntactic (and not the semantic) evidence as our guide.

and I probes nominative DPs, cf. (28b) – which implies embracing the dependent theory of Case and the Case-sensitive theory of Agree (Marantz 2000, Bobaljik 2008). The second crucial assumption is that in Null Subject languages (NSLs) “the φ -features of Tns are interpretable and do not delete after valuation”. This means that “once its φ -features are valued, the lower Tns in (20) [our (28), M&R] will further value the phi-features of the matrix Tns by copying its features onto the higher Tns through the formation of an agreement chain with it”, cf. (28d).

(28) Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2021: 24)

- a. [TP Tn_{S φ []} [vP NOM_{3PL}]]] *Agree with NOM and valuation* →
- b. [TP Tn_{S φ [3pl]} [vP NOM_{3PL}]]] *Merge with high Tns* →
- c. [TP₁ Tn_{S φ []}] ... [MoodP na [TP Tn_{S φ [3pl]} [vP NOM_{3PL}]]] *Agree with embedded T/ valuation* →
- d. [TP₁ Tn_{S φ [3pl]}] ... [MoodP na [TP Tn_{S φ [3PL]} [vP NOM_{3PL}]]]

Here we reject dependent Case, as is evident from the discussion of ergative/unaccusative alignments in previous sections, carried out within the Agree theory of Case (Chomsky 2000, 2001). More importantly, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou do not even hint at how their proposal can be extended to hyper-raising to object, e.g., to the causatives studied here. Recall that these involve an accusative DP, for example, *qenin* ‘the dog’ in (26), corresponding to the presence of a higher v^* probe.²³

Remaining then within the Agree theory of Case, the simplest account of data like (26) is treating them on a par with the English raising-to-object/ECM in (15), as summarized in (29). In this respect, let us assume that in (29a) Agree does not apply between I and DP. While in English (15) this is due to the fact that I is non-finite (i.e., it does not have φ -features), in Albanian we assume that it corresponds to the interpretability of I in NSLs (see the discussion below). At the next step, (29b), the potential violation of the Case Filter by *qenin* is repaired by Agree with v^* . This derivational step is enabled by the fact that there is no intervening phasal C-I head. In other words, Balkan subjunctives are like English infinitivals in this respect. In the last step, (29’), the parallel with English ceases. The rule of Form Copy (FC) applies as part of the interpretive procedure INT, spotting the two identical φ -feature sets of the embedded I and *qenin*, and forming a sequence <I, *qenin*>. The rule is necessitated by the interpretable nature of I in NSLs, hence in Albanian, requiring theta-linking with *qenin* in theta-position. Note that the sequence <I, *qenin*> is very similar to a case of doubling between a clitic and a DP.

²³ Theoretically, the Agree theory of Case is stronger than the dependent Case theory, building on the classical treatment of Case as the reflex of a relation between a head and a DP, which can crucially also be realized by agreement on the head (cf. the head and dependent marking of Nichols 1992, Vergnaud 1978 for generative frameworks). The key argument of dependent Case theorists, especially Baker (2015), is that this correlation between Agree and Case cannot be maintained face to empirical evidence. In fact, Balkan accusative causees, or even more clearly Arbëresh oblique causees, are obvious counterexamples to it. Crucially, we do not see how going the dependent Case way might help. This suggests remaining with the more restrictive theory.

(30) Albanian

Era bëri që të thyhej xhami
 the.wind made-3SG that PRT broke-3SG the.glass-NOM
 ‘The wind made the glass break.’

The final step we need to consider is whether the grammar has other means than Agree at its disposal to identify the ϕ -features of I with those of the subject. In (29c) we propose that the rule of Form Copy (FC) introduced by Chomsky (2021) to account for control can be generalized to the case at hand. Chomsky argues that a subcase of the operation Search Σ , namely Internal Search (IS), determines that IM is more economical than EM whenever available, as in (31a). Therefore, EM occurs only if IM is impossible; one such environment is control, where IM from the controlled to the controller position is impossible because of Duality of Semantics (i.e., controller and controllee have two distinct theta-roles, each of which must be satisfied by EM), cf. (31b). Importantly, Resource Restriction (RR) imposes “no access to previous stages of the derivation”. Therefore, the Form Copy (FC) rule has no way of distinguishing a copy created by IM or EM, applying to both, as in (30c).

(31) Control Derivation by FC

- a. the operation Search Σ , namely Internal Search (IS), determines that IM is more economical than EM whenever available. Therefore, EM occurs only if IM is impossible.
- b. In control environments, EM of a copy, as opposed to IM, is forced by Theta-Theory/Duality of Semantics.
- c. Resource Restriction (RR) imposes “no access to previous stages of the derivation”. Therefore, the Form Copy (FC) rule has no way of distinguishing a copy created by IM or EM, applying to both under identity/non-distinctness.

The main properties of FC according to Chomsky (2021) are listed in (32). It is an interface procedure, it obeys Minimal Search (MS) and the PIC, cf. (32a-c), and it is Markovian (32d) – having the basic property of not being able to distinguish copies formed by EM and IM; in other words, “the next step doesn’t have access to the history” (Chomsky 2021: 16). Crucially, if we want to apply FC, as we do, to the embedded I inflection in (29) and to the embedded subject, we cannot assume that FC works between identical copies. We propose that it is in fact driven by identity with respect to some subset of Formal Feature (FFs), as in (32e), defining partial copies – or copies with respect to some relevant FF set. This extension is again explicitly envisaged by Chomsky (2021: 25), since he states that “Principle A of the Binding Theory can be taken to be an option of FC”.

- (32) a. FC is a component of the interpretive (INT) procedure,
- b. it appropriates the freely available principle MS (Minimal Search, namely, ‘Search Σ searches as far as the first (relevant) element it reaches and no further’),
- c. it operates at the phase level,
- d. it is strictly Markovian,
- e. it applies under identity of FF set α (e.g., $\alpha = \phi$ -features).

Note that in general Chomsky himself envisages the possibility of extending FC beyond perfectly identical inscriptions – and the phenomenon of control he discusses in some detail, cf. “Principle A of the Binding Theory can be taken to be an option of FC – like FC, bound by Optimal Computation (OC) but ignoring Θ -Theory” (Chomsky 2021: 25).

Since FC is part of INT, it is evident that its input can only be constituted by interpretable elements. If we want to show that a derivation along the lines of (29c) is possible, not only the ϕ -features of the causee, but also the ϕ -features of I need to be interpretable – but this is what we have already assumed in reviewing step (29a) of the derivation. Because we also assume that I is not associated with lack of valuation either, I is really akin to a pronominal clitic.²⁵

Unlike other theoretical constructs assumed in (29), the assumption that ϕ -features are interpretable/valued on I in NSLs requires a reassessment of standard minimalist theory, specifically of Agree. It is worth remembering that the formal definition of Agree, provided by Chomsky (2000: 122) only mentions Identity (33a) and Minimal Search (33b-c).

- (33) Chomsky (2000:122, ex. (40))
- a. Matching is feature identity.
 - b. [the domain] D(P) [of the probe P] is the sister of P.
 - c. Locality reduces to “closest c-command”.

Thus, D(P) is in the c-command domain of P, and a matching feature G[*oal*] is *closest to P* if there is no G' in D(P) matching P such that G is in D(G').

In practice, starting with Chomsky (2000) himself, and then with Pesetsky and Torrego (2004), the asymmetry between probe and goal is encoded in terms of meta-features (features of features), namely interpretable/uninterpretable and/or valued/unvalued. At the same time, probes are restricted to phase heads, certainly for the purposes of ϕ -feature Agree and as far as we can tell, for other Formal Features (FFs) as well. Here we take the view that meta-features are best avoided if possible – though we maintain the identification of probes with phase heads, as in (34b). Furthermore, as Baker (2008) points out, at least one formal restriction must be added to (33), namely that Agree is subject not only to Minimal Search, but also to the other fundamental locality condition, namely the PIC, as in (34c). The definition of Agree in (33) is therefore to be revised as in (34).

- (34) a. = (33)
 b. P is a phase head
 c. (P, G) complies with the PIC

²⁵ This position has occasionally been expressed in the literature, see for instance the following passage from Manzini and Savoia (2007: 35): “clitics and inflections of the verb alike are interpretable. The ultimate consequence of this way of reasoning is that an inflection and a subject, or a subject clitic and a lexical subject, and so on, being all argumental in nature, can only share the same argumental slot of the verb in so far as they form a chain. If so, then the grammar contains a great number of chains where the different points are independently lexicalized. Thus, the chain interpretation cannot be subsumed by movement” – where ‘chain’ needs to be substituted in current terminology by FC sequence. Otherwise, their discussion stands.

Taking a suggestion of Chomsky (2019), we identify phase heads, relevant for (34b), with the categorizers v , n , etc. (cf. Marantz 2000), to which we add C, though principled reasons for the inclusion of C remain to be clarified.²⁶

Given the standard definition of Agree in (33) and the equally standard additions in (34), we propose abandoning the idea that uninterpretable/unvalued features are necessary to trigger Agree – and that vice versa, Agree is necessary because of such features. It is possible that in non-NSLs, ϕ -features on I are uninterpretable, or in any event “too weak to label” (Chomsky 2015), obligatorily triggering Agree. At least in NSLs, however, we assume that Agree (in the sense of (33)–(34)) is optional. It may be triggered by the need to satisfy the Case Filter (i.e., to check the Case feature, also deactivating the DP), but the derivation in (29) witnesses the fact that the derivation may very well skip a probe (no obligatoriness).²⁷

In short, we propose that hyper-raising/Agree in Balkan languages reproduces the basic steps of raising to object/Agree in English. In both types of language, a crucial role is played by the fact that the embedded CP is not a phase, whether non-finite (English infinitives) or finite (Balkan subjunctives). This allows long-distance IM from the embedded subject to the matrix v^* , or alternatively, long distance Agree. The reason why finite sentences in English or in Italian do not display hyper-raising/Agree is simply that they have a phasal C. Hyper-raising/Agree in the Balkan languages requires a sentential complement introduced by a subjunctive particle, which, despite being finite, by-and-large covers the distribution of English (and Romance) infinitives. The crucial difference between Balkan languages and English is that Balkan languages are NSLs – which means that I is not forced to enter Agree by uninterpretability or any other consideration. Again, the same configuration is recreated as in English raising/ECM, namely the presence of an embedded subject DP active in the terms of (27). In other words, the interpretable property of finite I in subjunctive complements (understood as its ability to label itself, without requiring IM with a DP), frees the DP to enter Agree with a higher probe, giving rise to accusative case via matrix v^* . Finally, the correct interpretation requires interpretable I to be identified as a (partial) copy of the subject DP – and this is performed by FC at INT. This last step leaves open the possibility that I may enter FC with any non-nominative DP, not necessarily an accusative. In the next section, we argue that Arbëresh verifies this prediction.

3.2. Arbëresh and language contact

Language contact is a convenient shorthand for a prolonged situation of bilingualism

²⁶ The intuition is that lexical material embodied by Roots is essentially inert from the syntactic point of view. Therefore, each Root is associated with at least one (perhaps at most one) functional head, the categorizer and holder of FFs. If so, the role of C as a phase head would seem to connect to the syntactic inertness of T.

²⁷ The optionality of Agree further means that *pro* is not motivated by the need to provide a Goal for it. Therefore, the only residual motivation for *pro* is the UTAH (Uniformity of Theta-Role Assignment Hypothesis, Baker 1988), or more generally Uniformity. See Manzini and Pescarini (2022) for a recent rejection of Uniformity, and hence of *pro*, as part of Romance clitic structure; Manzini and Roussou (2000) for an early attempt to do without both PRO and *pro*. These matters are left open for future research.

involving many generations of speakers. A learner of Arbëresh typically gets two types of input – from Arbëresh and from some Italo-Romance variety (nowadays generally the standard one).²⁸ The inputs are used to construct two grammars. Convergence is what happens when stimulus from one language inputs the grammar of the other language. It is only in externalist approaches that convergence can be thought of as the wholesale transfer of some construct from one language to another. In a mentalist conception, the convergence is mediated by the construction of a mental grammar. Therefore, we expect that examples like (1), repeated in (35) below (Arbëresh, Vena di Maida), will arise through the normal process of variation and change, namely the resetting of some minimal parameter.

- (35) Arbëresh
 u bërë tə piçə krumiʃt-inə buʃtr-itə / ŋga buʃtr-i
 I made.1SG PRT drank.3SG milk-ACC dog-DAT by dog-NOM
 ‘I made the dog drink the milk.’

Let us adopt the same basic derivation for Arbëresh (35) as for (29) – obviously up to the different Case properties of the causee. The first steps of the derivation involve merger of the lexical verb and of its internal argument, merger of the embedded v^* phase head, Agree between v^* and the internal argument, which surfaces as accusative. The next step consists in merger of the external argument and of the C-I phase head. In (36), as in (29a), no Agree takes place between the embedded I and the embedded external argument DP. At this point, the subject of finite sentences in Balkan languages is open to further Agree with the matrix v^* – and this is what happens in standard Albanian (29b). Balkan varieties in contact with Romance, here Arbëresh, adopt an alternative, which derives not from the autochthonous input, but rather from the Romance input. The external argument is embedded under an oblique case projection, or under a preposition *by*. The final step of the derivation is represented by an application of FC as part of INT, creating the sequence <I, *buʃtritə*>, in which I reads as a partial (clitic-like) copy of the DP.

- (36) ... [CP të [IP I [VP v^* [VP piçə krumiʃt-inə] buʃtr-itə]] FC

On the other hand, the grammar of standard Albanian and that of Arbëresh display complete parallelism when it comes to the treatment of causees that are the sole argument (internal or external) of intransitive verbs. In both languages they surface in the accusative Case, as illustrated in (37a) for Arbëresh – though in Arbëresh nominative remains possible, as in (37b) (both examples from Vena di Maida). Indeed, with embedded intransitive verbs, the Italian input to the learner is superficially similar, since the causee is also accusative.²⁹

²⁸ Arbëresh belongs to the Tosk varieties of Albanian, diverging from those spoken in South Albania from the XV century.

²⁹ A reviewer queries some aspects of the data. The verb ‘eat’ in (37b) is intransitive, lacking an internal argument. The element *pə* (cf. Italian *per* ‘for’) is a preposition introducing sentential complements, in the way independently attested for Romance infinitival complements. This *pə* is generally optional, but we of course reproduce corpus data exactly as

- (37) Manzini and Savoia (2007: 338)
- a. u bəɾɐ pə tə ikənə ɲeri-unə
 I made.1SG for PRT run.3SG man-ACC
 ‘I made the man run.’
- b. bəɲɲa tə harə diaʎ-i
 make.1SG PRT eat.3SG boy-NOM
 ‘I make the boy eat.’

Under present assumptions, the derivation of sentences like (37a) must involve raising to object/ECM. This means that these derivations are present in Arbëresh as in standard Albanian, cf. (29) above. In (38) we execute the latter by Agree of *ɲeriunə* ‘the man’ with the matrix *v** (assuming that the embedded C-I phase is defective), surfacing as accusative. On the other hand, the relation between the embedded I and the oblique causee is a partial copy relation under FC:

- (38)
- $$\dots [_{VP} v^* [_{VP} bəɾɐ [_{CP} pə tə [_{IP} I [_{v^*P} ɲeriunə VP]]]]]] \quad FC$$

Comparison between obliquization of the causee in (36) and ECM/raising to object in (38) raises the interesting question why the latter is not attested with embedded transitive predicates. We surmise that obliquization offers a strategy for the early termination of the derivation which pre-empts the IM (raising to object) derivation.

Let us sum up so far. The Arbëresh causative pattern with oblique causees depends on (a) the availability of hyper-raising/Agree in the native data; and (b) the obliquization of causee subjects of transitive verbs triggered by the Romance data. In this perspective, the contribution of the Romance input is limited to a one-step change in the native grammar. Corroborating evidence for the present approach comes from Arbëresh data on the interaction of causatives with clitics and passives. Under a holistic view of convergence, we may very well expect that whatever triggers the obliquization of the causee in (35) also allows long passive and clitic climbing. The same expectations seem to us to arise under monoclausal analysis such as that suggested by Ledgeway et al. (2018, forthcoming) for Italiot Greek. In reality, in the Arbëresh variety of Vena illustrated so far, clitic climbing is excluded, as is long passive.

Consider first cliticization. Clitics corresponding to the embedded object cliticize on the embedded verb, as in (39) (cf. the lower ε clitic on the verb *ʃɔrə*). If Arbëresh causatives are ordinary bisentential structures, we expect object clitics to normally cliticize on the embedded I (the closest one), whence (39). On the other hand, in (39) the causee is cliticized on the matrix I (the higher ε clitic on the matrix verb *bəɲɲənə*). Importantly, the causee is not in the dative Case (the dative clitic is *i* in Albanian) but in the accusative. We interpret this fact as indicating that the raising to object treatment of the causee is not excluded in Arbëresh, rather it is limited to clitic causees. The Arbëresh example below is from Vena di Maida.

they have been provided by the informant. Exactly as the prepositional introducer of Romance infinitives, the *pə* of Arbëresh must be transparent (not a phase head). For some introduction to the matter see Manzini and Savoia (2018: 307-309) and references quoted there.

- (39) Arbëresh, Vena di Maida; Manzini and Savoia 2007: 339

ε bəɣɣənə t ε ʃərə
 him make-3PL PRT it sees.3SG
 ‘They make him see it.’

Manzini and Savoia (2007) also report a variety, Ginestra, where the dative causee cliticizes on the embedded verb, as in (40). The variety of Ginestra is one further step away from standard Albanian, presenting incorporation of the subjunctive particle *tə* on the causative verb, which appears in the non-inflected form, *bitə* in (40). This is outside the scope of the present discussion. Even so, the treatment of clitics is the one expected in a biclausal structure.³⁰

- (40) Arbëresh, Ginestra; Manzini and Savoia (2007: 341)

ɣu bitə t a zɣʌɛðətʃ
 I make.1SG you it read.2SG
 ‘I make you read it.’

Let us then consider passive, which in Albanian corresponds to the deployment of middle-passive morphology (inflectional or clitic or periphrastic), with a range of possible meanings covering passives, reflexives and anticausatives (Manzini, Roussou and Savoia 2016). Embedding of middle-passive morphology under *make* is robustly attested, contrary to Romance (cf. (10b) above). This triggers IM from the object to the subject position, clause internally as in (41) (example from Vena di Maida). Middle-passive morphology can also be associated with the causative verb, as in (42) from the variety of Piana degli Albanesi. In this latter case, the causee can be promoted

³⁰ In the corpus of Manzini and Savoia (2007) (originally Savoia 1989a, 1989b), only the variety of Barile presents clitic climbing on the causative verb, as in (i); incorporation of the subjunctive particle into the causative verb seems to be a necessary precondition (though not a sufficient one, see Ginestra in the text). The morphological make-up of *pata* and similar forms is discussed by Manzini and Savoia (2007: 367). Specifically, the alternant *bəta* (cf. (ii) of fn. 31) is transparently formed by the causative verbal base *bə-* followed by the incorporated Prt *-t-*.

- (i) Arbëresh, Barile; Manzini and Savoia (2007: 339)

u j a pata bəɣ ()
 I to.him it make do.1SG
 ‘I make him do it.’
 ()

The existence of a variety like (i) does not weaken the fully biclausal treatment provided for Arbëresh varieties in the text – rather it strengthens it, showing the progression towards a truly impoverished embedded structure. The grammar of Barile is outside the scope of the present work.

Note that Vena di Maida is in Calabria, where Arbëresh is most strongly attested; Barile and Ginestra are in Lucania, in a more isolated area. No doubt, some scholars may want to investigate the heritage status of one or more of these languages. As far as we are concerned, variation and change are the interesting topics; whether or when languages qualify for external linguistics labels like ‘heritage’ is a distraction from what we take to be the true nature of the problem, i.e., defining their grammar (the competence of their speakers).

to subject matrix position – but there are no examples of promotion of the embedded object.

- (41) Arbëresh; Vena di Maida, Manzini and Savoia (2007: 345)
 ε bɛɲna tə sətahətə diaɫ-inə
 him make.1SG PRT sit.MP.3SG boy-ACC
 ‘I make the boy be seated.’
- (42) Arbëresh; Piana degli Albanesi; Manzini and Savoia (2007: 345)
 ai klɛu bən tə cɛʃəɲə
 He was made PRT laugh.3SG
 ‘He was made to laugh.’

Descriptively, therefore, we confirm once more that the Romance-like case array of Arbëresh causatives does not seem to have anything to do either with a radical restructuring of the grammar (e.g., monoclausality). Theoretically, the crucial reason why Arbëresh cannot have long passive has to do with the phase structure of the language. Specifically, while the complement of the Italian causative verb is a non-phasal/deficient vP, the embedded object in Arbëresh (Albanian) is inside a v*P phase constituent. In other words, the Italian structure (22a), schematized below as (43a) is to be compared with the Arbëresh structure in (43b). Let us assume that the embedded C-I phase is deficient and that so is the matrix passive v (by hypothesis), by the PIC. Even so, at the matrix C-I phase the complement of the embedded v* phase, i.e., OBJ, is packed off to externalization. This means that probing by matrix I is impossible.³¹

- (43) a. Italian
 [IP I [vP CAUSE-PASS [vP SUBJ v [vP V OBJ]]]]
- b. Arbëresh
 [IP I [vP CAUS-MP [CP/IP PRT [v*P SUBJ v* [V OBJ]]]]]

³¹ Structural schemas are provided, as opposed to the structures of actual examples because the corpus at our disposal only includes positive evidence (hence negative evidence is indirect). Unsurprisingly, given the data from cliticization in fn. 30, long passive is in fact attested in the variety of Barile. Long passive involves middle passive morphology on both the embedded verb and the causative verb, the latter by means of the middle-passive clitic *u*:

Arbëresh; Barile, Manzini and Savoia (2007: 346)

- (i) Arbëresh; Barile cə kəmɪʃ u pata ʎaf
 this shirt MP make wash.MP
 ‘Somebody had this shirt washed’ (lit: ‘This shirt was made to be washed’)
- (ii) latruni u bəta zu ŋga cəni
 thief-NOM MP make caught.MP by dog-NOM
 ‘Somebody had the thief caught by the dog’
 (lit: ‘The thief was made to be caught by the dog’)

Though Barile is outside the scope of the present article, we note that (i)-(ii) are far from providing evidence for monoclausality, given the presence of two distinct middle-passive inflections, on *make* and on the embedded verb.

In short, Arbëresh causatives, like Italo-Greek causatives, raise the issue of convergence effects, typical of contact, i.e., of historically protracted bilingualism. We now have an answer to this question. Contact does not involve a wholesale process of change in the basic structure of complementation but proceeds in discrete (micro)parametric steps. Standard Albanian has hyper-raising/Agree based on various factors, mainly the lack of an embedded C-I phase and its NSL status. Arbëresh is just one step away: based on the same premises, it displays obliquization of the causee. The surface result is the same as that of Romance (and indeed presumably corresponding to a Romance input to bilingual speakers) – the underlying grammar is that of Albanian.

4. Concluding remarks

To summarize, in the present paper we have argued that the variation attested regarding the realization of the causee can be accounted for once we consider the different properties of the complement clause. The empirical data under consideration have shown that the unifying property in English, Romance, and Balkan languages is that causatives require a non-phasal complement. The latter can be finite or non-finite. English and Italian take a non-finite complement but further differ in the realization of the causee (in the case of transitive predicates). English manifests raising to object position, hence an accusative causee, following φ -Agree with the matrix v^* . On the other hand, Italian manifests an ergative alignment in transitives: it is the embedded object that is probed directly by the matrix v^* , enters Agree with it and is therefore accusative (the v case). The external argument follows the fate of external arguments in ergative alignments, namely it is turned into an oblique, hence in Italian into a PP, either a dative/possessor *a*-PP or an instrumental/causer *da*-PP.

The English vs Italian parameter is iterated in the Balkan context, but in a finite non-phasal context. In the Balkan group, the non-phasal complement is an IP introduced by the subjunctive particle, triggering a transparent domain between the embedded subject and the matrix v^* . Due to space limitations, we have not discussed the exact role of this particle in the relevant structures (but see Manzini and Savoia (2018) for Albanian; Roussou (2009) for Greek); for this reason, we have taken the empirical data at face value. The accusative causee in (Standard) Albanian is on a par with its English counterpart. However, since the embedded clause is finite, this is an instance of hyper-raising. This is where finiteness plays a role: the embedded I is labeled by its own φ -features. Since the DP (subject) does not participate in the I-labeling it can enter φ -Agree with a higher probe, that is the matrix v^* in this case. Interpretability requires the formation of a sequence between the φ -features of I with the DP (the argument). Arbëresh permits two more options. The first is a nominative subject, that is restricting Agree in the embedded clause (with I). The second is an oblique subject, following the Italian pattern, thus not manifesting the hyper-raising option, but resorting to an ergative alignment.

There are various open issues to be addressed in future research. For example, to what extent this approach extends to hyper-raising documented in other languages (see the overview in Zyman 2023), or what role infinitival inflection plays in Italian as opposed to its total absence in English. In the present paper our aim was to dispense with a uniform account (same meaning – same abstract structure) that ignores the

morphosyntactic properties of individual grammars. It seems that the only unifying property in the causatives under consideration is the requirement for a non-phasal complement.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank three anonymous reviewers for comments and suggestions.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis, & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing Agr: Word Order, V-Movement and EPP-Checking. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16: 491–539. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006090432389>

Alexiadou, Artemis, & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2002. Raising without infinitives and the role of agreement. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, S. Barbiers, & H.-M. Gaertner (eds), *Dimensions of movement. From features to remnants*, 17–30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.48.02ale>

Alexiadou, Artemis, & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2021. Backward control, long distance Agree, nominative case and TP/CP transparency. In A. Mucha, J. Hartmann, & B. Trawiński (eds), *Non-canonical control in a cross-linguistic perspective*, 15–34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.270.01ale>

Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Baker, Mark. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511619830>

Baker, Mark. 2015. *Case: Its principles and its parameters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107295186>

Belletti, Adriana. 2020. Ways of smuggling in syntactic derivations. In A. Belletti, & C. Collins (eds), *Smuggling in syntax*, 13–37. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197509869.003.0002>

Bidese, Ermenegildo, & M. Rita Manzini 2022. Progressive and prospective aspect in a German dialect in Italy. In H. Fischer, M. Gillmann, & M. Schmuck (eds), *Aspektualität in Varietäten des Deutschen*, 141–164. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag. <https://iris.unitn.it/handle/11572/364146>

Bittner, Maria, & Kenneth Hale. 1996. Ergativity: towards a theory of a heterogeneous class. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27(4): 531–604. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178953>

Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where's phi? Agreement as a post-syntactic operation. In D. Harbour, D. Adger, & S. Béjar (eds), *Phi-Theory: Phi features across*

interfaces and modules, 295–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199213764.003.0010>

Brandi, Luciana, & Leonardo M. Savoia. 1990. Proprietà morfosintattiche e assegnazione del Caso nel causativo arbëresh. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 15: 29–121.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-4522-7>

Cardinaletti, Anna, & Giuliana Giusti. 2003. Motion verbs as functional heads. In C. Tortora (ed.), *The syntax of Italian dialects*, 31–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195136456.003.0002>

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884166>

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language. Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In R. Martin, D. Michels, & J. Uriagereka (eds), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1–54. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of Projection. *Lingua* 130: 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.12.003>

Chomsky, Noam. 2015. Problems of projection: Extensions. In E. di Domenico, C. Hamann, & S. Matteini (eds) *Structures, strategies and beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, 3–16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.223.01cho>

Chomsky, Noam. 2019. *The UCLA lectures*. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005485>

Chomsky, Noam. 2021. Minimalism: Where are we and where can we hope to go. *Gengo Kenkyu* 160: 1–41. https://doi.org/10.11435/gengo.160.0_1

Chomsky, Noam. To appear. The Miracle Creed and SMT. In M. Greco, & D. Mocchi (eds), *A Cartesian dream: A geometrical account of syntax. In honor of Andrea Moro. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa/ Research in Generative Grammar, Monograph Series* (Lingbuzz Press).

Chomsky, Noam, Ángel Gallego, & Dennis Ott. 2019. Generative grammar and the faculty of language: Insights, questions, and challenges. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics Special Issue, 2019*: 229–261. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.288>

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195179545.001.0001>
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2018. On the status of functional categories (heads and phrases). *Language and Linguistics* 18(4): 521–576. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lali.18.4.01cin>
- Ciutescu, Elena. 2018. *Defective causative and perception verb constructions in Romance*. Ph.D. thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8(2): 81–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2005.00076.x>
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2017. Predication in the syntax of hyperraising and copy raising. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 64(1): 3–43. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2062.2017.64.1.1>
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886597>
- Donazzan, Marta. 2017. Italian causatives and the grammar of (in)direct causation. In P. Rodrigues, R. Pires de Oliveira, A. P. Quadros Gomes, & M. J. Foltran (eds), *Linguística Formal, Revista Letras* 96: 398–422.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5380/rel.v96i0.50948>
- Folli, Raffaella, & Heidi Harley. 2007. Causation, obligation, and argument structure: On the nature of little *v*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(2): 197–238.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4179405>
- Guasti, M. Teresa. 1993. *Causative and perception verbs: A comparative study*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Guasti, M. Teresa. 2017. Analytical causatives. In M. Everaert, & H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*, Second edition.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsyncom038>
- Hale, Kenneth. 1970. The passive and ergative in language change: The Australian case. In S. A. Wurm, & D. C. Laycock (eds), *Pacific linguistics studies in honour of Arthur Capell*, 757–781. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Halpert, Claire. 2019. Raising, unphased. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 37:123–165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-9407-2>
- Hill, Virginia. 2013. The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive. *The Linguistic Review* 30(4): 547–583. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2013-0016>
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1): 69–96.
<https://doi.org/10.1162/002438999553968>

-
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1993. On nominative Case and a few related things. In: *Papers on case and Agreement II, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19: 175–196.
- Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(4): 647–686. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178745>
- Laka, Itziar. 2006. Deriving split-ergativity in the progressive: The case of Basque. In A. Johns, D. Massam, & J. Ndayiragije (eds), *Ergativity: Emerging issues*, 173–195. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4188-8_7
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. From coordination to subordination: The grammaticalisation of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento. In F. Pratas, S. Pereira, & C. Pinto (eds), *Coordination and subordination. Form and meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, 157–184. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Schifano, Norma, & Silvestri, Giuseppina. 2018. Il contatto tra il greco e le varietà romanze nella Calabria meridionale. *Lingue antiche e moderne* 7: 95–133. <https://doi.org/10.4424/lam72018-5>
- Ledgeway, Adam, Schifano, Norma, & Silvestri, Giuseppina. 2020. I costrutti causativi nelle varietà romanze e greche della Calabria meridionale. In P. del Puente, F. Guazzelli, L. Molinu, & S. Pisano (eds), *Tra etimologia romanza e dialettologia. Studi in onore di Franco Fanciullo*, 203–217. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Schifano, Norma, & Silvestri, Giuseppina. Forthcoming. *Greek-Romance Contact: The Fading Voices of Southern Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 2017. Accusative and ergative in Hindi. In J. Coon, D. Massam, & L. Demena Travis (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, 86–108. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198739371.013.4>
- Manzini, M. Rita. 1983. *Restructuring and reanalysis*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Manzini, M. Rita. 2022. Romance causatives and ergativity. In N. Boneh, D. Harbour, O. Matushansky, & I. Roy (eds), *Building on Babel’s rubble*, 271–292. Presses Universitaires de Vincennes. <https://doi.org/10.3917/puv.boneh.2022.01.0271>
- Manzini, M. Rita, & Paolo Lorusso. 2022. A bisentential syntax for *a*/bare finite complements in South Italian varieties. Motion verbs and the progressive. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds), *Pseudo-coordination and multiple agreement constructions*, 65–98. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.03man>

- Manzini, M. Rita, & Diego Pescarini. 2022. The clitic string as a Pair Merge sequence. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 45(1): 1–37.
<https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.6571>
- Manzini, M. Rita, & Anna Roussou. 2000. A minimalist theory of A-movement and control. *Lingua* 110(6): 409–447. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(00\)00006-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(00)00006-1)
- Manzini, M. Rita, Roussou, Anna, & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2016. Middle-passive voice in Albanian and Greek. *Journal of Linguistics* 52(1): 111–150.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226715000080>
- Manzini, M. Rita, & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2007. *A unification of morphology and syntax*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968154>
- Manzini, M. Rita, Savoia, Leonardo M., & Ludovico Franco. 2015. Ergative case, Aspect and Person splits: Two case studies. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 62(3): 297–351. <https://doi.org/10.1556/064.2015.62.3.3>
- Manzini, M. Rita, & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2018. *The morphosyntax of Albanian and Aromanian varieties*. Berlin: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501505140>
- Marantz, Alec. 2000. Case and licensing. In E. Reuland (ed.), *Arguments and Case: Explaining Burzio's generalization*, 11–30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/la.34.04mar>
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226580593.001.0001>
- Palancar, Enrique. 2008. Varieties of ergative. In A. Malchukov, & A. Spencer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 562–571. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199206476.013.0038>
- Pesetsky, David, & Esther Torrego. 2004. Tense, Case and the Nature of Syntactic Categories. In J. Guéron, & J. Lecarme (eds), *The Syntax of Time*, 495–538. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6598.003.0021>
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195133561.001.0001>
- Postal, Paul. 1974. *On Raising*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Postal, Paul. 1977. Antipassive in French. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 1(2): 333–374.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/li.1.2.04pos>
- Rivero, Maria-Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63–120.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992746>

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7
- Roussou, Anna. 2000. On the left periphery: modal particles and complementisers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1: 65–94. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jgl.1.05rou>
- Roussou, Anna. 2009. In the mood for control. *Lingua* 119(12): 1811–1836. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.010>
- Rouveret, Alain, & Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1980. Specifying reference to the subject. French causatives and conditions on representations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(1): 97–202. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178152>
- Salvi, Giampaolo, Skytte, Gunver, & M. Rita Manzini. 1991. Frasi subordinate all'infinito. In L. Renzi, & G. Salvi (eds), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, 483–570. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Savoia, Leonardo M. 1989a. Processi morfologici, proprietà di caso e accordo nel causativo arbëresh. *Zjarri* 33: 186–293.
- Savoia, Leonardo M. 1989b. Alcune caratteristiche del causativo arbëresh. In *Le minoranze etniche e linguistiche. Atti del 2° Congresso Internazionale*, 363–420. Piana degli Albanesi: Comune di Piana degli Albanesi.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2020. The development of Exceptional Case Marking in Romance with a particular focus on French. *Probus* 32(2): 367–400. <https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2020-0002>
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1996. Clitic constructions. In J. Rooryck, & L. Zaring (eds), *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, 213–276. Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8617-7_9
- Tortora, Christina. 2015. *A comparative grammar of Borgomanerese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199945627.001.0001>
- Tubino Blanco, Mercedes. 2010. *Contrasting causatives: A minimalist approach*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Turano, Giuseppina. 2015. Quando caso e accordo sono disgiunti: soggetti accusativi e dativi nell'albanese e nei dialetti arbëreshë. *Hylli i dritës* 35(1–2): 129–154.
- Turano, Giuseppina. 2018. Optional vs obligatory movement in Albanian (pseudo)-raising constructions. In M. Grimaldi, R. Lai, L. Franco, & B. Baldi (eds), *Structuring Variation in Romance Linguistics and Beyond. In honour of Leonardo M. Savoia*, 177–192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.252.12tur>
- Turano, Giuseppina, & Shezaj Rrokaj. 1998. Strategia del Causativo in albanese. *Studi*

Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata 3: 551–565.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 1994. *Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory*. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 7. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 2008 [1978]. Letter to Noam Chomsky and Howard Lasnik on “Filters and Control”, April 17, 1977. In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero, & M.-L. Zubizarreta (eds), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 3–15. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262062787.003.0002>

Woolford, Ellen. 1997. Four-way case systems: Ergative, nominative, objective, and accusative. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 181–227. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005796113097>

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives. Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110908329>

Zyman, Erik. 2023. Raising out of finite clauses (Hyperraising). *Annual Review of Linguistics* 9: 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-022421-070658>