ON THE ANALYSIS OF NON-SELECTED DATIVES IN MALTESE

Maris Camilleri   and   Louisa Sadler
University of Essex   University of Essex

Abstract

This paper provides a descriptive overview of extra argumental or non-selected datives in Maltese, poorly described in existing grammars. We outline an LFG approach to the facts we describe bulding on existing LFG work and in particular on Kibort (2008)'s approach to dative arguments, extending her approach to the various subclasses of non-selected dative arguments.

1   Introduction

In this paper we aim to provide the first account of non-selected datives (henceforth NSDs) in Maltese, a Maghrebi/Siculo-Arabic dialect. In presenting Maltese NSDs we add to the growing literature on NSDs in the Semitic languages. A reasonable body of well-described data is available (Al-Zahre, 2003) for Syrian Arabic and we draw some brief comparisons to this data. The Maltese NSDs are described in terms of the typology of NSDs presented in Bosse et al. (2012), which appears to suffice for the Maltese data to be presented.[1]

Before proceeding to a discussion of the distinct types of NSDs in Maltese, we provide some discussion of dative-marked arguments in the language. Section 3 introduces Bosse et al. (2012)'s typology of NSDs (using their German data) and section 4 applies this typology to Maltese. Section 5 provides an LFG analysis for NSDs in Maltese, building on Kibort (2008) and Sadler and Camilleri (2012).

2   Selected Dative Arguments in Maltese

Pronominal accusative (object) and dative arguments are normally expressed affixally, that is, as incorporated pronouns, in Maltese: the relevant paradigms are shown in (1). As is evident, the two sets of forms basically differ in terms of the presence of *-l-* in the dative set, an element which is quite transparently related to the dative marker found with NP arguments, to be illustrated below.

(1)

PNG	OBJ	DATIVE OBJ
1sg	-ni	-lni
2sg	-(V)k	-lVk
3sgm	-u∼h	-lu
3sgf	-ha	-lha
1pl	-na	-lna
2pl	-kom	-lkom
3pl	-hom	-lhom

The accusative forms (i.e. those without *-l-* correspond to the OBJ function: for the moment we will refer to the GF associated with the dative forms as the DAT OBJ

---

[1]We note however, that this classification omits one less well-described type of NSD, the so-called *subject correferential datives*, which is found in both Syrian Arabic and Hebrew but not in Maltese.

(for further discussion see Sadler and Camilleri (2012)). Dative pronominal affixes and dative NPs occur as the goal or recipient argument in a canonical ditransitive construction as in (2) and (3).

(2) *Bgħat-t-i-l-ha*   *l-ittra*
    sent.PV-1SG-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-letter
    I sent the letter to her.

(3) *Bgħat-t*   *il-ktieb*   *lil* *Marija*
    sent.PV-1SG DEF-book.SGM DAT Mary
    I sent the book to Mary.

Argumental datives are not restricted to ditransitive predicates: *ċempel* 'phone' is a bi-valent verb which takes a dative as its second argument.

(4) *T-i-nsie-x*   *iċ-ċempil-l-i*
    2-FRM.VWL-forget.IMPER-NEG 2-phone.IMPV-DAT-1SG
    Don't forget to phone me.

While the bound forms that realize the OBJ and DAT OBJ functions are distinct, a slight complication is that the free pronominal non-subject forms are syncretic and derive diachronically from a pronominal inflection attached to *lil*, out of which the contracted form *'l* and the *-l-* marking on the bound dative forms are also derived (Camilleri, 2011). Free pronominal forms are used in a number of specific contexts such as in coordinated constructions as well as contrastively-stressed contexts — see (6).

(5)

PNG	Free pronoun	PNG	Free pronoun
1sg	lili	1pl	lilna
2sg	lilek	2pl	lilkom
3sgm	lilu	3pl	lilhom
3sgf	lilha		

(6) *Raj-t*   *lilu, u*   *mhux lilek*
    saw.PV-1SG him CONJ NEG 2SG
    I saw him and not you.

A complicating factor is that the free marker *lil* is also implicated in a form of differential object marking (on accusative objects), operating in accordance with the accessibility hierarchy. With human objects, proper names are obligatorily (and other definites are usually) marked with the ACC *lil* marker, but indefinite human NPs are optionally marked. Non-human NPs are usually not *lil*-marked. Note further that the presence of a dative-marked indirect object inhibits the appearance of *lil* on the direct object, even if human definite, as shown in (7).

(7) a. *Raj-t   (l)it-tifel*
     saw.PV-1SG ACC.DEF-boy
     I saw the boy.

   b. *Taj-t   *(l)it-tifel   lil omm-u*
     gave.PV-1SG ACC.DEF-boy DAT mother-3SGM.ACC
     I gave the boy to his mother.

Although dative-marked NPs/pronouns typically realize the goal/recipient argument of a ditransitive verb, in what we have elsewhere called the canonical dative construction (following Kibort (2008)), Maltese also has a (rather restricted) double object or dative-shift construction, found with certain ditransitive verbs, where the goal/recipient is obligatorily expressed as a bound OBJ pronoun. Compare (8), a canonical dative construction, with the double object construction in (9). (10) is a further example of the DOC.

(8) *Wera   t-triq   lil Pawlu*
   showed.PV.3SGM DEF-road DAT Paul
   He showed the road to Paul.   CDAT

(9) *Wrie-h   it-triq*
   show.PV.3SGM-3SGM.ACC DEF-road
   He showed him the road.   DOC

(10) *Ma n-af-x   min għallm-u   l-Malti*
    NEG 1-know.IMPV.SG-NEG who taught.PV.3SGM-3SGM.ACC DEF-Maltese
    I don't know who taught him Maltese.   DOC

In other work on the Maltese ditransitive predicates, Sadler and Camilleri (2012) provide a number of arguments showing that the recipient/goal argument corresponds to an OBJ function in the DOC illustrated in (9) and (10), and further that the canonical dative construction (examples (2), (3) and (8)) involves a secondary or restricted OBJ rather than a prepositional OBL.

This section has briefly introduced the use of the dative-marked argument in *selected* contexts, typically where it functions as the third argument of the predicate. We now consider the NSD use of dative pronominal affixes (optionally doubled by a dative-marked NP) in a range of other constructions, but before doing so, provide a brief introduction to the classification of non-selected dative constructions, drawing principally on that proposed by Bosse et al. (2012) (henceforth BBY).

3   Types of Non-selected Datives

On the basis of data from a (relatively modest) spread of languages, BBY identify essentially four distinct types of NSDs; external possessor datives (EP), benefactive

datives (BEN), affected experiencer datives (AE) and attitude holder datives (AH). All of the following German examples are due to BBY.[2]

(11) illustrates an external possessor dative, in which a relation of possession exists between the NSD and (typically) the OBJ: in some languages external possession is restricted to cases of inalienable possession. As is frequently the case, an EP interpretation may occur alongside an AE interpretation, in which the dative participant is interpreted as particularly affected by the event (here, by the cleaning of the suit).

(11) *Sie säuberte mir   den Anzug.*
     she cleaned me.DAT the suit
     She cleaned my suit.   EP
      She (went and) cleaned the suit on me.   AE

In the benefactive (BEN) dative construction the argument is not required to be either a possessor or sentient (although it is, in this particular example).

(12) *Dennis installierte seinem Freund das Programm.*
     Dennis installed   his.DAT friend the program
     Dennis installed the program for his friend.   BEN

The affected experiencer (AE) construction is illustrated in (13): here the argument is interpreted as an experiencer and must be both sentient and aware.

(13) *Alex zerbrach Chris   Bens Vase.*
     Alex broke   Chris.DAT Ben's vase
     Alex broke Ben's vase on Chris.
      Alex broke Ben's vase, and this mattered to Chris.   AE

The final type, the attitude holder (AH) construction involves an argument that holds an attitude towards the proposition as a whole. The AE construction is often of very restricted distribution — for example, BBY state that it is restricted to first person attitude holders only in German and first and second person in French. Furthermore, this NSD type is widely thought of as entirely non-truth conditional, that is, making no contribution to the at-issue semantics.

(14) *Du sollst mir   nicht wieder fernsehen.*
     you shall me.DAT not   again   watch.television
     You shall not watch TV again and I want this to come true.   AH

For completeness, we can add to this list a further type of NSD, in which the dative pronoun is co-referential with the SUBJ, the so-called **coreferential dative** construction, illustrated in (15) (Al-Zahre and Boneh, 2010). Such examples typically express the **speaker**'s own attitude towards the eventuality. We do not discuss this type further in this paper (they are not found in Maltese).

---

[2]Bosse et al. (2012) eschew use of the term *ethical dative*, which has been the locus of some terminological confusion, sometimes used in the literature to refer to their (AH) (Rákosi, 2008; Gutzmann, 2007, 2011), and sometimes their (AE) type. Borer and Grodzinsky (1986) use *ethical dative* to cover Hebrew POSS and AE and Al-Zahre and Boneh (2010) to refer to AE in Hebrew and SA. They use "interested hearer datives" to refer to the AH in these languages.

(15) *Salma raʔṣet-l-a   šway*
    Salma dance.PAST.3SGF-to-3SGF a little
    Salma (just) danced a little (it's a minor issue). [Syrian Arabic]   SA

A central insight of BBY is to establish that these four (EP, BEN, AE, AH) subtypes of NSD construction have distinct properties: these are summarized in (16). One important dimension concerns whether or not the added dative argument makes a contribution to the truth-conditional semantics (TC vs. NTC in (16)). The distribution of these NSD construction types in the languages of their sample is shown in (17).

(16)

	EP	BEN	AH	AE
Semantics	possession	benefit	attitude to Prop	psychological
Poss reqd	yes	no	no	no
Nec. sentient	no	no	yes	yes
TC	yes	yes	no	y (Ger)/n (Heb)
NTC	no	no	yes	yes

(17)

	EP	BEN	AH	AE
Albanian	-	-	-	yes
German	yes	yes	yes	yes
French	-	-	yes	yes
Japanese	yes	yes	-	yes
Korean	yes	yes	-	-
Hebrew	yes	-	-	yes
Micmac	-	yes	-	-

4   Maltese Non-Selected Datives

In this section we consider how Maltese fits within this typology of NSDs: showing how the tests and diagnostics which they provide behave in this language. Unlike argument datives, which may be pronominal (affixal) or lexical — Maltese NSD are only pronominal in form (although the dative affix may be doubled by an external lexical NP associated with a discourse function). With one small exception involving certain cases of inalienable possession in a construct state construction, NSDs are optional.

4.1   Possessor Datives

Maltese involves two distinct means with which to realize possession. The first is a construct state or *iḍāfa* construction. The second involves the possessive prepositional marker *ta'* 'of', as in (18) and (19). (20) illustrates an external possessor dative (EP), while (21) shows that when a prepositional possessive is present, a NSD may not be interpreted as an external possessor EP: this example is ungrammatical *on the* EP *reading* of the NSD.

(18) *Pawlu farrak   il-karozza ta' Marija*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM DEF-car   of Mary
  Paul broke/ruined Mary's car.

(19) *Pawlu farrak   l-karozza tagħ-ha*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM DEF-car   of-3SGF.ACC
  Paul ruined her car.

(20) *Pawlu farrk-i-l-ha   l-karozza*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-car
  Paul ruined her car.   EP

(21) **Pawlu farrk-i-l-ha$_i$ l-karozza ta' Marija$_i$*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-car   of Mary
  Paul broke/ruined Mary's car.

(22) shows that the NSD can be optionally doubled by an external topic NP or a strong pronoun (*lil*-marking is obligatory on the human, proper name).

(22) *Pawlu farrk-i-l-ha   l-karozza (lil Marija)*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-car   DAT Mary
  Paul ruined Mary's car /Mary, I ruined her car.   EP

As noted above, except for such cases of discourse topics, the possessor can be only expressed once in such possessive constructions; either internally as in (18) and (19) or externally through the presence of a NSD in (20). Examples such as (23) and (24) are entirely parallel in interpretation, and both receive affected experiencer (rather than possessor) interpretations.

(23) *Pawlu farrk-i-l-ha$_i$ l-karozza tagħ-ha$_i$*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-car   of-3SGF.ACC
  Paul (went and) ruined her car on her.   AE

(24) *Pawlu farrk-i-l-na$_j$ l-karozza tagħ-ha$_i$*
  Paul   broke.up.3.PV.SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-1PL DEF-car   of-3SGF.ACC
  Paul went and) ruined her car on us.   AE

Although the examples so far have involved an external possessor associated with an OBJ function, it is possible also with other functions. In (25), *t-tifel* 'DEF-boy' is the SUBJ and *-lha* refers to the 'possessor' of *t-tifel*. *Marija* is optional, bears a discourse function and is intonationally offset. (26) and (27) illustrate possessor 'raising' from other grammatical functions.

(25) *Marija n-sterq-i-l-ha   t-tifel*
  Mary   PASS-stole.PV.3SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-boy
  Mary's boy was stolen.   SUBJ

(26) *Għamil-t-l-u   servis lill-karozza*
    did.PV-1SG-DAT-3SGM service DAT.DEF-car
    I serviced his car.   DAT OBJ

(27) *Ħdim-t-l-u   fuq il-karozza illum*
    worked.PV-1SG-DAT-3SGM on DEF-car   today
    I worked on his car today.   OBL OBJ

With the external possessor datives, a question such as (28) asks about an event concerning *his (Mario's) car* (so the possession relation is within the questioned event) and it is also possible for the possessor to be the target of a wh-question: these observations support the view that the NSD contributes to the at-issue or truth-conditional semantics, as argued by BBY. Note that (29) corresponds to a question on an EP NSD - the form of question corresponding to a prepositional possessive is shown in (30).

(28) *Fark-u-l-u   ('l-)karozza (lil Mario)?*
    broke.up.3.PV-PL-DAT-3SGM DEF-car   DAT Mario?
    Did they ruin Mario's car?

(29) *'L   min fark-u-l-u   ('l-)karozza?*
    DAT who broke.up.3.PV-PL-DAT-3SGM DEF-car?
    To whom did they ruin the car = Whose car did they ruin?

(30) *Il-karozza ta' min fark-u?*
    DEF-car   of who broke.up.3.PV-PL
    Lit: The car of whom did they ruin? = Whose car did they ruin?

Consistent with the fact that a NSD interpreted as an EP makes a truth-conditional contribution we see that the presence/absence of the NSD is associated with an interpretational distinction in (31): (31a) involves reference to a car owned by someone in the discourse context while (31b) refers to any car.

(31) a. *Jekk j-fark-u-l-u   ('l-)karozza ...*
       If   3-bring.to.pieces.IMPV-PL-DAT-3SGM DEF-car   ...
       If they ruin HIS car ...   EP

    b. *Jekk j-fark-u   ('l-)karozza ...*
       If   3-bring.to.pieces.IMPV-PL DEF-car   ...
       If they ruin the car - ANYONE'S car

4.2 Benefactive Datives

The NSD in Maltese can also have a benefactive interpretation. Under this interpretation the NSD in (33) can express the same meaning (abstracting away from the lexical content of the beneficiary itself) as (32), which involves an OBL with the preposition *għal*.

(32) *Ġab   il-ktieb   għal Marija biex*
got.PV.3SGM DEF-book for   Marija in.order.to
t-a-qra-h
3-FRM.VWL-read.IMPV.SGF-3SGM.ACC
He got the book for Mary to read.

(33) *Ġab-i-l-ha   l-ktieb   biex*
got.PV.3SGM-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-book in.order.to
t-a-qra-h
3-FRM.VWL-read.IMPV.SGF-3SGM.ACC
He got the book for her to read.

A BEN NSD can co-occur with an OBL with the preposition *għal* 'for', provided that they do not co-refer. In (34) the intended sense is consistent with a scenario in which the dative 'she' had been intending to give the book to Mary to read, but had not been able to because she did not have it herself.

(34) *Ġab-i-l-ha_i   l-ktieb   għal Marija_j biex*
got.PV.3SGM-EP-DAT-3SGF DEF-book for   Marija   in.order.to
t-a-qra-h_j
3-FRM.VWL-read.IMPV.SGF-3SGM.ACC
He got her (i.e. for her benefit) the book for Mary, in order for her (Mary) to read it.

An important fact about BEN datives, according to BBY, is that these do not require the BEN argument to be sentient, or alive (unlike the AE datives) and this holds true of NSDs with benefactive interpretations in Maltese:

(35) *Bdej-t   t-i-xgħel-l-u   xemgħa wara*
started.PV-2SG 2-FRM.VWL-light.up.IMPV-DAT-3SGM candle   after
li   miet.
COMP died.PV.3SGM
You started lighting a candle for him after he died.   BEN

Note that evidence that a NSD can correspond to an argument which may be distinguished from an (external) possessor is provided by the fact that a BEN dative may coexist with an internal possessor (which would itself give rise to an EP in the possessor NSD construction). Example (36) involves both a NSD with a benefactive interpretation and a (distinct) possessor, indicating that a BEN NSD is distinct from an EP one.

(36) *Had-t-l-u   t-tfal   ta' Marija l-iskola*
took.PV-1SG-DAT-3SGM DEF-children of Mary   DEF-school
I took Mary's children to school for him (i.e. for his benefit).   BEN

In the case of the BEN argument, the event *involving* (interpreted as including) the NSD can be negated (37) and questioned (38), providing evidence that the contribution made by the NSD is part of the truth-conditional or at-issue semantics. Note however that the BEN role cannot be directly negated when it is expressed as an NSD (see (39)) but only when it is expressed as a PP OBL as in (40); a restriction which perhaps follows from the affixal nature of the NSD.

(37) *Ma seraq-hom-l-i-x*
NEG stole.3SGM-3PL.ACC-DAT-1SG-NEG
He didn't steal them for me.   BEN

(38) *'L min bdej-t   t-i-xgħel-l-u   xemgħa*
DAT who started.PV-2SG 2-FRM.VWL-light.up.IMPV-DAT-3SGM candle
wara li   miet?
after COMP died.3SGM
Who did you start lighting a candle for after he died?   BEN

(39) **Seraq   l-affar-ijiet   imma ma*
stole.PV.3SGM DEF-thing-PL but   NEG
seraq-hom-l-i-x
stole.PV.3SGM-3PL.ACC-DAT-1SG-NEG
He stole the things, but he didn't steal them for me.

(40) *Seraq-ha   l-karozza. Biss ma*
stole.PV.3SGM-3SGF.ACC DEF-car.   but NEG
seraq-hie-x   għal-i-ja
stole.PV.3SGM-3SGF.ACC-NEG for-EP.VWL-1SG.ACC
He stole the car, but not for me.   BEN

4.3 Affected Experiencer Datives

A NSD may also be interpreted as an affected experiencer (AE), in which case the referent must be sentient and aware.

(41) *Is-subien ta' Rita żżewġ-u-**l-hom***   *kollha (***lil bniet ta'***
DEF-boys of Rita married.PV.3-PL-DAT-3PL all   DAT girls of
Carmen*), u   issa ma fadal   ħadd mir-raħal*
Carmen   CONJ now NEG left.3.PV.SGM no.one from.DEF-village
għal-i-hom
for-EP.VWL-3PL.ACC
All of Rita's boys (went and got) married on-them (Carmen's daughters) all, and now there is no one in the village left for them (Carmen's daughters).

(42) *Wasal-l-i   tard mill-iskola   t-tifel*
arrived.3SGM-DAT-1SG late from.DEF-school DEF-boy
The boy arrived late from school, affecting me by doing so.   AE

Because a AE interpretation is only available for alive and sentient participants, *Pawlu* cannot antecede the NSD in (43):

(43) *Meta miet Pawlu_i, ftit wara miet-it-l-u_j*
when died.PV.3SGM Paul a.little after died-PV.3SGF-DAT-3SGM
omm-u_j
mother-ACC.3SGM
When Paul died, his ($\neq$ Paul) mother died soon after.

Just as in the case of the BEN dative, we see that an AE NSD can co-occur with a separate possessor, and hence that AEs are not simply possessors.

(44) *Ħbej-t-i-l-ha l-kotba ta' ħi-ja ħalli*
hid.PV-1SG-EP.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-book.PL of brother-1SG.ACC so.that
ma t-a-qra-hom-x
NEG 3-EP.VWL-read.IMPV.SGF-3PL.ACC-NEG
I went and hid my brother's books (i.e. adversely affecting her), so that she does not read them.   AE

BBY argue that AEs are the locus of parametric variation in a number of respects. In particular, they suggest that AE are wholly non-truth conditional in some languages (contributing conventionally implicated (*ci*) content only), but may also contribute to the truth-conditional (*at issue*) semantics in other languages. In fact a major concern of their paper is to establish that AE NSDs *may* contribute to both *ci* and *at issue* domains and to propose a treatment of such hybrid elements. Detailed discussion of their assumptions, and in particular of their claim that the observed behaviour of German AEs is evidence for a putative dual contribution to both domains is beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless it is interesting to note their claim that AE datives are entirely non-truth conditional in Hebrew. The evidence suggests that this is not so in Maltese: (45), which shows that the NSD with an AE interpretation may be within the scope of negation, is just as good as (37). We think, therefore, that in Maltese at least, AE NSD contribute to the *at-issue* semantics. Further evidence comes from the fact that an event involving the AE can be questioned (46), and the affected experiencer can be wh-questioned, as in (47).

(45) *Għad-hom ma żżewġ-u-l-hom-x kollha (lil bniet ta'*
still-3PL.ACC NEG married.PV.3-PL-DAT-3PL-NEG all DAT girls of
Carmen), is-subien ta' Rita, jiġifieri għad-hom fiċ-ċans.
Carmen DEF-boys of Rita, so.this.means still-3PL.ACC in.DEF-chance
Rita's boys have still not all married on them, which means that they (Carmen's girls) still have a chance (i.e. to get married to Rita's remaining boys).

(46) *Żżewġ-u-l-hom kollha (lil bniet ta' Carmen) is-subien ta'*
married.PV.3-PL-DAT-3PL all DAT girls of Carmen DEF-boys of
Rita?
Rita
Did all of Rita's boys get married on them - (Carmen's daughters)?   AE

(47) *Min huma dawk li jekk j-iżżewġ-u-l-hom kollha is-subien ta'*
who cop.PL those COMP if 3-marry-PL-DAT-3PL all DEF-boys of
Rita, ma j-i-bqa-x raġel mir-raħal
Rita, NEG 3-EP.VWL-left-NEG man from.DEF-village
għal-i-hom?
for-FRM.VWL-3PL.ACC
Who are the ones who if all of Rita's boys marry on-them, there will be no
man left for them from the village? AE

A further relevant observation concerns conditional sentences. If the AE makes
a contribution to the (regular) semantics, then the inclusion of an experiencer dative
in the clause should make a difference to the interpretation of the antecedent of a
conditional clause. The following pair do in fact differ in meaning precisely in
terms of whether the speaker is affected by all the boys marrying.

(48) *Jekk j-iżżewġ-u-**l-i*** *kollha s-subien ta' Rita, Rina se*
If 3-marry.IMPV-PL-DAT-1SG all DEF-boys of Rita Rina FUT
t-a-għti lil Rita 100 ewro.
3SGF-EP.VWL-give DAT Rita 100 euros
If all of Rita's boys get married on me, then Rina will give Rita $100 euros.

(49) *Jekk jiżżewġu kollha, s-subien ta' Rita, Rina se*
If 3-marry-PL-DAT-1SG all DEF-boys of Rita Rina FUT
t-a-għti lil Rita 100 ewro.
3SGF-EP.VWL-give DAT Rita 100 euros
If all of Rita's boys get married, then Rina will give Rita $100 euros.

4.4 Attitude Holder Datives

We turn now to the fourth type, the AH or attitude holder dative, in (50). Unlike the
other types of NSD, the Maltese AH dative cannot be doubled by an external topic,
(51), and it cannot be questioned or negated (see (52)).

(50) *Rebħ-i-l-na, lilna, kien*
won.PV.3SGM-EP.VWL-1PL.DAT-1PL, lilna, was.PV.3SGM
He had won on us (ie. affecting us by doing so). AE

(51) *Ejja ħa t-i-rbħ-i-l-na*
come.IMP.2SG so.that 2-FRM.VWL-win.IMPV.SG-EP.VWL-DAT.1PL
*lilna/*aħna*
we.DAT/we.NOM
Come on! Win! AH

(52) *'L min sejjer t-i-rbaħ-l-u?*
ACC who going.SGM 2-FRM.VWL-wins.IMPV.SG-DAT-3SGM
Whom are you going to win on-him?

The construction occurs only with 1st and 2nd person pronouns, and only in imperative and exclamative clause types.[3] Pragmatically, such expressions may serve as a politeness strategy directed towards the addressee as in (55).

(53) *Ara!*   *ħa*   *t-i-tilq-u-l-i*   *mid-dar*
      See.IMP.2SG FUT 2-FRM.VWL-leave.IMPV-PL-DAT-1SG from.DEF-house
      fl-aħħar   *?!*
      in.DEF-last
      See/Look at this! You are finally leaving the house?!   AH

(54) *Itilq-u-l-i*   *minn quddiem-i*
      leave.IMP-PL-DAT-1SG from in-front-1SG.ACC
      Get away from in front of me!   AH

(55) *ħa*   *n-e-ħod-l-ok*   *naqra ilma jekk*
      FUT 1-EP.VWL-take.IMPV.SG-DAT-2SG a.little water if
      j-o-għġb-ok
      3-EP.VWL-like/please.SGM-2SG.ACC
      I will take on-you some water please   AH

4.5 Summary

This section has applied the classification of non-selected dative types developed in BBY to Maltese. All NSDs in Maltese are expressed as dative verbal affixes. Maltese has all four types proposed in the BBY classification, with a major distinction emerging between the AH datives on the one hand, and the three other types of NSD (EP, BEN and AE) on the other hand. The former make no contribution to the at-issue semantics, and indeed syntactically, the NSD affix is limited to 1st and 2nd person and may not be doubled by a (dative-marked) NP (topic). On the other hand, the other three types show the syntactic behaviour expected of syntactic arguments.

The picture emerging for Maltese is rather different than that BBY claim for Hebrew: that language, they assert, has just two types of NSD, the EP and the AE, with the latter being entirely non-truth conditional. However, examples provided in Al-Zahre and Boneh (2010) indicate that the AE type is probably also found in Hebrew, and as shown below, Syrian Arabic shares at least the EP, AE and AH types (and just as in Maltese, these are expressed by means of a verbal affix).[4]

(56) *Sami kasar-lo*   *ǝn-naDDaar-aat le-ʕali*
      Sami break.PV.3MS.-to.3MS the-glass-PL   to-Ali
      Sami broke Ali's glasses. [Syrian Arabic]   EP

---

[3]With imperatives this is highly colloquial in use and is most likely with the imperative form *ejja* 'come', which functions like 'come on' in English.

[4]We believe it is highly likely that BEN datives also exist in SA and other Arabic dialects. On the other hand, Maltese appears to lack the coreferential dative. Further cross-dialectal work is required to determine whether Maltese is merely exceptional in this regard or whether distributional variables may be detected.

(57) *Ɛali Ɛam-yəтfalsaf-la   la-salma*
     Ali PROG-philosophize.IMPV.3MS-to.3FS to-Salma
     Ali is philosophizing on Salma (this aggravates her). [Syrian Arabic]   AE

(58) *šəf-tə-lek   šaʔfət šab!*
     see.PV-1S-to.2FS piece young man
     I saw one of these guys! [Syrian Arabic]   AH

5   The analysis

The syntactic analysis we offer makes a fundamental distinction between the AH dative and the remaining three types of NSD. These latter are essentially distinguished from each other in the semantics, in terms of the different entailments over the added participant which they involve: from a morphosyntactic point of view, at least the AE and the BEN NSDs (and we would suggest also the EP datives) are indistinguishable. As we have seen in the discussion of data above, NSD which are interpreted as EP, BEN or AE participants are *syntactically active*, participating in syntactic constructions such as wh-question formation, and also contribute to the at-issue semantics. These properties indicate that these NSDs result from a valency-increasing operation in the morphology which introduces an additional argument. The AH dative is clearly distinct, showing a markedly different behaviour in the syntax (for example, it cannot be the focus of a wh-question, cannot be doubled by a co-referential NP topic or occur as a free pronoun) and does not contribute to the at-issue semantics: this behaviour is fully consistent with BBY's observations concerning AH datives in other languages. We will propose that while both sets of NSDs involve the same morphological realization, they do not share the same morphosemantic operation: the *syntactically active* types of NSD involve the introduction of an additional syntactic argument, but the AH type does not.[5]

A reasonable starting point would seem to be to model the analysis of the syntactically active NSDs (EP, BEN, AE) on that of selected dative arguments in ditransitive constructions such as (59), for they share the syntactic properties of these arguments (that is, they can be doubled by a dative-marked external topic, can be focused, and involve a dative-marked pronoun attached to the verb).

(59) a. *Bgħat-t-i-l-ha   l-ittra*
        sent.PV-1SG-EPENT.VWL-DAT-3SGF DEF-letter
        I sent the letter to her.   PRON. CDAT

     Bgħat-t   il-ktieb   lil Marija
     end.PV-1SG DEF-book.SGM DAT Mary
     I sent the book to Mary.   CDAT

---

[5]A theory-internal consequence which is perhaps of some passing interest is that if we are correct, then one morphological operation (affixation of a dative pronominal marker) can correspond to a multiplicity of different effects (ie is not classified as either morphosemantic or morphosyntactic), as claimed also in Kroeger (2007).

In the canonical ditransitive construction in Maltese the goal/recipient argument is expressed as a dative NP or incorporated dative pronominal. Although the *l*-marking (*lil Marija*) derives diachronically from a preposition, it does not function synchronically as such, and the dative argument does not correspond to a PP in c-structure or an OBL in f-structure. Unlike a primary OBJ, it is not accessible to promotion to SUBJ by passivization, and of course, shows distinct morphological marking when incorporated. Sadler and Camilleri (2012) argue that in the canonical ditransitive construction in Maltese the goal/recipient argument corresponds to a restricted OBJ, in particular a OBJ_{recip} as proposed (for some languages) in Kibort (2008). Kibort argues that standard LMT does not provide an adequate account of the range of syntactic realizations of ditransitive constructions. In standard LMT two surface mappings are provided by associating different intrinsic classification features with the arguments. As a result, in the prepositional construction the theme maps to OBJ and the recipient/goal to OBL while in the dative shift construction the recipient/beneficiary/goal is the OBJ (and accessible to promotion under passivization) and the theme is a restricted object OBJ_{theme}:[6]

(60) **dative shift**   recip OBJ   theme OBJ_θ
      dative oblique recip OBL   theme OBJ

Kibort (2008) argues persuasively that dative arguments are distinct from both (first, direct) objects and prepositional obliques, and recognises three mappings for RECIP (and similar) arguments. In her approach, which uses a layer of ordered arguments mediating between semantic roles (or rather, sets of semantic entailments) and intrinsic features (underspecifying grammatical functions), the RECIP argument may map variously to arg2 (when it will surface as OBJ in active clauses), arg3 (when it will surface as a canonical dative in languages permitting this encoding), and arg 4 (when it surfaces as a prepositional oblique). In this version of LMT, then, argument positions (i.e. the valency slots of the predicate) constitute an independent level of representation which mediates the relation between semantic participants and grammatical function assignment.[7]

(61) $<$ arg1   arg2   arg3   arg4   ...   argn $>$
           $-o/-r$ $-r$ $+o$ $-o$ $-o$

The association of semantic arguments with argument positions is guided by the (relative prominence of the) sets of entailments associated the different arguments, and hence a recipient argument associated with arg3 is associated with more

---

[6]A different alternative to the standard LMT approach to dative arguments in ditransitive predicates is proposed in Alsina (1996), in which function argument biuniqueness is abandoned and both arguments are treated as (primary) OBJ. However it seems that this approach fails to distinguish adequately between dative objects and 'shifted' goal/recipient arguments, that is, between the canonical dative construction and the shifted construction. This is clearly inadequate for Maltese, where both are found, with different properties associated with the goal/recipient argument. See Sadler and Camilleri (2012) for discussion.

[7]For arguments in favour of the tiered approach using an ordered args list in additional to the semantic roles, see, *inter alia* Ackerman and Moore (2001).

Proto-Benefactive entailments (Primus, 1999) than one associated with arg4, and a recipient argument associated with arg2 bears a significant number of Proto-Patient entailments (and hence outranks the theme argument in dative shift constructions). For clarity, such sets of entailments are abbreviated (by Kibort) in the notation x, y, b, standing for the three participants in a ditransitive event: where x stands for the participant with the most P-A entailments, y for the (Proto-Patient) theme argument and b for the recipient/beneficiary argument. It is important to bear in mind that in the different cases, distinct sets of entailments may be associated with these participants. The point of reference which remains constant in modelling argument structure is the syntactic representation of the predicate's valence and not the ordering of the semantic participants themselves (Ackerman and Moore, 2001, 44ff).

This approach to ditransitive constructions therefore accommodates three distinct mappings for such predicates, as shown in (62):

	canonical dative	recip OBJ_{recip}	theme OBJ
(62)	**dative shift**	recip OBJ	theme OBJ_{theme}
	dative oblique	recip OBL	theme OBJ

Semantic participants should be understood as sets of semantic entailments of the predicate but not as discrete thematic roles which are part of the lexical entry of verbs. In subsection 5.1 we briefly illustrate how this approach may be applied to Maltese ditransitive verbs, before extending it to non-selected datives in 5.2.

5.1 Maltese Ditransitives

In Maltese, the canonical dative mapping is the default realization for ditransitive verbs and is available for all verbs in this class (with semantic arguments x,y,b. An example such as (59) is mapped as in (63).

			x	y	b	
(63)	bagħat	$<$	arg1	arg2	arg3 $>$	
			-o	-r	+o	**canonical dative**
			SUBJ	OBj	OBJ_{recip}	

Here the theme (y) argument outranks the b argument: the latter corresponds to a dative-marked (thematically restricted) OBJ_{recip}. The OBJ_{recip} may be a lexical NP, a free pronoun (under certain syntactic conditions) or an incorporated pronominal as in (59a). As noted above, the y argument, but not the b argument is accessible to promotion to SUBJ under passivisation in this construction, which is as predicted by this mapping.

The dative oblique (or prepositional) mapping is also available for verbs with the ditransitive argument frames (x,y,b) where the b argument may be encoded by an appropriate preposition consistent with the semantic interpretation. An example can be provided for the verb *bagħa* 'send', as in (64). Here the b argument corresponds to an arg4, which maps to an OBL.

(64) *Il-kmandant bagħat 'l kull tifla għand omm-ha*
    DEF-commander sent.PV.3SGM ACC every girl at mother-3SGM.ACC
    The commander sent every girl to her mother.

(65)

		x	y	b	
bagħat	<	arg1	arg2	arg4 >	
		-o	-r	+r	**dative as oblique**
		SUBJ	OBj	OBL	

Interestingly, there is some evidence that the dative shift construction is also found in Maltese (with the consequence that all three mappings are attested and hence that a theory which accommodates only two is problematic). The dative shift mapping in Maltese is subject to two major restrictions: it is (i) available only with a subset of the ditransitive verbs, and (ii) it is limited to cases where the recipient (b) argument is (an accusative, or OBJ) pronominal (and hence expressed in the verbal morphology). This is somewhat reminiscent of an applicative, although the morphological marker *is* the recipient argument and not simply an (additional) applicative morph. For fuller discussion of this construction, the argumentation underlying this analysis, and further data illustrating the alternations more fully, see Sadler and Camilleri (2012). The dative shift mapping is shown in (67): the diacritic +*OM* on the lexeme should be read as indicating that the verbal morphology includes an object affix.

(66) *wrie-h it-triq*
    show.PV.3SGM-3SGM.ACC DEF-road
    He showed him the road.

(67)

		x	b	y	
wera$_{+OM}$	<	arg1	arg2	arg3 >	
		-o	-r	+o	**shifted dative**
		SUBJ	OBj	OBJ$_\theta$	

We are now in a position to extend this approach to the set of non-selected dative arguments which are the focus of this paper. We propose that the analysis of what we have called syntactically active non-selected datives should be closely modelled on that of the canonical datives in the ditransitive construction with which they share many significant properties. The difference between SDs and NSDs is that the latter are not included as part of the verb's basic valence, but are added by a general valency increasing morphosemantic operation which is widely applicable to Maltese verbs, including, for example, intransitive verbs such as *raqad* 'sleep', as illustrated in (68).

(68) *Raqad-l-i l-kelb*
    slept.PV.3SGM-DAT-1SG DEF-dog
    The dog slept on me = affected me by sleeping.

5.2 Maltese Non-Selected Datives

Our proposal is that Maltese NSDs with BEN, EP and AE interpretations result from a morphosemantic operation in the lexicon which (i) applies to a base predicate introducing an additional argument associated with a small range of closely related lexical entailments; (ii) introduces a pronominal argument (affix) associated with that additional argument. The output of this morphosemantic process is to increase the valency of the predicate by addition of an argument whose semantic entailments are consistent with the arg3 role. This in turn means that the added argument will be mapped (under Kibort (2008)'s mapping theory) to (one of a small number of) OBJ_θ. Although it is not selected as part of the basic valency of the verb, a NSD in one of these classes is not non-thematic, for it results from a process which extends the predicate's *a*-structure, in much the same way as an applicative construction may extend a predicate's argument structure.[8] This morphosemantic operation adding an arg3 is schematized in (69): **a** stands for a participant associated with entailments consistent with beneficiaries, affected arguments or possessors. In the case of a ditransitive predicate, as discussed in the previous section, a (dative) pronominal affix (DAT.OM) results from a morphosyntactic operation in the sense that it simply realizes an (appropriate) arg3. (70) shows the mapping which results for predicates extended by a non-selected dative (in this case, added to a transitive predicate).

$$(69) \quad +\text{DAT.OM} \quad < \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{a} \\ \text{arg3} \\ \text{+o} \end{array} \quad > \quad \text{+affected/ben/poss}$$

$$(70) \quad \text{V+DAT.OM} \quad < \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{x} & \text{y} & \text{a} \\ \text{arg1} & \text{arg2} & \text{arg3} \\ \text{-o} & \text{-r} & \text{+o} \\ \hline \text{SUBJ} & \text{OBj} & \text{OBJ}_{b/p/ae} \end{array} \quad > \quad \text{+affected/ben/poss}$$

If this approach is along the right lines, it is clear that dative case can signal a range of closely related OBJ_θ roles (a similar point is established, looking at different construction types, in Kibort (2008)). This raises the question of whether multiple dative arguments might co-occur. Given limitations on morphological resources, the addition of two NSD is not expected in Maltese, as such non-selected arguments are necessarily morphological in this language, and the morphology makes available only one 'slot' in the verbal template for such affixes. However one might wonder whether examples might be found in which a non-pronominal CDAT

---

[8] As Kibort (2008) notes, in symmetrical applicative languages, two alternative mappings are found, so an applied argument in such languages map may to arg3.

$$(i) \quad < \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{x} & \text{y} & \text{b} \\ \text{arg1} & \text{arg2} & \text{arg3} \\ \text{-o} & \text{-r} & \text{+o} \end{array} > \quad \textbf{ben as canonical dative}$$

Further, in languages in which a transitivising applicative can add up to two core arguments, the second applied argument position will also be pre-specified as [+o] and mapped into OBJ_θ, resulting in two secondary objects which "will be distinguished by their subscripts" (Kibort, 2008, 19).

(in a standard ditransitive) and a NSD co-oocur. Consider the following example, which seems to exemplify just this combination. Here the dative affix introduces an argument with an affected experiencer interpretation.

(71) *Bagħat-l-i*   *l-ittra*   *lil* *Pawlu bi* *żball*
     sent.PV.3SGM-DAT-1SG DEF-letter DAT Paul   with mistake

     He sent the letter to Paul by mistake, affecting me in doing so.   AE

		x	y	a	b	
(72) V+DAT.OM	<	arg1	arg2	arg3	arg3	>
		-o	-r	+o	+o	
		SUBJ	OBj	OBJ$_{recip}$	OBJ$_{ben/poss/ae}$	

Before turning to the analysis of the (syntactically inactive) attitude holder datives, we flag an issue concerning the analysis of EP non-selected datives such as (73). In such cases the external possessor is semantically (also) an argument of one of its co-arguments, here the OBJ *l-pum* 'the handle'. Further, for reasons that we do not fully understand, if the external possessor (EP dative) is such that it would have been expressed *inside* the NP argument by means of the Maltese construct state (which is heavily restricted, mainly to cases of inalienable possession, most usually kinship terms and body parts), then it is often obligatory to double the EP by a pronominal affix on the noun it would be in construct with, as in (74).

(73) *Qsam-t-l-u*   *l-pum*   *('ill-bieb).*
     broke-1SG-DAT-3SGM DEF-handle DAT.DEF-door

     I broke the handle of the door (door handle).
     The door, I broke its handle.   EP

(74) *Marija weġġħ-et-l-i*   *id-i*   *x'ħin*
     Mary   hurt.CAUSE.PV-3SGF-DAT-1SG hand-1SG.ACC what.time
     qars-it-ni
     pinched.PV-3SGF-1SG.ACC

     Mary hurt my hand when she pinched me.

We do not have anything to add at this point about cases such as (74) involving the construct state, but the question arises in connection with examples such as (73) as to whether the possessor should be represented syntactically within the f-structure corresponding to the possessum. Such an approach is often adopted in the literature for cases of possessor raising, in which (typically) a possessor 'raises' to (non-thematic) OBJ, 'displacing' the second argument to an OBL, as in *John kissed Mary on the cheek*: for example Lødrup (2009) proposes a functional control equation (↑ OBJ) = (↑ OBL OBJ POSS) in such cases. If cases of dative external possession were similar, they would involve a functional control equation added as a side-effect of the morphosemantic operation in the lexicon. There are, however, a number of differences between possessor raising and the dative external possessor construction - in particular, the possessor is a non-thematic OBJ in

the former and hence a syntactic control relation is required for completeness and coherence. Further, the possessum is not restricted to an OBL OBJ function, but can correspond to a range of different GFs, and hence an f-control equation along the lines of (75). We tend to the view that there is no motivation for representing the possessor-possessum relation syntactically by means of a control equation, but leave this question open.[9]

(75) $(\uparrow \{\text{OBJ} \mid \text{SUBJ} \mid \text{OBL OBJ} \mid \text{OBJ}_{recip} \} \text{POSS}) = (\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{poss})$

Finally, we turn to the treatment of AH non-selected datives: we have shown there is no evidence that they are syntactically active. In common with other sub-types of NSD, attitude holder arguments are expressed by means of a dative affix, but AH datives *cannot* be linked to topicalised NP arguments, unlike other types of NSD. The AH interpretation is also only available for first and second person markers (denoting speaker/hearer participants). There is no evidence that the AH dative contributes to the at-issue semantics. We suggest, therefore, an additional role for the 1person and 2person dative affix: effectively, it may simply realize *pragmatic* information. A possible analysis is that the AH non-selected dative is simply absent from the syntax and the semantics —- the morphology encodes only *ci* meaning. An analysis along these lines is effectively proposed (although in the context of different syntactic assumptions) in Gutzmann (2007) as shown in (76) (for German *mir* 'me.DAT').

(76) $\text{MIR}_{DE}: : \lambda\text{P}.\text{MIR}_{DE}(\text{P}) =_{def} \lambda \text{P}. \text{want}(\text{Speaker})(\text{P}): < t^a, t^c >$

Within an LFG context, there is no reason, of course, to rule out a morphology-pragmatics correspondence which has no representation on the syntactic levels. This seems to us to be a promising direction in which to develop an analysis of morphologically expressed AH datives.

References

Ackerman, Farrell and Moore, John. 2001. *Proto-Properties and Grammatical Encoding: A Correspondence Theory of Argument Selection*. CSLI Publications.

Al-Zahre, Nisrine. 2003. *La Structure du Groupe Verbal en Arabe*. Ph. D.thesis, Université Paris VIII.

Al-Zahre, Nisrine and Boneh, Nora. 2010. Coreferential Dative Constructions in Syrian Arabic and Modern Hebrew. *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 2, 248–282.

Alsina, Alex. 1996. *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar: Evidence from Romance*. CSLI Publications.

Borer, Hagit and Grodzinsky, Yosef. 1986. Syntactic cliticization and lexical cliticization: The case of Hebrew dative clitics. In *Syntax and Semantics, 19*, pages 175–217, Academic Press.

---

[9]It is possible that the obligatory presence of the pronominal affix within the possessum in (74) might weigh in favour of an f-control/a-control approach to these EP constructions, but do not yet understand the nature of this interaction with the construct state.

Bosse, Solveig, Bruening, Benjamin and Yamada, Masahiro. 2012. Affected Experiencers. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30/4, 1185–1230.

Camilleri, Maris. 2011. On pronominal verbal enclitics in Maltese. In Sandro Caruna, Ray Fabri and Thomas Stolz (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics; Syntax and the Lexicon*, pages 131–56, Academie Verlag.

Gutzmann, Daniel. 2007. Eine Implikatur konventioneller Art: Der Dativus Ethicus. *Linguistische Berichte* 211, 277–308.

Gutzmann, Daniel. 2011. Expressive Modifiers and Mixed Expressions. In Olivier Bonami and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 8*, pages 123–41, http://www.cssp.cnrs/fr/eiss8.

Kibort, Anna. 2008. On the syntax of Ditransitive Constructions. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *On-line Proceedings of the LFG2008 Conference*, CSLI Publications.

Kroeger, Paul. 2007. Morphosyntactic vs. morphosemantic functions of Indonesian -kan. In Annie Zaenen, Jane Simpson, Tracy King, Jane Grimshaw, Joan Maling and Chris Manning (eds.), *Architectures, Rules, and Preferences: Variations on Themes of Joan Bresnan*, CSLI Publications.

Lødrup, Helge. 2009. Looking Possessor Raising in the mouth: Norwegian Possessor Raising with Unergatives. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *On-line Proceedings of the LFG2009 Conference*.

Primus, Beatrice. 1999. *Cases and Thematic Roles: Ergative, Accusative and Active*. Niemeyer.

Rákosi, György. 2008. Some remarks on Hungarian ethical datives. In József Andor, Béla Hollóst, Tibor Laczkó and Péeter Pelyvás (eds.), *When grammar minds language and literature*, pages 413–22, University of Debrecen.

Sadler, Louisa and Camilleri, Maris. 2012. Ditransitive Predicates and Dative Arguments in Maltese, University of Essex.