

Benefactive periphrases: a typological approach

Denis CREISSELS
Université Lumière (Lyon2)
e-mail: denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

1. Introduction

The recognition and analysis of periphrastic constructions functionally equivalent to morphological derivations encoding operations on verbal valency has been a recurrent topic in the study of passive and causative constructions. By contrast, applicative periphrases are largely neglected in the general literature on valency changes, although such constructions have been described in many languages.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, after defining the notion of applicative periphrasis, I define benefactive periphrases as a semantic subtype of applicative periphrases, and I examine their general properties. In section 3, I propose to distinguish three formal types of benefactive periphrases according to the grammatical nature of the verb forms involved, and in section 4, I examine their geographical distribution. In section 5, I discuss the possible correlations between types of benefactive periphrases and types of clause chains encoding successive events. In section 6, I examine the grammaticalization paths in which benefactive periphrases are involved. Section 7 is devoted to the use of ‘take’ in complex predicates expressing an autobenefactive meaning. Section 8 examines the use of verbs other than ‘give’ in benefactive periphrases.

2. Benefactive periphrases: definition and introductory remarks

2.1. Applicative periphrases

An applicative periphrasis involves two verbs designated here as *lexical verb* (abbreviated as Vlex) and *verb-operator* (abbreviated as Vop). The lexical verb determines the type of event encoded by the applicative periphrasis, and the argument structure of the applicative periphrasis is the argument structure of the lexical verb augmented by an additional participant. Vop acts as a valency operator whose contribution to the construction is limited to licensing the expression of an additional participant fulfilling a given semantic role in the event encoded by the lexical verb, without modifying the expression of the other participants.

The type of semantic role assigned by the verb acting as a valency operator in an applicative periphrasis has a historical connection with one of the roles assigned by the same verb when independently used in predicate function, but semantic evolutions may result in that, synchronically, verbs in valency operator function in applicative periphrases assign roles

that sometimes have no direct connection with their argument structure as independent verbs.

2.2. Benefactive periphrases: definition

Applicative periphrases licensing various sub-types of beneficiaries, illustrated by examples (1) to (3), are particularly common.

(1) *Yoruba* (Abraham 1962)

Ó rà iwé fún iyá

3SG buy book give mother

‘He bought a book for his mother’ (recipient beneficiary)

(2) *Yoruba* (Abraham 1962)

Ó pè-é fún mí

3SG call-3SG give 1SG

‘He called him for me’ (deputative beneficiary)

(3) *Twí* (Christaller 1933:566)

Owu kyεε me

3SG.die share 1SG

‘He died for me, for my benefit’ (plain beneficiary)

The term ‘benefactive periphrasis’ is used here as an abbreviation for ‘applicative periphrasis licensing the expression of a beneficiary’.¹

2.3. What benefactive periphrases are not

Note that the definition formulated in section 2.2 does not apply to all periphrastic constructions expressing benefactive / malefactive meanings, but only to those whose argument structure can be described as the result of the addition of a beneficiary to the argument structure of the lexical verb. For example, the periphrastic passive of Vietnamese, illustrated by ex. (4), is outside the scope of this study. The point is that the verb-operator in this periphrasis does not license the expression an additional participant: it obligatorily specifies whether the P argument of the lexical verb is positively or negatively affected, which is an entirely different operation.

¹ Instrumental and comitative periphrases are other cross-linguistically common semantic subtypes of applicative periphrases.

(4) *Vietnamese*

a. *Học sinh được thầy giáo khen*
pupil get teacher praise

‘The pupil was [positively affected by being] praised by the teacher’

b. *Học sinh bị thầy giáo đánh*
pupil undergo teacher beat

‘The pupil was [negatively affected by being] beaten by the teacher’

Similarly, the Munda language Santali has a periphrasis in which *jəm-* ‘eat’ expresses a malefactive meaning – ex. (5), which however is not a malefactive periphrasis in the sense of a construction licensing the expression of a valency-external participant affected to his/her detriment, but rather a passive construction implying that the patient of a transitive verb (promoted to subject role) is negatively affected by the action of the agent (represented by a dative-marked NP).

(5) *Santali* (Neukom 2001:17)

Uni-then ədi ruhet'-iŋ jəm-akat'a
that(AN)-DAT much scold-A1SG eat-PFV.ACT-IND

‘I got scolded baldly by him’ (lit. ‘I ate much scolding from him’)

A similar phenomenon is found in Hindi, which has couples of light verb constructions such as *dhokhā denā* ‘give cheating’ > ‘deceive’ / *dhokhā khānā* ‘eat cheating’ > ‘get deceived’, in which the light verb ‘eat’ expresses passive diathesis. Further illustrations of this use of ‘give’ in Hindi are for example *mār khānā* ‘eat blow’ > ‘be beaten’, *gālī khānā* ‘eat insult’ > ‘be insulted’, etc. (Montaut 2004:91 & Annie Montaut, p.c.).

The definition formulated in section 2.2 also excludes a type of biverbal benefactive construction found in Gumer and other Ethiosemitic languages (Völlmin 2007), in which a dative-marked NP representing a beneficiary is introduced by a converbial form of the verb ‘say’ – ex. (6). The point is that, in such constructions, the beneficiary NP is case-marked in the same way as in monoverbal constructions, and the construction with ‘say’ is used in cases when another dative-marked NP is present in the construction of the main verb (in particular, in the presence of a patient NP requiring dative marking, as in ex. (6)). Consequently ‘say’ does not act here as a role assigner, its introduction is rather a disambiguating strategy aiming to avoid the presence of two NPs with identical case marking in the construction of the same verb.

(6) *Gumer* (Völlmin 2007)

Arægga yə-Kəbbədə y-Abbəβə t-i-βir k'wət't'ər-ə-n-im
Aregga DAT-Kebbede DAT-Abbebe when-A3SGM-say.IPFV kill.PFV-A3SGM-P3SGM-???

‘Aregga killed Kebbede for Abbebe’ (lit. ‘Aregga killed Kebbede saying “for Abbebe”’)

2.4. Benefactive and malefactive

Rather than a specifically benefactive meaning, benefactive periphrases may express a more general meaning of affectedness lending itself to malefactive interpretations, depending on the context – ex. (7).

(7) *Yoruba* (Abraham 1962)

a. *Ó puró fún mí*
3SG cut.lie give 1SG
'He lied to me'

b. *íbi t-ó se fún mí*
harm REL-3SG make give 1SG
'the harm he did to me'

However, the malefactive use of benefactive periphrases seems to be less common than the malefactive use of benefactive constructions involving applicative derivation or adpositions, which suggests that the extension of the use of benefactive periphrases to the expression of malefactive meanings tends to occur at a relatively advanced stage of the grammaticalization process.

An important observation concerning malefactives is that I have found no mention of applicative periphrases involving verb-operators expressing malefactive meanings only, either in descriptive grammars or in the literature on benefactives and malefactives. One can imagine biclausal constructions implying that a participant expressed in one of the two clauses is negatively affected by the event described by the other clause (like in English 'He ate the cake without leaving anything for me'), but I know of no language having grammaticalized a verb-operator specifically encoding malefactive.

For example, a superficial look at the Baule serial verb construction illustrated by ex. (8) could suggest analyzing it as a malefactive periphrasis.

(8) *Baule*

Bè-dí bè-kpè mín
A3PL-eat A3PL-cut 1SG
'They eat without giving anything to me'

However the use of this construction is limited to expressing the exclusion of a participant, which is not the same thing as malefaction: the excluded participant is negatively affected by the fact of being excluded, not by the event from which (s)he is excluded. Consequently it would not be correct to analyze this construction as a grammaticalized malefactive periphrasis.

The absence of dedicated malefactive periphrases is consistent with the fact that, more generally, dedicated malefactive markers are much less common in the languages of the world than dedicated benefactive markers, and at least some of the cases of benefactive vs. malefactive marking that have been reported seem to boil down to a contextual interpretation

of a basically centripetal vs. centrifugal contrast – see e.g. Salas 2006:121-4 and Zúñiga 2007 on Mapudungun.

2.5. Benefactive and autobenefactive

In principle, any type of construction licensing a beneficiary NP can express autobenefactive via reflexivization. However, some of the languages that have a benefactive periphrasis also have a distinct periphrasis expressing an autobenefactive meaning. This question is developed in section 7.

2.6. General characteristics of benefactive periphrases

Benefactive periphrases have the following two characteristics:

(a) the verb in valency operator function, when used independently, almost always expresses the general meaning ‘give’, or denotes a particular type of giving (e.g. ‘share’, as in ex. (3) above),

(b) irrespective of the status of the language in question with respect to constituent order typology, ‘give’ almost always occupies the second position in benefactive periphrases.²

There are however some exceptions.

The use of verbs other than ‘give’ as valency operators in benefactive periphrases is examined in section 8.

Concerning the generalization according to which ‘give’ occurs in second position in benefactive periphrases, the best-known exception is Mandarin Chinese – ex. (9).

(9) *Mandarin Chinese* (Li & Thompson 1981:388)

Wǒ gěi tā jì le yì fēng xìn
1SG give 3SG mail PFV one CLF letter
‘I mailed a letter for him/her’

The other cases of benefactive periphrases with ‘give’ in first position I am aware of are the Tibeto-Burman language Yongning Na (Lidz 2006), the Papuan language Abui (Kratochvíl 2007:394-6), and Ecuadorian Highland Spanish (Haboud 1994, Haboud 1998:215-223). We will return to the case of Mandarin, Yongning Na and Abui in sections 6.3.2-3, since the exceptional order of the benefactive periphrasis in those languages can be viewed as an evidence that the construction is only superficially identifiable as a benefactive periphrasis, and that ‘give’ has been reanalyzed as an adposition. But this analysis is not possible in the case of Ecuadorian Highland Spanish, which will be discussed in section 4.3.2.

² Note that this is not a general property of applicative periphrases. For example, ‘take’ acting as a valency operator in instrumental periphrases normally occurs in V1 position. There is an obvious connexion between the linear ordering of applicative periphrases and the chronological succession of the phases of complex events.

2.7. Identifying benefactive periphrases

2.7.1. Distinguishing benefactive periphrases from biclausal constructions

Very often, benefactive periphrases are similar or even identical to biclausal constructions expressing that a giving event expressed by the second clause follows another event expressed by the first clause involved in the construction.

However, in addition to the language-specific formal manifestations of a distinction between a biclausal construction and a complex predicate, the distinction is generally made obvious by the contrast between the role assigning properties of ‘give’ as a monoverbal predicate and its function in benefactive periphrases. From this point of view, the only ambiguous case is constituted by sentences describing situations involving recipient-like beneficiaries (such as *I cooked a cake for the children* / *I cooked a cake and gave it to the children*), which precisely can be viewed as providing the crucial context for the development of the reanalysis of ‘give’ as an applicative operator with a benefactive function. Deputative beneficiaries or plain beneficiaries cannot be analyzed as receiving their semantic role from ‘give’ in a biclausal construction, and role assignment in such cases results from the interaction of the meaning of the lexical verb and a general benefactive meaning (or an even more abstract meaning) contributed by ‘give’ in valency operator function.

Most sources do not comment the radical change in the role assigning properties of ‘give’ involved in a benefactive periphrasis, but some authors insist on the specificity of verbs ‘give’ used as valency operators. For example, in his description of the Papuan language Kokota, Bill Palmer describes benefactive / malefactive serial verb constructions involving what he calls “the affective verb *tufa*”, and uses for this verb the special gloss AFFECT, in spite of the fact that *tufa* “is normally interpreted in isolation with a meaning similar to ‘give’” (Palmer 1999:176).

2.7.2. Distinguishing benefactive periphrases from adpositional constructions

Applicative periphrases are easy to distinguish from adpositional constructions insofar as the verb in valency operator function shows verbal inflection. But if it occurs in an invariable form, an alternative analysis is that, synchronically, the word licensing the expression of a beneficiary is not a verb form, but rather an adposition homonymous with a verb.

Unfortunately, it is very difficult if not impossible to consistently solve this question on the basis of universally valid criteria, and no consistency must be expected in the way different descriptive traditions deal with it. Some linguists tend to consider that the absence of *morphological* evidence of a verbal status is sufficient to analyze a word looking like a verb form as an adposition homonymous with a verb rather than a verb. Others tend to consider that, so far as a word occurring in a construction in which it could be analyzed as an adposition coincides with a semantically related form encountered in other contexts with a clearly verbal status, this word must be uniformly analyzed as a verb, and the construction in which it could be analyzed as a preposition is rather a complex predicate. Others try to find *syntactic* evidence supporting one of the two competing analyses.

On the initial stage of a typological study of benefactive periphrases, the only way to ensure the homogeneity of the data examined is to operate with a broad definition, and to leave for further discussion the question of the possible decategorialization of the verb form

in function of valency operator. Consequently, in its broad sense, the term ‘benefactive periphrasis’ will be applied here to any construction in which a benefactive NP is licensed by a word that also occurs with a related meaning in constructions in which it clearly has the status of verb. Some possible criteria for analyzing the categorial status of uninflected verb forms in valency operator function are presented in section 6.3.

2.8. Benefactive periphrases and other grammaticalized uses of verbs ‘give’

Verbs ‘give’ are among the verbs most commonly involved in grammaticalization processes. Their possible functions in applicative periphrases are not limited to licensing the different subtypes of beneficiaries (recipient-beneficiaries, deputative beneficiaries, and ‘plain’ beneficiaries – Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:383-4). For example, according to Hagemeyer 2000, in São-Tomense (a Creole language spoken on the island of São Tomé), *da* ‘give’ in valency operator function in a serial verb construction in which it occupies the second position can assign the following semantic roles: benefactive (10a), goal (10b), experiencer (10c), recipient (10d), and even source (10e).

(10) *São-Tomense* (Hagemeyer 2000)

- a. *Sela pa n toma zawa pa n ba pya da bo*
 must for 1SG take urine for 1SG go see give 2SG
 ‘I must take your urine in order to check it for you’
- b. *Ola ku-e ka bili zanela,*
 hour that-2SG IPFV open window
so n ga zuga vunvu se da glentu ke
 then 1SG IPFV throw bee DEM give inside house
 ‘When he opens the window, I will throw the bees inside the house’
- c. *Fogon ka sa kentchi da non*
 kitchen IPFV be hot give 1PL
 ‘The kitchen is getting hot for us’
- d. *fatu se ku men bo mole fika da bo*
 costume DEM that mother 2SG die stay give 2SG
 ‘that costume that remained for you when your mother died’
- e. *Inen mina se tava ka kole da koblo*
 3PL child DEM PST IPFV run give snake
 ‘Those children were running away from the snake’

In Yoruba, the possible semantic roles licensed by *fún* ‘give’ in applicative operator function include not only beneficiary, recipient, experiencer, and purpose, but also reason – ex. (11a); *fún* can even be used to introduce temporal adjuncts – ex. (11b).

(11) *Yoruba* (Abraham 1962)

a. *Ó n kú lọ fún ebi*
3SG PROG die go³ give hunger
'He is dying of hunger'

b. *Mo sinmi fún wákàtí kọn*
3SG rest give hour one
'I rested for an hour'

Grammaticalized uses of verbs 'give' as role assigners in the construction of other verbs are not always limited to licensing more or less peripheral participants, and may extend to argument marking: in the Chinese language Hakka, the use of 'give' to introduce recipient NPs has extended to the verb 'give' itself, giving raise to the construction illustrated by ex. (12), currently analyzed as involving a first occurrence of 'give' in verbal predicate function and a second occurrence of 'give' in dative preposition function.

(12) *Hakka* (Lai H.-L. 2001)

Gia ba bun yi kiu tien bun gi
3SG.GEN father give one CLF field give 3SG
'His father gave a piece of field to him'

Moreover, verbs 'give' quite commonly develop other types of grammaticalized uses. They may grammaticalize as valency operators, not only in applicative periphrases, but also in passive periphrases, in causative or permissive periphrases, and their grammaticalization as complementizers, or as TAM markers, has been widely discussed in the literature on grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2002:149-155; 321).

Verbs 'give' are often involved in polygrammaticalization processes. For example, in Phnong (a language of the Bahnaric branch of the Mon-Khmer family), *?an* 'give' occurs in V2 construction in dative / benefactive constructions, but also in V1 position in causative / permissive constructions, and in medial position in triverbal constructions expressing purpose – ex. (13), and e.g. Mon *kv* 'give', Thai *háj* 'give' and Burmese *pèi* 'give' show a similar range of grammaticalized functions – Jenny 2005:214-5).⁴

(13) *Phnong* (Vogel 2006)

a. *Gɔp ntum ɲɔj dro:n ?aŋ paŋ*
1SG teach speak Khmer give 3SG
'I teach him Khmer'

³ In this construction, *lọ* 'go away' expresses continuative aspect.

⁴ On the relationship between benefactive and causative constructions involving the same verb 'give', see in particular Iwasaki & Yap 2000.

b. *Gɔp ?aŋ paŋ kʰɛt*
1SG give 3SG die
'I let him die'

c. *Cʰo:ŋ piɑŋ ?aŋ lɛ? do:*
eat rice give finish IMP
'Eat the rice so that none of it is left'

This aspect of the question will not be addressed further in this paper, since the main focus is on benefactive periphrases.

3. Formal types of benefactive periphrases

Three formal types of benefactive periphrases can be recognized with respect to the grammatical nature of the two verb forms involved in the periphrasis. Note that, in the definition of formal types of benefactive periphrases, 'marked' applied to a verb form must be understood as an abbreviation for 'showing morphological evidence of a dependent status'.

3.1. The serializing type

I adopt the definition of serial verb constructions as complex predicates (i.e., monoclausal constructions involving two or more verbs) showing the following two characteristics:

- (a) no linking element is present between the verbs involved in the construction;
- (b) none of the verbs involved in the construction is in a form implying a non-autonomous status.

This definition basically concords with that formulated by Alexandra Aikhenvald (Aikhenvald 2003:1). It crucially differs from earlier definitions in that it explicitly excludes covert clause or VP coordination from serial verb constructions. Covert coordination may be the historical source of serial verb constructions, and in some languages the limit between covert coordination and serial verb constructions may be fuzzy, but a notion of serial verb construction that would not include this restriction would be too vague to be useful in the analysis of syntactic structures. For recent discussions, see a.o. Ameka 2003, Newmeyer 2004, Paul 2004.

Concerning the distinction between complex predicates of the serial type and the combination of a monoverbal predicate with an adposition, the uncontroversial cases of serial verb constructions are those in which each of the verbs involved in the construction shows at least some of the inflectional variations characteristic of verb forms heading independent clauses. In such cases, it may happen that the verbs involved in a serial construction show *parallel* inflection (if V1 and V2 show identical inflectional marks) or *distributed* inflection (if some of the inflectional marks characteristic of verbs heading independent clauses attach to V1, and some others, to V2).

Ex. (14) from the Kwa language Baule and (15) from the Gur language Dagaare illustrate benefactive periphrases of the serial type with parallel inflection of the lexical verb and of 'give' in valency operator function.

(14) *Baule*

ákísí à-tòn duô à-màn kòfi
Akissi PRF-cook yam PRF-give Kofi
'Akissi has cooked yam for Kofi'

(15) *Dagaare* (Bodomo & van Oostendorp 1994:23-4)

Bayoɔ zo-ro gɛ-rɛ wuo-ro la haani waa-na ku-ro ma
Bayor run-IPFV go-IPFV collect-IPFV DECL blackberry come-IPFV give-IPFV 1SG
'Bayor is presently going and collecting some blackberries for me'

As already commented in section 2.3.2, the analysis of serial constructions involving a fully inflected lexical verb and a verb-operator invariably occurring in bare stem form is much less obvious. Ex. (11) from Yoruba, reproduced here as (16), and ex. (17) from the Cross-River language Kana, illustrate this type of benefactive serial verb construction.

(16) *Yoruba* (Abraham 1962)

Ó ní kú lọ fún ebi
3SG PROG die go give hunger
'He is dying of hunger'

(17) *Kana* (Ikoro 1996:254)

ɲwîkâ wêè ób túú nè nûè
Nwiika PST roast three-leave yam give Nute
'Nwiika roasted a three-leave yam for Nute'

3.2. The marked-Vop type

The Grassfields Bantu language Mankon – ex. (18) – illustrates a type of benefactive periphrasis in which the lexical verb is inflected like verbs heading monoverbal independent clauses, whereas 'give' in valency operator function is in a non-autonomous 'sequential' form typically used for verbs heading non-initial clauses in clause chains encoding sequences of events.

(18) *Mankon* (Leroy 2003)

Mà mʰí fàʔá ɣʰá mbó zúó
1SG FUT work SEQ.give to 3SG.ENUNC
'I will work for him' (lit. something like 'I will work and-give him')

Some Benue-Congo languages spoken in South East Nigeria (e.g. Efik, Igbo) have complex predicates, including benefactive *give*-periphrases, in which the first verb is fully inflected as an independent verb form, and the TAM value it expresses determines the form

of the second verb. In some tenses, the verb in V2 position is in the dependent form otherwise used in clause chains encoding sequences of events, whereas in other tenses, the construction looks like a serial verb construction (Welmers 1973:366-72).

(19) *Efik* (Welmers 1973:369-70)

a. *Nám útóm émì nò mí*
do work DEM give 1SG
'Do this work for me!'

b. *Ánàm útóm ónò mí*
3SG.PRS.do work 3SG.SEQ.give 1SG
'He is working for me'

3.3. The marked-Vlex type

The Saharan language Beria – ex. (20) – illustrates the type of benefactive periphrasis in which 'give' in valency operator function is inflected like verbs heading monoverbal independent clauses, whereas the lexical verb is in a non-autonomous form typically used, in the languages that have this type of benefactive periphrasis, for verbs heading non-final clauses in clause chains encoding sequences of events. A variety of terms are used to label such forms in descriptive grammars; in this paper they are uniformly designated as *converbs*, and their characteristic affixes are uniformly glossed CVB, whatever the terms used in the sources I have consulted.

(20) *Beria* (Jakobi & Crass 2004)

Áská gí-n-é é-géí
door open-A2SG-CVB P1SG-give.IMP
'Open the door for me' (lit. 'Having open the door give me')

In this type of benefactive periphrasis, 'give' can be characterized as *auxiliary* in the sense of function word inflected like a independent verb and combined with a dependent form of the verbal lexeme with which it constitutes a complex predicate. *Vector verb* is another term found in the literature (in particular on Indo-Aryan languages) to characterize verbs fulfilling a grammaticalized function in this type of compound predicate.

4. The geographical distribution of benefactive periphrases

Benefactive periphrases show a very uneven geographical distribution: unattested in some areas (in particular, Europe and Australia), they are extremely common in some others.

4.1. The distribution of the serializing type

4.1.1. Benefactive periphrases in language families or areas in which serialization has been recognized as a common phenomenon

Benefactive periphrases of the serial type are common among the serializing languages of West Africa – ex. (1), (2), (3), (7), (11), (14), (15), & (17) above, South Eastern Asia – ex. (21) to (23), and New Guinea – ex. (24) & (25). Benefactive periphrases of the serial type are also found in those of the pidgin and creole languages that are known for making extensive use of serial constructions – ex. (5) above.

(21) *Thai* (Lord 2002:220)

Kháw thamṅaan hây phîichaay
3SG work give older brother
'He works for his brother'

(22) *Vietnamese*

Đê^o tôi làm cho anh
let 1SG do give older brother
'Let me do it for you!'

(23) *Yao Samsao* (Matisoff 1991:428)

Yiə tsiá? nəm daan pun nîn
1SG weave CLF basket give 3SG
'I wove a basket for him'

(24) *Kokota* (Palmer 1999:176)

Fa doli tufa-nau zuta-na
CAUS be alive give-P1SG lamp-DEM
'Light that lamp for me'

(25) *Dom* (Tida 2006:169)

[^]Flawa [˘]nu [˘]na [^]to-gwe
flour knead⁵ 1EXC give-A3SG.IND
'She kneaded flour for me'

⁵ Note that Tida misleadingly glosses bare verbal stems occurring in V1 position in the SVCs of Dom as 'INF(itive)'.
'INF(itive)'

Among the language families in which serialization is a widespread phenomenon, Oceanic seems to be the only one in which applicative, and in particular benefactive serial verb constructions are not common:

“One widely attested development in the world’s languages regarding the grammaticalization of serial verbs is the co-opting of verbs meaning ‘take’ and ‘give’ to function as prepositions expressing instrumental and benefactive meanings respectively. It is worth pointing out at the outset that in Oceanic languages, these verbs are rarely encountered in serial constructions, so prepositions with these particular verbal origins are seldom convincingly attested.”

Crowley 2002:173

The Western Austronesian language Keo, spoken on the Indonesian island of Flores, illustrates the case of a benefactive periphrasis of the serial type in a language belonging to a family within which serialization is not a common feature, but located not very far from an area in which such constructions are common – ex. (26).

(26) *Keo* (Margetts & Austin 2007 quoting Louise Baird)

Ja’o tendo jawa ti’i ‘ine
 1SG plant corn give mum
 ‘I’m planting corn for mum’

In Africa, benefactive periphrases of the serial type have been sporadically signaled outside the area of West Africa characterized by a particular concentration of languages having very productive SVCs, for example in the Ubangian language Ngbandi (Toronzoni 1989), and in the Sara (Central Sudanic) languages Kabba (Moser 2005) and Sar (Palayer 1989).

4.1.2. Others

In addition to language families or areas in which they are particularly common, benefactive periphrases of the serial type are sporadically attested in language families or areas in which serialization does not constitute a widespread phenomenon.

Benefactive periphrases of the serial type with parallel inflection (i.e., with the same inflectional mark on the two verbs) are attested in Old Turkic sources (Anderson 2001). Benefactive periphrases are very common among Turkic languages, but in modern Turkic languages, they uniformly belong to the marked-Vlex type – section 4.3.

Contrary to most Indo-Aryan languages, Hindi has a benefactive periphrasis in which, in the same way as in other auxiliary (or ‘vector verb’) constructions, the lexical verb occurs in a form consisting of the bare stem. This form is currently analyzed as a zero-marked converb (or ‘conjunctive participle’ – Montaut 2004:93), but whatever the justification for such an analysis, the external appearance of the Hindi *give*-periphrasis is that of a serial verb construction with verbal inflection concentrated on the verb in V2 position.

Among Amerindian languages, benefactive serial verb constructions with parallel inflection are found in the Siouan languages Hidatsa and Mandan – ex. (27).

(27) *Mandan* (Mixco 1997:50)

wáwaraqhku-rə té wa-hræ-ak rúť rá-sít wa-hræ wa-rj-kyʔ-rjít-oʔš
deer-TOP die 1SG-cause-DS rib by heat-roast 1SG-cause 1SG-2-give-2PL-INDma
'I've killed a deer and roasted the ribs for you'

4.2. The distribution of the marked-Vop type

This type has been illustrated above by Mankon, an atypical (and geographically peripheral) Bantu language that has lost the morphological applicative attested in most Bantu languages and reconstructible at least at Proto-Bantu level, and has compensated this loss by the creation of an applicative periphrasis formally identical to a clause chain encoding the successive phases of a complex event.

The only attestations of this type I am aware of come from Benue-Congo languages (Bantu and non-Bantu) spoken in West Cameroon and South-East Nigeria and sharing with Mankon both the loss of the morphological applicative and the retention of overtly inflected sequential verb forms. As already mentioned in section 3.1 above, many of the languages spoken in this area have complex predicates (including benefactive periphrases) with morphological characteristics that make them look like serial verb constructions in some tenses, and constructions of the marked-Vop type in some others.

4.3. The distribution of the marked-Vlex type

This type is extremely common among the verb-final languages of Asia, from Ainu and Japanese to the East to Turkish to the West and Tamil to the South. Outside this area, it seems to occur only sporadically.

4.3.1. Asian attestations

Lapolla 2003:33 observes that, among Tibeto-Burman languages,

“a commonly found development is the grammaticalization of a benefactive construction. This most commonly takes the form of an auxiliary verb derived from a verb meaning ‘to give’, as in Jinghpaw (*-tʃa*³³), Tamang (*pín*), Tsangla (*bi*), Camling (*bi*), Belhare (*-per*), and Lahu (*pî* ...). As can be seen from these examples, the verb used in this construction is often the P[roto]-S[ino]-T[ibetan] verb **biy*, but the constructions themselves were independently innovated.”⁶

As illustrated by ex. (28) to (35), benefactive periphrases of the marked-Vlex type occur not only among Tibeto-Burman languages, but also in Ainu, Japanese, Korean, and in languages belonging to the Mongolic, Turkic, Indo-Aryan, and Dravidian families. A benefactive periphrasis of this type is also attested in Tajik (Mamatov & al. 2005), which

⁶ Note that benefactive periphrases of the serial type are also found among Tibeto-Burman languages. This is consistent with the fact that the territory occupied by Tibeto-Burman languages overlaps the South East Asian linguistic area, characterized by extensive use of serial verb constructions in general, and of benefactive serial verb constructions in particular.

seems to be rather exceptional for an Iranian languages, but is not surprising from the point of view of the geographical location of Tajik, surrounded by Turkic languages.

(28) *Dolakha Newar* (Tibeto-Burman – Genetti 2007)

Janta lukhā khoṅ-an bi-sin
1SG.DAT door open-CVB give-IMP
'Open the door for me'

(29) *Ainu* (Tamura 2000:181)

Néno iki wa en-kore hani!
similar do CVB 1SG-give ENUNC
'Would you do that for me?'

(30) *Japanese*

Kodomo-ni kutsu-o kat-te yat-ta
child-DAT shoe-ACC buy-CVB give-PST
'I have bought shoes for the child'

(31) *Korean*

Yumi-ka Sumi-eykey mwun-ul yel-e cwu-ess-ta
Yumi-SBJ Sumi-DAT door-ACC open-CVB give-PST-DECL
'Yumi opened the door for Sumi'

(32) *Mongolian*

Nadad zam zaaž ögööč
1S.DAT way show.CVB give.IMP
'Show me the way'

(33) *Ojrot* (Turkic – Dyrenkova 1940:191)

Uulčak bis-ke d'ol ayd-ıp ber-di
boy 1PL-DAT road tell-CVB give-PFV.A3SG
'The boy showed us the road'

(34) *Pāli* (Middle Indo-Aryan – Hendriksen 1944:134, quoted in Butt & Tantos 2004)

... assamapadaṃ ānetvā aggim katvā adāsi
hermitage.ACC lead.CVB fire.ACC make.CVB give.IPRF.3SG
'... brought her to his hermitage and made a fire for her'

(35) *Tamil* (Krishnamurti 2003)

Rājā kumār-ukkuk katav-ai tirant-u koṭutt-āṇ
Raja Kumaar-DAT door-ACC open-CVB give.PST-3SGM
'Raajaa opened the door for Kumaar'

Benefactive *give*-compounds and derived benefactive verb forms including an applicative marker originating from a verb 'give', which clearly result from the evolution of benefactive periphrases, are also very common among the languages spoken in this area.

4.3.2. African attestations

Converbial constructions similar to those of the Asian languages mentioned in the preceding section are common among North East African verb-final languages (Azeb & Dimmendaal 2006), but apart from the Saharan language Beria already mentioned in section 3.3, Old Nubian is the only African language in which the descriptions I have been able to consult mention *give*-periphrases of the marked-V1 type, and my only source for this language characterizes the construction as 'dative' without mentioning the possibility of a benefactive function:

den- 'to give' (to me/us) and *tī-* 'to give' (to you/him/them) are the so-called 'dative verbs', used to specify an indirect object: e.g. St. 3.10-11 *ouka pīlīgṛā denjisnā* 'he revealed to us' (lit., 'revealing, he gave to us') and M. 7.5-6 *tan` eila` outfa tṛsna* 'she placed it in his hand'.

Browne 2002:65

Ijo languages, which constitute an exceptional case of consistently OV languages in West Africa,⁷ should perhaps be considered as having a benefactive periphrasis of this type. For example, according to Williamson 1965, in the benefactive periphrasis of *Iḷon*, as in other semantic types of complex predicates, the verb in V2 position is fully inflected, whereas V1, exactly like non-final verbs in the sequential construction, alternates between the bare stem form if the following word begins with a consonant, and a form characterized by an ending *-n(i)* if the following word begins with a vowel – ex. (36).

(36) *Iḷon* (Williamson & Timitimi 1983)

Okokodja sɔkj-ni i-piri
coconut pick out-NI 1SG-give.IMP
'Pick the coconut out (of its shell) for me'

Consequently, the construction has the appearance of a serial construction if the word following Vlex begins with a vowel, and of a marked-Vlex construction if the word following Vlex begins with a consonant, so that two alternative interpretations can be considered:

⁷ Apart from the Ijo languages spoken in the delta of Niger, the Dogon languages spoken in the eastern part of Mali are the only group of West African languages consistently showing OV typology.

(a) *-n(i)* is a converbial ending with a phonologically conditioned zero allomorph (according to this analysis, the complex predicates of Iḡon are considered as belonging to the marked-V1 type);

(b) *-n(i)* has the purely morphophonological function of preventing the deletion of the vowel of the verb in V1 position, which in Iḡon would automatically be deleted in contact with a word beginning with a vowel (according to this analysis, the complex predicates of Iḡon are considered as belonging to the serial type).

4.3.2. American attestations

A benefactive periphrasis in which ‘give’ in Vop function fully inflected like a verb heading a monoverbal independent clause combines with a dependent form of the lexical verb is attested in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish (Haboud 1994, Haboud 1998:215-223). An exceptional feature of this *dar + gerund* benefactive periphrasis of Ecuadorian Highland Spanish is that, in conformity with Spanish word order, *dar* ‘give’ in auxiliary function precedes the gerund with which it forms a benefactive periphrasis.

This construction has been noted to be particularly usual in the imperative, but it is also used in other TAMs, as illustrated by ex. (37). Note in particular the possibility to combine *dar* acting as a benefactive auxiliary with *dar* in the gerund form expressing its basic meaning ‘give’.

(37) *Ecuadorian Highland Spanish* (Haboud 1994)

a. *Me dio cocinando*
 D1SG give.PFV.A3SG cook.GER
 ‘(S)he cooked for/instead of me’

b. *Él me da haciendo el pan mientras yo lavo*
 3SGM D1SG give.PRS.A3SG make.GER DEF.SGM bread while 1SG wash.PRS.A1SG
 ‘He bakes the bread for/instead of me while I wash’

c. *Él me dio dando el cuchillo a la María*
 3SGM D1SG give.PFV.A3SG give.GER DEF.SGM knife to DEF.SGF María
 ‘He gave the knife to María instead of me’

The first explanation that comes to the mind is that this construction might be the result of a transfer from Ecuadorian Quechua, since Quechua has clause chains of the same type as the Asian languages that have benefactive periphrases of the marked-Vlex type. But this construction does not seem to be attested in other Quechua varieties, and Marleen Haboud notes that, in Ecuadorian Quechua, it occurs in direct elicitation with bilingual Quechua-Spanish speakers, but not in spontaneous productions of speakers having a lower command of Spanish. She tries to explain it as resulting from the transfer of an imperative honorific suffix found in the local variety of Quechua and traceable back to the Quechua applicative suffix *-pu-*, but this explanation is not very convincing, since the notion of transfer of syntactic structures implies a word-to-word relation, and is hardly compatible with the hypothesis of an affix-to-word relation.

Although the emergence of this construction must certainly be viewed as a contact induced language change, it is reasonable to assume that it involves a historical scenario more complex than the mere transfer of a Quechua construction. The point is that Ecuadorian Quechua is the result of a relatively recent expansion. When the Spaniards arrived (1530), the Incas' conquest was recent, and many Indian groups in the Ecuadorian Highlands were still speaking their own languages. Linguistically, the Spanish conquest was followed by an extensive process of Quechuanization, which means that the Ecuadorian varieties of both Quechua and Spanish have evolved in a context favoring the development of complex pidginization / creolization processes. The explanation of the particularities of Ecuadorian Highland Spanish may therefore lie in a complex contact situation involving not only Spanish and Quechua, but also languages that are now extinct, so that the explanation of linguistic particularities of Ecuadorian Highland Spanish that cannot be the result of a straightforward transfer from Quechua is condemned to remain purely speculative.

5. Correlations

When I began this investigation, my idea was that there should be a correlation between the type of benefactive periphrasis that can be found in a language and the type of clause chain used in the same language to encode complex events conceived as a sequence of elementary events, since diachronically, benefactive periphrases probably result from the reanalysis of constructions that, originally, express the meaning 'create/manipulate something and give it to someone'.

However, the data I have collected suggest a weaker claim. They confirm that, in general, marked-Vlex benefactive periphrases are found in languages or language families having sequential constructions in which non-final verbs are in a form overtly marked as non-autonomous, and marked-Vop benefactive periphrases are found in languages or language families having sequential constructions in which non-initial verbs are in a form overtly marked as non-autonomous. By contrast, benefactive periphrases of the serial type are not limited to languages using covert coordination in clause chains. In particular, Papuan languages typically use clause chains in which the final verb is the only one occurring in an independent form, but many of them also make extensive use of serial verb constructions, including benefactive ones.

A possible explanation of this imperfect correlation is probably that the grammaticalization process converting biclausal constructions into complex predicates may involve reduction of morphological marking. Another possibility is that multiverbal constructions grammaticalized as complex predicates do not necessarily follow changes occurring in the make-up of multiclausal constructions.

6. Grammaticalization

Similarly to other applicative periphrases, benefactive periphrases constitute an intermediary stage in grammaticalization chains, either from verb to adposition-like or case-marker-like items, or from verbs to applicative verb affixes.

The initial impetus for the development of applicative periphrases in general, and benefactive periphrases in particular, is probably a tendency to limit monoverbal constructions to the expression of arguments, and to make more explicit the role of more or less peripheral or optional participants by using multiverbal constructions. For example, São-Tomense uses a double object construction to mention the source/maleficiary argument of *futa* ‘steal’, whereas with the same verb, a serial construction is required to express a beneficiary – ex. (38).⁸

(38) *São-Tomense* (Hagemeijer 2000)

- a. *Ladlon futa mu djelu*
 thief steal 1SG money
 ‘The thief stole money from me’
- b. *Ladlon futa djelu da mu*
 thief steal money give 1SG
 ‘The thief stole money for me’

6.1. From sequential construction to benefactive applicative periphrasis

6.1.1. The reanalysis of ‘give’ as a benefactive operator

It seems reasonable to assume that the starting point of the grammaticalization chains involving applicative periphrases expressing benefactive is typically a sequential construction in which the second clause describes a giving event constituting the second phase of a complex event whose first phase is described by the first clause, as in English *She sewed a dress and gave it to her daughter*.

In such a construction, the recipient of give can also be viewed as the beneficiary of the first event:

She sewed a dress and gave her to her daughter
 ⇒ *She sewed a dress for the benefit of her daughter*

An applicative periphrasis in which ‘give’ acts as a modifying element of the first verb can therefore emerge as the result of the conventionalization of this implicature. Once the reanalysis has been completed, ‘give’ is no more interpreted as encoding a giving event involving a giver and a gift already involved in an event preceding the giving event, and the NP that originally represented the recipient in a subsequent giving event is interpreted as representing the beneficiary of the first event, without any hint at the precise reason why this participant can be considered as a beneficiary.

Different subtypes of beneficiaries can be recognized, and it is reasonable to assume that the reanalysis of sequential constructions involving a verb ‘give’ as benefactive periphrases

⁸ In some languages, the tendency to avoid sentences with more than two NPs in the construction of each verb affects the expression of arguments too, as observed by Marisa Censabella for the Guaycuruan language Toba – Censabella 2007).

develops first with recipient-like beneficiaries (e.g. ‘buy something for someone’) before being extended to the expression of other subtypes of beneficiaries.

6.1.2. Evidence of the reanalysis of ‘give’ as a valency operator

The possibility to have constructions that are lit. *X opened the door gave Y* or *X having opened the door gave Y*, in which it is excluded to interpret *Y* as being assigned the role of recipient in the same way as in *X gave the door to Y*, can be used as a diagnostic of the reanalysis of the sequential construction as an applicative periphrasis expressing benefactive.

Additional evidence may be provided by the malefactive interpretation of ‘give’ in constructions that are lit. *X ate Y gave Z* or *X having eaten Y gave Z* interpreted as ‘X ate Y to the detriment of Z’: here again, the interpretation of *Z* as a recipient is excluded.

Constituent order may also provide evidence of the reanalysis of a sequential construction involving two clauses as a monoclausal construction. For example, in Japanese, when the converb formed with *-te* occurs in a clause chain, phrases belonging to the clause headed by the final verb are inserted between the converb and the final verb, as in ex. (38a), whereas in a complex predicate in which the final verb is ‘give’ in valency operator function, nothing can be inserted between the converb and the final verb – ex. (38b).

(39) Japanese

a. *Machi-e it-te, eiga-o mi-ta*
 town-ALL go-CVB movie-ACC see-PST
 ‘I went to town and saw a movie’

b. *Yamada-san-wa Tanaka-san-ni tegami-o kai-te yat-ta*
 Yamada-Mr.-TOP Tanaka-Mr.-DAT letter-ACC write-CVB give-PST
 ‘Mr. Yamada wrote a letter to/for Mr. Tanaka’

In Igbo, the possibility to have clauses combining *nyé* ‘give’ assigning the recipient role with *nyé* ‘give’ assigning the beneficiary role, as in ex. (40b), provides evidence of the grammaticalization of ‘give’ as a valency operator. The same observation applies to Baule *man* ‘give’ – ex. (41).

(40) Igbo (Onumajuru 1985)

a. *ó-zù-rù ánú nyé 'ányí*
 A3SG-buy-PFV meat give 1PL
 ‘S/he bought meat for us’

b. *ó-nyè-rè-m̀ jí 'nyé 'ùbá*
 A3SG-give-PFV-P1SG yam give Uba
 ‘S/he gave me yams for Uba’

(41) *Baule*

- a. *Wǎ kà mìn sìkǎ màn mìn*
come count 1SG money give 1SG
'Come and count my money for me'
- b. *Fà sìkǎ'n màn Kuàkú màn mìn*
take money-DEF give Kouakou give 1SG
'Give the money to Kuaku on my behalf'

Note however that, as in other cases of grammaticalization, ambiguities may subsist between benefactive periphrases and superficially identical constructions still interpretable as sequential constructions – ex. (42).

(42) *Dolakha Newar* (Genetti 2007)

- Lū=e bo thi-pta hā-en bi-u*
gold=GEN plate one-CLF bring-CVB give-IMP
(a) 'Bring a plate of gold and give it (to him)'
(b) 'Bring a plate of gold for him'

Conversely, it is also possible that the benefactive periphrasis is bound by semantic restrictions due to the retention of elements of its original signification. For example, as discussed in Shibatani 2003:282-3, in spite of being clearly distinct from a sequential construction, the benefactive periphrasis of Japanese is restricted to situations involving “the transfer of possessive control of a certain entity, whether concrete or abstract”. In Japanese, intransitive verbs, or transitive verbs whose object NP denotes an object that is not normally transferred to a beneficiary cannot occur in a benefactive periphrasis including an overtly expressed beneficiary – ex. (43a-b); note however that the same verbs can occur in the benefactive periphrasis provided the beneficiary is not overtly expressed – ex. (43c-d).

(43) *Japanese* (Shibatani 2003:283)

- a. **Ken-wa hahaoya-ni itiba-e it-te yat-ta*
Ken-TOP mother-DAT market-ALL go-CVB give-PST
Intended: 'Ken went to the market for mother'
- b. **Ken-wa watashi-ni gomi-o sute-te kure-ta*
Ken-TOP 1SG-DAT garbage-ACC throw away-CVB give-PST
Intended: 'Ken threw away the garbage for me'
- c. *Ken-wa itiba-e it-te yat-ta*
Ken-TOP market-ALL go-CVB give-PST
'Ken did (someone) the favor of going to the market'

- d. *Ken-wa gomi-o sute-te kure-ta*
 Ken-TOP garbage-ACC throw away-CVB give-PST
 ‘Ken threw away the garbage (for me)’⁹

6.2. The grammaticalization of ‘give’ as a benefactive auxiliary

In benefactive periphrases of the marked-Vlex type, and in some of the benefactive periphrases of the serial type, ‘give’ in benefactive operator function bears full verbal inflection. A verb ‘give’ occurring in such constructions may lose the ability to be used in monoverbal constructions with the meaning ‘give’, or take in this construction a form different from the form it has when expressing the meaning ‘give’, giving thus raise to a benefactive auxiliary whose relation to a verb ‘give’ can be recognized in a diachronic perspective only. This evolution seems to be common among Tibeto-Burman languages.

6.3. The grammaticalization of ‘give’ as a benefactive adposition / case marker

Verbs ‘give’ are widely recognized as a possible source of benefactive adpositions.

For example, according to Carlson 1991, in the Senufo languages Tagbana and Jimini, a benefactive marker is developing from the verb *kan* or *kã* ‘give’ in constructions in which “it is unclear from the sources whether *kã* is a serial verb or a postposition” (Carlson 1991:214), whereas Karaboro (another Senufo language) has the cognate benefactive postposition *kã̃* but has lost the corresponding form for ‘give’, replaced by another verb *wãr*.

In the same geographic area, the Mande language Dzùungoo has a benefactive postposition *kɔ̀* whose probable origin is a SVC with the verb *kɔ̀́* ‘give’ in V2 position. However, in the SVCs of Dzùungoo, verbal inflection is borne by the verb in V2 position, whereas benefactive *kɔ̀* is invariable, which shows that it must not be analyzed as the second term of as SVC, but rather as a postposition etymologically related to the verb *kɔ̀́* (Solomiac 2007).

The problem is to determine at which stage of its evolution a verb ‘give’ engaged in such a grammaticalization path can be recognized as having been converted into an adposition. The analysis of verb forms devoid of overt inflection marks acting as valency operators is particularly problematic in languages in which regular verb inflection includes forms coinciding with the bare verb stem.

6.3.1. Evidence from extraction

Evidence of an ongoing process of grammaticalization from verb to preposition in a benefactive applicative periphrasis has been discussed by Jan Vorhoeve for the Caribbean Creole Sranan. He argues that the existence of two alternative cleft constructions shows that some Sranan speakers (those who front the phrase *gi*NP, as in (44c)), consider *gi* ‘give’ in the

⁹ Japanese has two verbs ‘give’, *yaru* and *kureru*; *kureru* implies orientation towards the speaker’s deictic center (Shibatani 2003:279-81); consequently, the beneficiary in this sentence is most likely to be the speaker. Verbs ‘give’ including a deictic component in their lexical meaning (either 1 vs. 2/3 or 1/2 vs. 3) are cross-linguistically not uncommon. They are found e.g. in Nubian (Browne 2002), Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997), etc.

benefactive construction as a preposition, whereas some others (those who front only the NP following *gi*, as in (44b)) consider it as a verb (Vorhoeve 1975).

(44) *Sranan* (Vorhoeve 1975)

- a. *mi wroko gi en*
 1SG work give 3SG
 ‘I worked for him’
- b. *na [en] mi wroko gi*
 FOC 3SG 1SG work give
 ‘It’s him I worked for’
- c. *na [gi en] mi wroko*
 FOC give 3SG 1SG work
 ‘It’s for him I worked’

In São-Tomense, the extraction of the complement of a preposition triggers the use of a resumptive pronoun, whereas resumptive pronouns do not occur when the complement of a verb is extracted, and the fact that ‘give’ in the benefactive periphrasis behaves like a verb from this point of view – ex. (45) – provides evidence that it has not fully grammaticalized as an adposition yet.

(45) *São-Tomense* (Hagemeijer 2000)

- a. *Ke kwa ku piskado bili vwado ku-e? / *... ku?*
 which thing COMP fisherman open flying fish with-3SG
 ‘With what did the fisherman open the flying fish?’
- b. *Ke nge ku Zon tlabá da? / *... d’e?*
 which person COMP Zon work give
 ‘For whom did Zon work?’

6.3.2. Evidence from constituent order: the case of Mandarin Chinese

Mandarin Chinese has been mentioned as having a benefactive periphrasis with ‘give’ in V1 position – ex. (9), repeated here as (45a). (45b) shows that with some lexical verbs at least, ‘give’ in valency operator function can occur in V2 position, but with a different meaning.

(46) *Mandarin Chinese* (Li & Thompson 1981:388)

- a. *Wǒ gěi tā jì le yì fēng xìn*
 1SG give 3SG mail PFV one CLF letter
 ‘I mailed a letter for him/her’

- b. *Wǒ jì le yī fēng xìn gěi tā*
 1SG mail PFV one CLF letter give 3SG
 ‘I mailed a letter to him/her’

It is interesting to observe that, in such cases, ‘give’ in V2 position assigns the recipient role to the NP that follows it, whereas ‘give’ in V1 position assigns the beneficiary role.

Gei belongs to a class of items commonly termed ‘coverbs’, which according to Mandarin Chinese grammars function as prepositions but show more or less evidence of a verbal origin. Phrases headed by coverbs most often precede the verb, which is highly unusual for prepositions phrases in a language having SVO order as dominant order at the clause level (Dryer 2003:48-9). Given this particularity of Mandarin, the position of benefactive *gei* can be viewed as resulting from alignment with a class of preposition-like items, contrasting with the retention of the order of the original sequential construction in the case of dative *gei*.

6.3.3. Evidence from constituent order: the case of Abui and Yongning Na

The Papuan language Abui is another case in point. Kratochvíl 2007:394-96 states that serial verb constructions with *l* ‘give’ in V1 position have the expression of a benefactive or malefactive participant as one of their two possible functions (their other function being the expression of a topical undergoer participant). However, none of the examples provided straightforwardly involves a benefactive meaning, and this construction seems to be best described as having the more abstract meaning of expression of a participant towards whom the action is directed (‘bite someone’, ‘hit someone’ ‘look for someone’, etc.). It seems therefore that, synchronically, this Abui construction is not a benefactive periphrasis properly speaking, in spite of the fact that it includes a role assigner etymologically related to a verb ‘give’. But whatever the exact function of this construction, since Abui is a verb-final language, the a priori exceptional position of *l* in valency operator function can be viewed as alignment with the position normally occupied by postpositions, providing thus evidence of reanalysis.

The same analysis applies to the Tibeto-Burman language Yongning Na, in which *ki*³³ ‘give’ has grammaticalized as a dative-benefactive-allative postposition: Yongning Na is a verb-final language, and postposition phrases headed by *ki*³³ used as a postposition precede the verb in the same way as other postposition phrases (Lidz 2006).

6.3.4. Prosodic evidence

Remijsen To appear on the Austronesian language Magey Matbat:

“In propositions involving a verb of transfer, the recipient semantic role can be expressed by a prepositional phrase ... The preposition in question, *be*, is segmentally identical to the verb *be*²¹ ‘give’. Unlike the verb, though, prepositional *be* is prosodically weak, cliticising to its argument.”

6.4. From benefactive applicative periphrases to benefactive verbal compounds, and from benefactive verbal compounds to derived benefactive verb forms

In benefactive periphrases, the verb ‘give’ in valency operator function may be obligatorily contiguous to the lexical verb. This is particularly common in benefactive periphrases of the marked-Vlex type.

When the two verbs constituting a benefactive periphrasis are obligatorily contiguous, there may be morphological and/or phonological evidence that ‘give’ in valency operator function nevertheless constitutes a separate word. For example, in Japanese, the fact that Vlex shows the same suffix as forms productively used to mark non-final verbs in clause chains (ex. (38) above) provides evidence against analyzing the benefactive periphrasis as involving compounding, in spite of the impossibility to insert anything between Vlex and Vop. But words obligatorily contiguous to each other tend to coalesce into a single word, which may result in constructions in which the relation between the two verbs is best treated in terms of compounding. Subsequent evolutions (in particular, phonological modifications of ‘give’ in second position in a benefactive compound, or the loss of the possibility to use a former verb ‘give’ in constructions other than benefactive compounds) may result in the reanalysis of ‘give’ as an applicative affix.

6.4.1. Benefactive give-compounds and applicative affixes cognate with verbs ‘give’ in Asian languages

Korean has benefactive periphrases in which a fully inflected form of *cwuta* ‘give (plain)’ or *tulita* ‘give (humble)’ is immediately preceded by a converbial form characterized by the suffix *-a/e*. However, in most sources, no separation is marked in writing between the converb and *cwuta*, which suggests that this sequence tends to be reinterpreted as a compound.

(47) *Korean*

a. *Yumi-ka Sumi-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta*
 Yumi-SBJ Sumi-DAT book-ACC give-PST-DECL
 ‘Yumi gave Sumi a book’

b. *Yumi-ka Sumi-eykey mwun-ul yel-e cwu-ess-ta / yel-e-cwu-ess-ta*
 Yumi-SBJ Sumi-DAT door-ACC open-CVB give-PST-DECL open-CVB-give-PST-DECL
 ‘Yumi opened the door for Sumi’

The hypothesis that the Korean benefactive periphrasis is engaged in a process of further grammaticalization is consistent with the fact that the Korean converb formed with *-a/e* does not seem to be used productively in clause chaining, and seems to be used mainly, if not exclusively, within complex predicates. It is however interesting to observe that, in spite of being in some sense more grammaticalized than its Japanese equivalent, the Korean benefactive periphrasis shows similar restrictions due to the retention of its original meaning, as illustrated by ex. (48).

(48) *Korean* (Song 2007)

- a. **Kiho-ka yenghi-eykey sicang-ey ka-cwu-ess-ta*
Keeho-SBJ Yonghee-DAT market-ALL go-give-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘Keeho went to the market for Yonghee’
- b. **Kiho-ka yenghi-eykey mwun-ul tat-a-cwu-ess-ta*
Keeho-SBJ Yonghee-DAT door-ACC close- CVB-give-PST-DECL
Intended: ‘Keeho closed the door for Yonghee’

According to Tsumagari 2003, Dagur (Mongolic) has a ‘benefactive mood’ *imperfective converb* + *ukw- ‘give’*, and this construction also has the synthetic (suffixalized) variant *-j-ukw-*.

In the Turkic language Xakas, Anderson 2001 describes a phonologically conditioned zero realization of the converbial suffix in the benefactive periphrasis and other ‘auxiliary verb constructions’, which can be viewed as evidence of evolution towards compounding.

According to Peterson 2007:131-2, in the Tibeto-Burman language Hakha Lai, the benefactive/malefactive applicative suffix *-piak*, seen in (49a), closely resembles the verb ‘give’ seen in (49b), “reflecting a grammaticalization path already well established for this verb”.

(49) *Hakha Lai* (Peterson 2007)

- a. *Tsewmang=ni? door-?a? ?a-ka-kal-piak*
Tsewmang=ERG market-ALL/LOC A3SG-P1SG-go-BEN
‘Tsewmang went to the market for me’
- b. *Tsewmang=ni? ?aar-saa ?a-ka-peek*
Tsewmang=ERG chicken-meat A3SG-P1SG-give
‘Tsewmang gave me chicken meat’

6.4.2. *Benefactive give-compounds and applicative affixes cognate with verbs ‘give’ in the languages of the Pacific*

The Papuan language Alambalak has benefactive *give*-constructions identified in Bruce 1988 as verbal compounds – ex. (50).

(50) *Alambalak* (Bruce 1988:39)

- Na yawyt yimam wikna-ha-mě-an-m*
1SG dog people buy-give-R.PST-A1SG-P3PL
‘I bought the dog for the people’

Benefactive *give*-compounds are also mentioned in Susan Quigley’s description of the Papuan language Awara (Quigley 2002: 58-62). The author discusses morphological evidence of the distinction between such compounds and biverbal constructions, but the affix indexing the beneficiary occurs between the two verb roots, which is unusual for compounds.

Other descriptions of Papuan languages do not analyze apparently similar constructions in terms of compounding, but rather as implying benefactive applicative affixes cognate with the homonymous verb ‘give’: Yimas (Foley 1991:308-9), Usan (Anderson 1995), Awtuw (Feldman 1986:48-9).

6.4.3. Benefactive give-compounds and applicative affixes cognate with verbs ‘give’ in African languages

Benefactive constructions in which ‘give’ is contiguous to the other verb involved in the construction are found in the Khoisan languages Ju|’hoan (Dickens 2005) – ex. (51) – and =Hoan (Collins 2003) – ex. (52). These constructions are currently treated as serial verb constructions, but they could equally be analyzed in terms of compounding, since nothing can be inserted between the two verbs, and there seems to be no decisive evidence in favor of one of the two possible analyses.

(51) *Ju|’hoan* (Dickens 2005)

Dshàú n/óá /’àn ha dà’ámá kò ’msì
 woman cook give 3SG child PREP food
 ‘The woman cooked food for her child’

(52) *=Hoan* (Collins 2003)

Ma ’a tsaxo cu Jefe ki /|a’e
 1SG PROG cook give Jeff PREP meat
 ‘I am cooking meat for Jeff’

In section 6.1.2, Igbo has been mentioned as having complex predicates with *nyé* ‘give’ in benefactive operator function, but *nyé* also occurs as the second formant of compound verbs in which *-nyé* acts as a valency operator licensing not only benefactive complements, as in ex. (53), but also dative or allative complements.¹⁰

¹⁰ According to Lord 1977, a change from SOV to SVO constituent order would have been responsible for the emergence of Igbo compound verbs assuming functions that, in other Benue-Congo languages spoken in the same region, are more commonly assumed by serial verb constructions, but the evidence in favor of this hypothesis is not very convincing. The point is that, when Carol Lord wrote this article, the hypothesis of a shift from proto-Niger-Congo SOV order to the SVO order attested in most Niger-Congo languages was advocated by several specialists. However, subsequent studies have cast serious doubts on the possibility to reconstruct proto-Niger-Congo constituent order (see in particular Creissels 2005 for a discussion of evidence from West African languages). Moreover, the data I have collected includes ample evidence of compound verbs originating from benefactive periphrases in language families in which there is no evidence pointing to a possible relation between the emergence of such compounds and a change in constituent order.

(53) *Igbo* (Uchechukwu In Press)

Dè-nyé nwókē à ákwúkwo íkíké
write-give man DEM paper permit
'Write a permit for this man'

Moreover, some Igbo dialects show evidence that *nyé* in such compounds tends to be reanalyzed as an applicative suffix. According to Uchechukwu In Press, the Ìgbúzò dialect shows a *-nyé* ~ *-nyá* alternation governed by the vowel harmony rule characteristic of Igbo affixes. For example, this dialect has *gbá-nyá* 'pour in', *zú-nyá* 'buy for' vs. *bè-nyè* 'cut out for', *kú-nyé* 'scoop out for' corresponding to Standard Igbo *gbé-nyé*, *zú-nyé*, *bè-nyè*, and *kú-nyé* respectively.

Old Nubian has been mentioned in section 4.3.2 as having dative periphrases involving the verbs *den-* 'give (to me/us)' and *tī-* 'give (to you/him/them)'. Not surprisingly, modern Nubian languages have benefactive applicative markers resulting from the grammaticalization of these verbs, for example *-dèen-* and *-tīr-* in Kunuz Nubian (Abdel-Hafiz 1988) – ex. (54).

(54) *Kunuz Nubian* (Abdel-Hafiz 1988)

Id ay-gi baab-ki alle-deen-s-u
man 1SG-ACC door-ACC repair-BEN-PST-A3SG
'The man repaired the door for me'

6.4.4. Benefactive give-compounds and applicative affixes cognate with verbs 'give' in Amerindian languages

Among Amerindian languages, benefactive compounds occur in the Amazonian language Kwaza – ex. (55). Note in particular, in the Kwaza ex. (55b), the possibility to express 'give for' by means of a compound formally constituted by two occurrences of *wady* 'give', which could be viewed as evidence that 'give' in second position in benefactive compounds should rather be analyzed as having grammaticalized as an applicative suffix.

(55) *Kwaza* (van der Voort 2004:373)

- a. *Kudere- 'wā māmāñē=wa 'dy-da-ki*
Canderé-AO sing=give-1SG-DECL
'I sang for Canderé'
- b. *Wera- 'wā haru 'rai wady=wa 'dy-ta?ỹ-ra*
Vera-AO armadillo give=give-P1SG-IMP
'Bring the armadillo (meat) to Vera for me'

Mapudungun has a productive mechanism of creation of verbal compounds by mere juxtaposition of two verb roots (Salas 2006:177-8), which suggests that derived verbs including the applicative suffix *-(l)e/* might originate from compound verbs whose second formant was *elu-* 'give'.

Among Amerindian languages, benefactive applicative affixes cognate with a verb ‘give’ have also been signaled in Sahaptian-Klamath (Rude 1991), Iroquian (Mithun 2001), Slave (Athabaskan – Rice 1989), and Tonkawa (an extinct language of Texas – Hoijer 1933).

7. Autobenefactive periphrases

In principle, any type of construction licensing a benefactive NP can express autobenefactive via reflexivization. However, some languages have developed an expression of autobenefactive that formally cannot be analyzed as a combination of benefactive marking and reflexive marking. Kartvelian ‘version’ (see a.o. Lacroix 2007 on Laz) illustrates the possibility of a morphological distinction between non-reflexive benefactive (‘objective version’) and self-benefactive (‘subjective version’) whose origin apparently cannot be reconstructed. In this section, we examine languages having an autobenefactive periphrasis distinct from the periphrasis licensing a beneficiary other than the subject, which diachronically constitutes a possible source of morphological distinctions of the type illustrated by Kartvelian version.

In almost all cases I am aware of, the autobenefactive periphrasis differs from the periphrasis licensing a beneficiary other than the subject by involving a verb ‘take’ instead of ‘give’ in V2 position, as illustrated in ex. (56) from the Turkic language Ojrot (also known as Altai-kiži), and in ex. (57) from Hindi.

(56) *Ojrot* (Turkic – Dyrenkova 1940:191)

a. *Uulčak bis-ke d’ol ayd-ıp ber-di*
 boy 1PL-DAT road tell-CVB give-PFV.A3SG
 ‘The boy showed us the road’

b. *Men balık tud-up al-dı-m*
 1SG fish catch-CVB take-PFV-A1SG
 ‘I caught (for myself) a fish’

(57) *Hindi* (Montaut 2004:125)

a. *Tum apnā kām jaldī kar lo*
 2 REFL work quickly do take-IMP
 ‘Do your work quickly’

b. *Maī tumhārā kām jaldī kar dūgā*
 1SG your work quickly do give.FUT
 ‘I will do your work quickly’

Not all languages that have benefactive periphrases have developed this expression of autobenefactive: most attestations of autobenefactive *take*-periphrases I have been able to find come from an area including the following language families: Mongolic, Turkic, Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Tibeto-Burman, and Austroasiatic languages. Tajik, which also has a *take*-

periphrasis expressing an autobenefactive meaning (Mamatov & al. 2005), does not belong to one of these families, but is located in the area in question. It has already been established that benefactive *give*-periphrases, either of the marked-Vlex type or of the serial type, are particularly widespread among the languages spoken in this area. Autobenefactive periphrases seem particularly common among Mongolic and Turkic languages, as already noted in Krueger 1964.

7.1. Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases in Mongolic languages

Skribnik 2003:117 on Buryat:

“Other common auxiliaries include ... *üge-* ‘to give’ vs. *aba-* ‘to take’ [benefactive].”

Nugteren 2003:281 on Shira Yughur:

“The combination *-j’ ab-* (imperfective converb + ‘to take’) indicates that the action is performed for the subject’s benefit ... Similarly *-j’ ög-* (imperfective converb + ‘to give’) indicates that the action is performed for someone else’s benefit, e.g. ... *ci nanda misgi xala-j’ ög* ‘sew a garment for me!’ (*ci* = 2sg, *nanda* = 1sg.dat).”

Hugjiltu 2003:342 on Bonan:

“The Bonan auxiliaries may be divided into three main groups: ... (3) those indicating the beneficiary of the action: *aw-* ‘to take; to do for oneself’ (<**ab-*), *oke-* ‘to give; to do for somebody else’.”

Kim 2003:360 on Santa:

“The two auxiliaries *agi-* ‘to take’ (irregularly from **ab-*) vs. *ogi-* ‘to give’ (<**ög-*) indicate that the action has a beneficiary (‘for’).”

7.2. Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases in Turkic languages

Bodrogligeti 2001:287 on Chagatay:

“[used as ‘descriptive verbs’ with gerunds in *-p*] *al-* ‘to take, to receive’ indicates that the action takes place in the interest of the subject ... *ber-* ‘to give’ signals that the action is carried out in the interest of someone else.”

Grunina 2005:287 on Turkmen:

“The verbs *al-* ‘give’ and *ber-* ‘take’ can occur as auxiliary verbs with the main verb in the form of the gerund in *-Ip*. In this case, *almak* indicates that the action is performed for the subject, in his interest, or is directed towards him, cf. *adresini ýazyp aldym* ‘I wrote his address (for myself)’. The verb *bermek* in this function points to an action directed from the subject to someone else or performed in the interest of someone else.”

Gregory Anderson has devoted several publications to the study of the ‘give’ vs. ‘take’ contrast in Turkic benefactive periphrases (Anderson 2001, Anderson 2002). Starting from the description of *take*- and *give*-periphrases in Altai-Sayan Turkic languages (Tofa, Tuvan, Xakas, Ojrot) he observes that similar periphrases are attested in “languages from the farthest reaches of the Turkic-speaking world, both temporally and geographically, with data from such languages as modern Yakut (Saxa), Turkmen, Uyyur, Tatar, Xalaĵ and Čuvaš, and Old Turkic”. He concludes that this feature dates back to Proto-Turkic times.

7.3. Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases in Indo-Aryan languages

Bhatia 1993:326-7 on Punjabi:

“*laiNaa* ‘to take’ indicates self-benefactive meaning; co-occurring with main verbs such as ‘to cry’, ‘to laugh’, it exhibits an introvert action; *deuNaa* ‘to give’ expresses benefactive meaning, and the beneficiary is other than the subject of the sentence. With verbs such as ‘to cry’, ‘to laugh’, it denotes an overt action.”

Paul 2003:3 on the grammaticalized uses of the Bengali verbs *deoya* ‘give’ and *neoya* ‘take’:

“Consider a verbal root *Sajano* ‘decorate’. It participates in following compound verb constructions: *Sajije deoya* ‘decorate for other’s benefit’ ... *Sajije neoya* ‘decorate and the result is directed towards the actor’.”

Pradeshi 2001 includes several examples of *take*-periphrases in Marathi.

7.4. Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases in Dravidian languages

Krishnamurti 2003:381-1 on Telugu:

“In Modern Telugu, the valency changing auxiliaries ... are: ... (A2.4) Reflexive: Vppl + *kon-* ‘take’, e.g. *cēs-* ‘to do’: //cēs-i-kon-// → /cēs-u-kon-/ ‘to do something for oneself’, *wiraga-gott-u-kon-* ‘to break (a body part) by oneself’.”

7.5. Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases in Tibeto-Burman languages

Ebert 1994:61 briefly mentions the autobenefactive use of ‘take’ in verb combinations of the serial type in the Kiranti languages Bantawa and Thulung.

Okell & Allott 2001:176 mentions the use of the Burmese verb *yu* ‘take’ as a postverbal marker expressing ‘V and take’, ‘V for oneself’.

7.6. Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases in Austroasiatic languages

Jenny 2005:204 on Mon:

“At least since M(iddle) M(on), the use of <ket> ‘take’ as postverbal operator implying action for one’s benefit or purpose is attested.”

7.7. Autobenefactive *eat*-periphrases

Verbs ‘eat’ semantically depart from the most typical action verbs in that the manipulation exerted by the agent of ‘eat’ on the patient is not the real aim of an eating event: by manipulating the patient, the agent of ‘eat’ aims at satisfying his/her hunger, i.e. at producing an effect on him/herself. Consequently, it is not surprising that verbs ‘eat’ can grammaticalize as operators in autobenefactive periphrases.

The Munda languages Mundari and Ho attest the grammaticalization of *jom-* ‘eat’ as an autobenefactive operator – Hook 1991. Note that Munda languages attest other grammaticalized uses of the same root:

– as already mentioned in section 2.3, Santali uses *jom-* ‘eat’ as an operator in passive periphrases;

– in Kharia, *jom-* is not used as a full verb anymore, but subsists as an ‘autopoiesis’ marker denoting “that something happened on its own, i.e., there was no outside force which caused it to happen. With potentially volitional predicates on the other hand, it denotes that the agent simply performed the action because s/he wanted to and was under no obligation to do so.” (Peterson 2006:233).

Note in particular that the ‘autopoetic’ use of ‘eat’ in Kharia has a clear semantic connection with autobenefactive.

Among Tibeto-Burman languages, the autobenefactive use of verbs ‘eat’ is attested in South East Kiranti language (see Ebert 1997 on Athpare, Rai 1985 on Bantawa).

8. Benefactive periphrases with verbs other than ‘give’ in valency operator function

When discussing the existence of benefactive periphrases with verbs other than ‘give’ in valency operator function, true periphrases involving a verb grammaticalized as valency operator must be distinguished from biverbal constructions in which a benefactive meaning is implied by the inherent semantics of the verb in V2 position, but in which this verb retains its specific semantics, as discussed for Thai in Jenny 2007.

The Tibeto-Burman language Lahu uses *pî* ‘give’ for third person beneficiaries only, and uses a particle cognate with *lâ* ‘come’ to express that an action is performed for the benefit of a speech act participant:

“Lahu is careful to specify for whose benefit the verbal action is performed. This is done by two morphemes, the Vv *pî* ‘give’ and the Pv *lâ* (< *lâ* ‘come’). The outer-directed *pî* is used to indicate that the action affects a third person, while the inner-directed *lâ* shows that the action affects a non-third person, e.g. *chɔ lâ* (Vh + Pv) ‘chop for me/us/you’; *chɔ pî* (Vh + Vv) ‘chop for him/her/them’.”¹¹

(Matisoff 2003:21)

Benefactive periphrases with a verb ‘help’, ‘put’, or ‘do/act for’ in valency operator function are sporadically attested.

¹¹ Vh = ‘main verb’ in a verb concatenation, Vv = post-head ‘versatile’ verb, Pv = verb particle.

In Cantonese, *béi* ‘give’ occur in V2 position in serial verb constructions with a dative rather than benefactive function – ex. (58a), and typical beneficiaries are introduced by *bōng* ‘help’ in the construction illustrated by ex. (58b).

(58) *Cantonese* (Matthews & Yip 1994:201/143)

- a. *Kéuih kàhmmáahn dá-dihnwá béi ngóh*
 3SG last night call-phone give 1SG
 ‘S/he gave me a call last night’
- b. *Ngóh bōng léih dá-dihnwá*
 1SG help 2SG call-phone
 ‘I’ll phone for you’¹²

Dulong (LaPolla 2003b) also has a benefactive periphrasis involving a verb ‘help’. Note that, (a) in the Dulong periphrasis, in contrast to Cantonese, ‘help’ occurs in V2 position, and (b) Dulong also has a benefactive construction involving a ‘benefactive auxiliary’ *č* showing verb inflection and occupying a position that could be identified as the V2 position in a serial verb construction, but apparently devoid of independent verbal uses, and whose etymology is not discussed in the source in question – ex. (59).

(59) *Dulong* (LaPolla 2003b:678)

- a. *àŋ cūŋ ǎgò tě rī sǎnǎŋ*
 3SG wood 1SG ERG carry help.1SG
 ‘I carry wood for him’ (lit. ‘I help carry his wood’)
- b. *ǎgò tě àŋ cūŋ rī čŋ*
 1SG ERG 3SG wood carry BEN.1SG
 ‘I carry wood for him’

The use of a verb ‘put’ as a valency operator in a benefactive periphrasis has been signaled in the Papuan language Hua – ex. (60), and in the Dravidian language Telugu – ex. (61).

(60) *Hua* (Haiman 1980)

- Zu ki-na d-te*
 house build-A3SG P1SG-put.A3SG.DECL
 ‘He built me a house’

¹² Note that, as explicitly stated by Matthews & Yip, “although *bōng* in isolation means ‘help’, the addressee here is not expected to participate actively; rather, the speaker is offering to perform the action single-handedly”. In other words, a possible English equivalent would be ‘I’ll help you by phoning’, but NOT ‘I’ll help you to phone’.

(61) *Telugu* (Krishnamurti 2003)

Mā āwiḍa rōjū padimandiki annam waṇḍ-i peḍutundi
POSS1SG wife daily for ten persons food cook-CVB put
'My wife daily cooks food for ten persons'

The use of 'do for' as a benefactive operator is found in the Austronesian language *Tukang Besi* – ex. (62) from Donohue 1999.

(62) *Tukang Besi* (Donohue 1999:187)

No-wila kua dao a ko te ina-no
A3PL-go ALL market do for CORE mother-3PL
'They went to the market for their mother'

Benefactive periphrases involving a verb 'show' are sometimes mentioned (in particular in the Kwa language *Akan*). However, *show*-periphrases seem to license recipients or goals rather than beneficiaries proper, and I have come across no unquestionable case of benefactive *show*-periphrasis.

According to Alexandra Aikhenvald (Aikhenvald 2003:437), the Amazonian language *Tariana* has benefactive serial verb constructions formed with *-uma* 'seek', 'find' and *-ni* 'do' as their first components. However, judging from the two examples she provides, the analysis of these verbs as possible benefactive operators in *Tariana* serial verb constructions seems very dubious:

– In the example with *-uma* 'seek' (whose relevant part is translated as 'I look for food for women'), it seems obvious that *-uma* contributes to the meaning of the serial construction *seek eat* → *look for food* with its basic meaning 'seek', and there is no evidence that it is involved in the assignation of the beneficiary role to 'women'.

– No word glossed as 'prepare' figures in the gloss of the example with *-ni* 'do', translated as 'Prepare manioc for them to eat', and the gloss suggests that it should better be analyzed as involving a causative serial verb construction with the meaning 'Make them eat manioc'.

9. Conclusion

In this paper, I have surveyed benefactive periphrases of different types. The main conclusions can be summarized as follows:

(a) Benefactive periphrases using a verb other than 'give' in valency operator function, or in which 'give' occurs in first position, are exceptional.

(b) Two of the three formal types of benefactive periphrases (the serial type and the marked-Vlex type) are widely attested in the languages of the world. They are particularly common on the Asian continent, where they occupy two distinct but contiguous areas. Outside Asia, attestations of benefactive periphrases of the marked-Vlex type are sporadic, whereas the serial type of benefactive periphrasis is common in all language families or areas known for their overall tendency towards serialization, with the exception of Oceanic.

(c) In benefactive *give*-periphrases, ‘give’ may grammaticalize as a benefactive adposition or an applicative marker. Benefactive verbal compounds constitute an intermediate stage in the conversion of ‘give’ into an applicative marker.

(d) Autobenefactive *take*-periphrases are particularly common among Mongolic and Turkic languages, and are also attested in Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Tibeto-Burman, and Austroasiatic languages, but do not seem to be attested outside this area.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--|--|
| 1 / 2 / 3: 1st / 2nd / 3rd person | GER: gerund |
| A: person mark referring to the agent of prototypical action verbs | IMP: imperative |
| ACC: accusative | IND: indicative |
| ACT: active | INDma: indicative, male addressee |
| ALL: allative | INF: infinitive |
| AN: animate | IPFV: imperfective |
| AO: animate object | IPRF: imperfect |
| BEN: benefactive | LOC: locative |
| CAUS: causative | P: person mark referring to the patient of prototypical action verbs |
| CLF: classifier | PFV: perfective |
| COMP: complementizer | PL: plural |
| CORE: core argument | POSS: possessive |
| CVB: converb | PREP: preposition |
| D: person mark referring to a participant represented by a dative NP | PRF: perfect |
| DAT: dative | PROG: progressive |
| DECL: declarative | PRS: present |
| DEF: definite | PST: past |
| DEM: demonstrative | REFL: reflexive |
| DS: different subject | REL: relativizer |
| ENUNC: enunciative particle | R.PST: recent past |
| ERG: ergative | SBJ: subject |
| EXC: exclusive | SEQ: sequential |
| FOC: focalization | SG: singular |
| FUT: future | SGF: singular feminine |
| GEN: genitive | SGM: singular masculine |
| | TOP: topic |

References

- Abdel-Hafiz, A. 1988. *A reference grammar of Kunuz Nubian*. PhD thesis. State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Abraham, R. 1962. *Dictionary of Modern Yoruba*. 2nd edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Aikhenvald, A. 2006. ‘Serial verb constructions in typological perspective’. In Aikhenvald, A. & R. Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ameka, F. 2003. ‘Multiverb constructions in a West African areal typological perspective’. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Serial Verb Constructions. La Trobe.
- Anderson, G. 1995. ‘Ditransitives, possessor raising, copying-to-OBJ: Animacy in morphosyntax’. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 31. 1-17.
- Anderson, G. 2001. ‘Subject version and object version in Tofa auxiliary verb constructions’. *Turkic Languages* 5/1. 240-269.
- Anderson, G. 2002. ‘Auxiliary verb constructions in Old Turkic and Altai-Sayan Turkic’. Paper presented at the Old Turkic Symposium. Frankfurt.

- Asher, R. 1985. *Tamil*. London: Croom Helm.
- Asher, R. & T. Kumari. 1997. *Malayalam*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Azeb, A. & G. Dimmendaal. 2006. Converbs from an African perspective. In Ameka, F., A. Dench & N. Evans (eds.), *Catching language: Issues in grammar writing*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 393-440.
- Bhatia, T. 1993. *Punjabi, a cognitive-descriptive grammar*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Bodomo, A. & M. van Oostendorp. 1993. 'Serial verb nominalization in Dagaare'. Paper presented at the 24th Annual Conference on African Linguistics. Columbus, Ohio.
- Bodrogligeti, A. 2001. *A grammar of Chagatay*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Browne, G. 2002. *Old Nubian grammar*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Bruce, L. 1984. *The Alambalak language of Papua New Guinea East Sepik*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Butt, M. & A. Tantos. 2004. 'Verbal semantics via Petri nets'. Paper presented at the LFG04 Conference. University of Canterbury.
- Carlson, R. 1991. 'From verb to preposition in Senúfo'. In Traugott, E. & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ???
- Censabella, M. 2007. 'Competing morphemes in Toba benefactive marking'. Presentation at the Workshop on the Typology of Benefactives and Malefactives. University of Zürich.
- Christaller, J. 1933. *Dictionary of the Asante and Fante language called Tshi (Twi)*. 2nd edition revised and enlarged. Basel: The Basel Evangelical Missionary Society.
- Collins, C. 2003. 'The internal structure of vP in Ju|'hoan and =Hoan'. *Studia Linguistica* 57. 1-25.
- Creissels, D. 2005. 'S-O-V-X constituent order and constituent order alternations in West African languages'. *BLS* 31.
- Crowley, T. 2002. *Serial verbs in Oceanic, a descriptive typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Demirci, K. 2006. *Kazakh verbal structures and descriptive verbs*. Hyattsville MD: Dunwoody Press.
- Dickens, P. D. 2005. *A concise grammar of Ju|'hoan*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Dryer, M. 2003. 'Word order in Sino-Tibetan languages from a typological and geographical perspective'. In Thurgood, G. & R. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 43-55.
- Dyrenkova, N. 1940. *Grammatika ojrotskogo jazyka*. Leningrad: Akademia Nauk SSSR.
- Ebert, K. 1994. *The structure of Kiranti languages*. Universität Zürich: Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Ebert, K. 1997. *A grammar of Athpare*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Fagerli, O. 1995. 'Benefactive constructions: a typological study'. *Working papers in Linguistics* 25. University of Trondheim. 101-117.
- Foley, W. 1991. *The Yimas language of New Guinea*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Genetti, C. 2007. *A grammar of Dolakha Newar*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grunina, E. 2005. *Turkmenskij jazyk*. Moscow: "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
- Haboud, M. 1994. 'On language contact and grammaticalization in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish'. Ms. University of Oregon.
- Haboud, M. 1998. *Quichua y castellano en los Andes Ecuatorianos, los efectos de un contacto prolongado*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Hagemeyer, T. 2000. *Serial verb constructions in São-Tomense*. Masters thesis. University of Lisbon.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi, & F. Hunnemeier. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, B. & T. Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hendriksen, H. 1944. *Syntax of the infinite verb forms of Pāli*. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.
- Hoijer, H. 1933. *Tonkawa: An Indian language of Texas*. New York: Columbia University. (Extract from *Handbook of American Indian languages*, Vol. 3)
- Hook, P. 1991. 'The compound verb in Munda: An areal and typological overview'. *Language Sciences* 13/2. 181-195.
- Hopper, P. & E. Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hugjiltu, W. 2003. 'Bonan'. In Janhunen, J. (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 325-45.
- Ikoru, S. 1996. *The Kana language*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.
- Iwasaki, S. & Yap F.-H. 2000. "Give constructions in Thai and beyond: A cognitive and grammaticalization perspective". *Proceedings of the International Conference on Tai Studies*, July 29-31, 1998. Bangkok: Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University. 371-382.
- Jakobi, A. & J. Crass. 2004. *Grammaire du beria (langue saharienne)*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.

- Jenny, M. 2005. *The verb system of Mon*. Universität Zürich: Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Jenny, M. 2007. 'Benefactive strategies in Thai'. Presentation at the Workshop on the Typology of Benefactives and Malefactives. University of Zürich.
- Kim, H. 2003. 'Santa'. In Janhunen, J. (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 346-63.
- Kiryu, K. 2000. 'Types of verbs and functions of the causative suffix *-k* in Newar'. Paper presented at the Sixth Himalayan Languages Symposium. University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee.
- Krishnamurti, B. 2003. *The Dravidian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krueger, J. 1964. 'The Turco-Mongolian benefactive'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84/4. 410-1.
- Lacroix, R. 2007. 'Benefactives in Laz'. Presentation at the Workshop on the Typology of Benefactives and Malefactives. University of Zürich.
- Lai, H.-L. 2001. 'On Hakka BUN: a case of polygrammaticalization'. *Language and Linguistics* 2/2. 137-153.
- LaPolla, R. 2003a. 'Overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax'. In Thurgood, G. & R. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 22-42.
- LaPolla, R. 2003b. 'Dulong'. In Thurgood, G. & R. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 674-82.
- Leroy, J. 2003. *Grammaire du mankon*. Thèse de doctorat d'état (Habilitation thesis). University of Paris 3.
- Lidz, L. 2006. 'A synopsis of Yongnin Na (Mosuo)'. Paper presented at the 39th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Liu, F. 2006. 'Dative constructions in Chinese'. *Language and Linguistics* 7/4. 863-904.
- Lord, C. 1973. 'Serial verbs in transition'. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4. 269-96.
- Lord, C. 1975. 'Igbo verb compounds and the lexicon'. *Studies in African Linguistics* 6/1. 23-48.
- Lord, C. 1977. 'How Igbo got from SOV serializing to SVO compounding'. *Studies in African Linguistics Supplement* 7. 145-155.
- Lord, C. 1993. *Historical change in serial verb constructions*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lord, C., F. Yap, & S. Iwasaki. 2002. 'Grammaticalization of 'give': African and Asian perspectives'. In Wischer, I. & G. Diewald (eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 217-235.
- Mamatov, J., S. Harrell, K. Kehoe, & K. Khodjibaev. 2005. *Tajik-English dictionary*. Springfields VA: Dunwoody Press.
- Margetts, A. & P. Austin. 2007. 'Three-participant events in the languages of the world: towards a crosslinguistic typology'. *Linguistics* 45/3. 393-451.
- Matisoff, J. 1991. 'Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu'. In Traugott, E. & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 2. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matisoff, J. 2003. 'Lahu'. In Thurgood, G. & R. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 208-21.
- Mithun, M. 2001. *Understanding and explaining applicatives*. Chicago Linguistic Society 37/2. 73-97.
- Mixco, M. 1997. *Mandan*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Montaut, A. 2004. *A grammar of Hindi*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Moser, R. 2005. 'Grammaticalization chains of the verb *kàre* 'to give' in Kabba'. In Voeltz, E. F. K. (ed.), *Studies in African linguistic typology*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 277-301.
- Neukom, L. 2001. *Santali*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Newman, J. 1996. *Give, a cognitive linguistic study*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Newman, J. (ed.). 1998. *Linguistics of giving*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Newmeyer, F. 2004. 'Some thoughts on the serial verb construction'. Workshop 'La notion de "construction verbale en série" est-elle opératoire?'. Paris: EHESS.
- Nugteren, H. 2003. 'Shira Yughur'. In Janhunen, J. (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 265-85.
- Okell, J. & A. Allot. 2001. *Burmese/Myanmar dictionary of grammatical forms*. London: Curzon.
- Onumajuru, M. 1985. *Système verbal de la langue igbo (parler d'Orlu)*. PhD thesis. University of Grenoble.
- Palayer, P. 1989. *La langue sar (sud du Tchad)*. Thèse de doctorat d'état. University of Tours.
- Palmer, B. 1999. *A grammar of the Kokota language, Santa Isabel, Solomon Islands*. PhD thesis. University of Sidney.
- Pardeshi, P. 2001. "The explicator compound verb in Marathi: Definitional issues and criteria for identification". *Kobe Papers in Linguistics* 3. 94-111.
- Paul, S. 2003. 'Composition of compound verbs in Bangla'. In Beermann D. & L. Hellan (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop on Multi-Verb Constructions*. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

- Paul, W. 2004. 'The "serial verb construction" in Chinese: a Gordian knot'. Workshop 'La notion de "construction verbale en série" est-elle opératoire?'. Paris: EHESS.
- Peterson, D. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quigley, S. 2002. *The Awara verbal system*. Master Thesis. University of North Dakota.
- Rai, N. 1985. *A descriptive study of Bantawa*. PhD thesis. University of Poona.
- Remijsen, B. To appear. 'Nouns and verbs in Magey Matbat'. In Klamer, M. & M. Ewing (eds.), *Typological and areal analyses: Contributions from East Nusantara*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Rice, K. 1989. *A grammar of Slave*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rude, N. 1991. 'Verbs to promotional suffixes in Sahaptian and Klamath'. In Traugott, E. & B. Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 2. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 183-99.
- Salas, A. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano*. Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
- Shibatani, M. 1994. 'Benefactive constructions: a Japanese-Korean comparative perspective'. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4, ed. N. Akatsuka. Stanford: CSLI. 39-74.
- Shibatani, M. 1996. 'Applicatives and benefactives: A cognitive account'. In Shibatani, M. & S. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 157-194.
- Shibatani, M. 2003. 'Directional verbs in Japanese'. In Shay, E. & U. Seibert (eds.) *Motion, direction and location in languages*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Skribnik, E. 2003. 'Buryat'. In Janhunen, J. (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 102-28.
- Solomiac, P. 2007. Phonologie et morphosyntaxe du dzùungoo de Samogohiri. PhD thesis. University of Lyon.
- Song, J. 2007. 'Korean particles and their meanings'. Presentation at the Workshop on the Typology of Benefactives and Malefactives. University of Zürich.
- Tida, S. 2006. *A grammar of the Dom language*. PhD thesis. University of Kyoto.
- Ting, J. & M. Chang. 2004. 'The category *gei* in Mandarin Chinese and grammaticalization'. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 22. 45-74.
- Toronzoni, N. T. N. 1989. *Description du ngbandi*. PhD thesis. Université libre de Bruxelles.
- Tsumagari, T. 2003. 'Dagur'. In Janhunen, J. (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 129-53.
- Uchchukwu, C. In Press. 'The grammaticalization of prepositional markers in Igbo: the example of the verb root *-nyé* 'give''. In Asbury, A., J. Dotlacil, B. Gehrke & R. Nouwen, *Syntax and semantics of spatial P*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- van der Voort. 2004. *A grammar of Kwaza*. Berlin / New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Van Valin, R., & R. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vogel, S. 2006. *Introduction à la langue et aux dits traditionnels des Phnong de Mondulkiri*. Phnom Penh: Editions Funan.
- Wöllmin, S. 2007. 'Benefactives in Gumer'. Presentation at the Workshop on the Typology of Benefactives and Malefactives. University of Zürich.
- Voorhoeve, J. 1975. 'Serial verbs in Creole'. Paper presented at the International Conference On Pidgins and Creoles. University of Hawaii.
- Welmers, W. 1973. *African language structures*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.
- Werner, R. 1987. *Grammatik des Nobiin (Nilnubisch)*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Williamson, K. 1965. *A grammar of the Kolokuma dialect of Ijò*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, K. & A. Timitimi. 1983. *Short Ijò-English dictionary*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- You, S.-H. 2003. 'Benefactive verbal constructions in Korean: A functional approach'. *Discourse and Cognition* 10/2. 75-93.
- Zúñiga, F. 2007. 'Benefaction and malefaction in Mapudungun'. Presentation at the Workshop on the Typology of Benefactives and Malefactives. University of Zürich.