This is the pre-final version of a paper published in Zuñiga, F. & S. Kittilä, *Studies in Ditransitive Constructions*, Benjamins, 2010, 29-69.

Benefactive applicative periphrases: a typological approach

Denis CREISSELS
University of Lyon

Abstract
After defining applicative periphrases as constructions in which a verb (the verb-operator) acts as a valency operator licensing the expression of an additional participant fulfilling a given semantic role in the event encoded by another verb (the lexical verb), this paper analyses applicative periphrases licensing beneficiaries. Three formal types are recognized with respect to the grammatical nature of the two verb forms involved in the periphrasis, and their distribution in the languages of the world is examined. Grammaticalization paths leading to benefactive applicative periphrases are discussed, as well as further evolutions of benefactive applicative periphrases. The last two sections are devoted to autobenefactive applicative periphrases and to the use of verbs other than 'give' as verb-operator in benefactive applicative periphrases.

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 examines applicative periphrases licensing benefactives in a typological perspective.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, after defining the notion of applicative periphrasis, I define benefactive applicative 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 applicative periphrases according to the grammatical nature of the verb forms involved, and in Section 4, I examine their geographical distribution. In Section 5, I examine the grammaticalization paths in which benefactive applicative periphrases are involved. Section 6 is devoted to the use of 'take' and 'eat' in complex predicates expressing autobenefaction. Section 7 examines the use of verbs other than 'give' in benefactive applicative periphrases. [1]

[1] I am grateful to the following colleagues for their comments on earlier versions of this paper and/or their help in collecting data: Azeb Amha, Isabelle Bril, Injoo Choi-Jonin, Antoine Guillaume, Miyuki Ishibashi, Guillaume Jacques, Mathias Jenny, Renée Lambert-Brétière, Annie Montaut, Christiane Pilot-Raichoor, and Masayoshi Shibatani. I am particularly grateful to Karen Ebert for her help with Asian data.

2. Benefactive applicative periphrases: definition and introductory remarks

2.1. Applicative periphrases

In applicative constructions, a participant that cannot be treated as a core term of the corresponding non-applicative construction shows morphosyntactic properties identical or similar to those of the patient in the prototypical transitive construction. Applicative constructions may thus promote participants otherwise encoded as adjuncts to the status of core syntactic terms, but there are also obligatory applicatives (particularly common among Bantu languages), i.e. applicative constructions that constitute the only possible way to encode some semantic roles.[2]

Applicative periphrases are biverbal constructions functionally comparable to monoverbal constructions headed by applicative verb forms. The two verbs they involve can be designated 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 morphosyntactic treatment 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 applicative periphrases

Applicative periphrases licensing beneficiaries are particularly common. Ex. (1) to (3) illustrate the three sub-types of beneficiaries (recipient-beneficiaries, deputative beneficiaries, and plain beneficiaries) recognized by Van Valin & LaPolla (1997:383-4)

(1) Yoruba – Rowlands (1969:83)

Rà á fún mi.
buy 3SG give 1SG
'Buy it for me.' (recipient beneficiary)

[2] For a more detailed presentation of my own views on applicatives, see Creissels (2006:73-84).

(2) Yoruba – Abraham (1962:348)

Ó jíṣẹ́ fún mi.
3SG go_on_an_errand give 1SG
'He went on an errand for me.' (deputative beneficiary)

(3) Twi – Christaller (1933:566)

Owu kyɛɛ me.
3SG.die share 1SG
'He died for me, for my benefit.' (plain beneficiary)

2.3. Benefactive applicative periphrases and other types of benefactive periphrases

The definition formulated in Section 2.2 does not apply to all periphrastic constructions expressing benefactive / malefactive meanings, but only to those in which the verb-operator can be described as adding a beneficiary to the argument structure of the lexical verb in a way comparable to what can be observed with morphological applicatives. For example, the periphrastic passive of Vietnamese, illustrated by Ex. (4), is outside the scope of this study, since it cannot be described as involving a valency change of the applicative type. Rather, a specification is added to the semantic role of the P argument of the lexical verb by means of a control construction in which the subject of *được* 'get' or *bị* 'undergo' controls the missing object of the lexical verb.

(4) Vietnamese – Dauphin (1977:46)

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, Santali (Munda) has a periphrasis in which *jɔm-* 'eat' expresses a malefactive meaning, illustrated by Ex. (5). However, this construction does not license a valency-external participant affected to his/her detriment, and consequently does not fall under the definition formulated above. It is 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-ṭhɛn əḍi ruhɛt'-iɲ jɔm-akat'a.
that(AN)-DAT much scold-A1SG eat-PFV.ACT-IND
'I got scolded badly by him.' (lit. 'I ate much scolding from him')

A similar phenomenon is found in Hindi, which has pairs 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 & p.c).

2.4. Benefactive and malefactive

Rather than a specifically benefactive meaning, benefactive applicative periphrases (henceforth BAPs) may express a more general meaning of affectedness lending itself to malefactive interpretations, depending on the context. Ex. (6) illustrates the malefactive reading of the Yoruba 'give' periphrasis, other possible readings of which have been illustrated by Ex. (1) & (2) above.

(6) Yoruba – Abraham (1962:316)

Ó purọ́ fún mi.
3SG lie give 1SG
'He lied to me.'

However, the malefactive use of BAPs 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 BAPs to the expression of malefaction 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. The grammaticalized malefactive serial verb constructions illustrated by Ex. (4) & (5) above and analyzed among others by Radetzky & Yamashita Smith (this volume) are not applicative constructions, and consequently fall beyond the scope of this paper.

Similarly, a superficial look at the Baule construction illustrated by Ex. (7) could suggest analyzing it as an applicative periphrasis specifically expressing malefaction. 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.

(7) Baule (pers. doc.)

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

The absence of dedicated applicative-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, based on a tendency to associate centripetal with benefactive, and centrifugal with malefactive – see e.g. Salas (2006:121-4) and Zúñiga (this volume) on Mapudungun.

2.5. Benefactive and autobenefactive

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

2.6. General characteristics of benefactive applicative periphrases

BAPs tend to share 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 (the use of verbs other than 'give' as valency operators in BAPs is examined in Section 8).
(b) Irrespective of the status of the language in question with respect to constituent order typology, 'give' almost always occupies the second position in BAPs.[3]

Mandarin Chinese constitutes the best-known exception to the generalization according to which 'give' occurs in second position in BAPs – Ex. (8).[4]

[3] 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 connection between the linear ordering of applicative periphrases and the chronological succession of the phases of complex events.
[4] Many speakers of Mandarin, especially towards the south, allow however BAPs with 'give' in second position (Masayoshi Shibatani, p.c.).

(8) Mandarin Chinese – Li & Thompson (1981:388)

Wǒ gěi tā jì le yi fēng xìn.
1SG give 3SG mail PFV one CLF letter
'I mailed a letter for him/her.'

The other cases of BAPs with 'give' in first position I am aware of are Yongning Na (Tibeto-Burman) – Lidz (2006), Abui (Papuan) – Kratochvíl (2007:394-6), and Ecuadorian Highland Spanish – Haboud (1994 & 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 BAP in those languages can be viewed as a piece of evidence that the construction is only superficially identifiable as a BAP, 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.

2.7. Identifying benefactive applicative periphrases

2.7.1. Distinguishing benefactive applicative periphrases from biclausal constructions

BAPs may be similar or even identical to biclausal constructions expressing that a giving event expressed by the second clause follows the event expressed by the first clause. Intonational contours can be expected to provide a clue to the distinction between monoclausal an biclausal expressions, but unfortunately, the documentation available on most languages does not allow using intonation as a criterion in a typological study relying mainly on second-hand data. 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 BAPs. 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 BAP, but some authors insist on the specificity of 'give' verbs used as valency operators. For example, in Kokota (Papuan), Palmer (1999:176) describes benefactive / malefactive 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'".

2.7.2. Distinguishing benefactive applicative 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 invariability in a given construction excludes analyzing a word as a verb in the construction in question, even if the same form is found in contexts in which it shows the inflectional variations that characterize verbs. Others tend to consider that, insofar 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 BAPs, 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 verb forms in valency operator function. Consequently, in its broad sense, the term *benefactive applicative periphrasis* will be applied here to any applicative 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 uniflected verb forms in valency operator function are presented in Section 6.3.

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

‘Give’ verbs are among the verbs most commonly involved in grammaticalization processes. Their possible functions in applicative periphrases are not limited to licensing beneficiaries. For example, according to Hagemeijer (2000), in São-Tomense (Creole; São Tomé), *da* ‘give’ in applicative operator function can assign the following semantic roles: benefactive (9a), goal (9b), experiencer (9c),[5] recipient (9d), and even source (9e).

[5] The categorization of the semantic role exemplified in this sentence as experiencer is somewhat questionable, but Hagemeier (2000) provides no clearer example of ‘give’ licensing an experiencer. I also have maintained here the characterization of Ex. (9e) given by Hagemeier, although it might be argued that (9e) rather instantiates cause.

(9) São-Tomense – Hagemeijer (2000:32/105/106)

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. (10a); *fún* can even be used to introduce temporal adjuncts – Ex. (10b).

(10) Yoruba – Abraham (1962:226)

a. *Ó ń kú lọ fún ebi.*
3SG PROG die go[6] give hunger
'He is dying of hunger.'

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

Grammaticalized uses of 'give' verbs 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 Hakka (Sinitic), the use of 'give' to introduce recipient NPs has extended to 'give' itself, giving rise to the construction illustrated

[6] In this construction, *lọ* 'go away' expresses continuative aspect.

by Ex. (11), currently analyzed as involving a first occurrence of ‘give’ in verbal predicate function and a second occurrence of ‘give’ in dative preposition function.

(11) Hakka – Lai H.-L. (2001:141)

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, ‘give’ verbs quite commonly grammaticalize as valency operators, not only in applicative periphrases, but also in passive periphrases, and in causative or permissive periphrases. As discussed among others by Heine & Kuteva (2002:149-155; 321), they may also grammaticalize as complementizers or TAM markers, and they are often involved in polygrammaticalization processes. For example, in Phnong (Bahnaric, Mon-Khmer), *ʔan* ‘give’ occurs in V2 position in dative / benefactive constructions, but also in V1 position in causative / permissive constructions, and in medial position in triverbal constructions expressing purpose – Ex. (12).[7]

(12) Phnong – Vogel (2006:108/133/166)

a. *Ɋɔp* *ntum* *ŋɜj* *ɖroːn* *ʔan* *paŋ.*
1SG teach speak Khmer give 3SG
‘I teach him Khmer.’

b. *Ɋɔp* *ʔan* *paŋ* *kʰɜt.*
1SG give 3SG die
‘I let him die.’

c. *Cʰoːŋ* *piaŋ* *ʔaŋ* *lɛʔ* *doː.*
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 BAPs.

3. Formal types of benefactive applicative periphrases

Three formal types of BAPs can be recognized with respect to the grammatical nature of the two verb forms involved in the periphrasis. Note that, in the definition

[7] Mon *kɒ* ‘give’, Thai *hâj* ‘give’ and Burmese *pèi* ‘give’ show a similar range of grammaticalized functions – see Jenny (2005:214-5). On the relationship between benefactive and causative constructions involving the same ‘give’ verb, see in particular Iwasaki & Yap (2000).

of formal types of BAPs, *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 according to which a *serial verb construction* (henceforth abbreviated as SVC) is a complex predicate (i.e., a monoclausal construction 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 coincides with that formulated by Aikhenvald (2006a:1). It crucially differs from earlier definitions in that it explicitly excludes covert clause or VP coordination from SVCs. Covert coordination may be the historical source of SVCs, and in some languages the limit between covert coordination and SVCs may be fuzzy, but a notion of SVC that did not include this restriction would be too vague to be useful in the analysis of syntactic structures. For recent discussions of the relationship between SVCs and covert coordination, see among others Ameka (2003), Newmeyer (2004), Paul (2004).

Although there is now a relative consensus on this definition, it must be mentioned at this point that the current conception of SVCs has been vigourously criticized by Shibatani (2006). He argues that this conception relies on a confusion between verb forms as pure forms and verb forms as members of a paradigm occupying a given slot in a given construction, and that SVCs as currently identified share so many properties with other formal types of complex predicates that it is not justified to view them as a cross-linguistically valid type of construction.

Concerning the distinction between complex predicates of the serial type and the combination of a monoverbal predicate with an adposition, the uncontroversial cases of SVCs 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 SVC 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. (13) from Baule (Kwa) and (14) from Dagaare (Gur) illustrate benefactive SVCs with parallel inflection of the lexical verb and of 'give' in valency operator function.

(13) Baule (pers. doc.)

Ákísí à-tɔ̀n duô à-màn Kòfí.
Akissi PRF-cook yam PRF-give Kofi
'Akissi has cooked yam for Kofi.'

(14) Dagaare – Bodomo & van Oostendorp (1993)

Bayɔɔ zo-ro gɛ-rɛ wuo-ro la haani
Bayor run-IPFV go-IPFV collect-IPFV DECL blackberry
waa-na kʊ-rɔ ma.
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 SVCs involving a fully inflected lexical verb and a verb-operator invariably occurring in bare stem form is much less obvious. Ex. (10) from Yoruba, reproduced here as (15), and Ex. (16) from Kana (Cross-River), illustrate this type of benefactive SVC.

(15) Yoruba – Abraham (1962:226)

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

(16) Kana – Ikoro (1996:254)

ŋwîkā wēè ɔ́b túú nɛ̀ Nūtɛ̀.
Nwiika PST roast three-leave_yam give Nute
'Nwiika roasted a three-leave yam for Nute.'

3.2. The marked-Vop type

Ex. (17) from Mankon (Grassfields Bantu) illustrates a type of BAP in which Vlex 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.

(17) Mankon – Leroy (2003:459)

Mà m↑ɨ́ fàʔá ɣ↑á mbó zuə́́.
1SG FUT work SEQ.give to 3SG.ENUNC
'I will work for him.' (lit. something like 'I will work and-give him')

Welmers (1973:366-72) describes benefactive 'give' periphrases and other complex predicates found in some Benue-Congo languages of South East Nigeria (e.g. Efik, Igbo), 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 SVC.

(18) Efik – Welmers (1973:369-70)

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

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

3.3. The marked-Vlex type

Beria (Saharan) – Ex. (19) – illustrates the type of BAP 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 BAP, 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.

(19) Beria – Jakobi & Crass (2004:171)

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

In this type of BAP, '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 applicative periphrases

4.1. The distribution of the serializing type

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

BAPs of the serial type are common among the serializing languages of West Africa – Ex. (1), (2), (3), (6), (10), (13), (14), & (16) above, South Eastern Asia – Ex. (20) to (22), and New Guinea – Ex. (23) & (24).

(20) Thai – Lord, Yap & Isawaki (2002:220)

Kháw thamŋaan hây phîichaay.
3SG work give older_brother
'He works for his brother.'

(21) Vietnamese – Dauphin (1977:39)

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

(22) Yao Samsao (Tibeto-Burman) – Matisoff (1991:428)

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

(23) Kokota (Papuan) – Palmer (1999:176)

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

(24) Dom (Papuan) – Tida (2006:169)

^*Flawa* ˇ*nu* ⌜*na* ^*to-gwe.*
flour knead[8] 1EXC give-A3SG.IND
'She kneaded flour for me.'

BAPs of the serial type are also found in those of the pidgin and creole languages that are known for making extensive use of SVCs – Ex. (9) above.

Among the language families in which serialization is a widespread phenomenon, Oceanic is the only one in which applicative, and in particular benefactive SVCs 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)

[8] Note that Tida misleadingly glosses bare verbal stems occurring in V1 position in the SVCs of Dom as 'INF(initive)'.

4.1.2. Others

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

Keo (Western Austronesian; Flores, Indonesia) illustrates the case of a BAP of the serial type in a language belonging to a family within which serialization is not widespread, but located not very far from an area in which such constructions are common – Ex. (25).

(25) Keo – Louise Baird, quoted by Margetts & Austin (2007)

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

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

BAPs 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). BAPs 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 BAP 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 SVC with verbal inflection concentrated on the verb in V2 position.

Among Amerindian languages, benefactive SVCs with parallel inflection are found in the Siouan languages Hidatsa and Mandan – Ex. (26).

(26) Mandan – Mixco (1997:50)

Wą́wąrąhku-rą té wa-hrœ-ak rút rá-sit wa-hrœ
deer-TOP die 1SG-cause-DS rib by heat-roast 1SG-cause
wa-rį-kų?-rįt-o?š.
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 BAPs) with morphological characteristics that make them look like SVCs 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. Not surprisingly, benefactive 'give' compounds and derived benefactive verb forms including an applicative marker originating from a 'give' verb, which clearly result from the evolution of BAPs, are also very common among the languages spoken in this area.

Outside this area, BAPs of the marked-Vlex type are only sporadic.

4.3.1. Asian attestations

LaPolla (2003a: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.[9]

As illustrated by Ex. (27) to (34), BAPs of the marked-Vlex type occur not only among Tibeto-Burman languages (illustrated below by Dolakha Newar), but also in Ainu, Japanese, Korean, and in languages belonging to the Mongolic, Turkic (illustrated below by Ojrot), Indo-Aryan, and Dravidian families.

(27) Dolakha Newar – Genetti (2007:334)

Janta	*lukhā*	*khoŋ-an*	*bi-sin!*
1SG.DAT	door	open-CVB	give-IMP

'Open the door for me!'

[9] Note that some Tibeto-Burman languages have BAPs of the serial type. This is consistent with the fact that the territory occupied by Tibeto-Burman languages overlaps with the South East Asian linguistic area, characterized by extensive use of SVCs in general, and of benefactive SVCs in particular.

(28) Ainu – Tamura (2000:181)

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

(29) Japanese (Miyuki Ishibashi, p.c.)

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

(30) Korean (Injoo Choi, p.c.)

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.'

(31) Mongolian – Gaunt & Bayarmandakh (2004:29)

Ter bidend xool xijž ögnö.
3SG 1PL.DAT food make.CVB give.IPFV
'He will make food for us.'

(32) Ojrot – Dyrenkova (1940:191)

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

(33) Pāli – Hendriksen (1944:134), quoted by Butt & Tantos (2004)

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

(34) Tamil – Krishnamurti (2003:376)

Rājā kumār-ukkuk katav-ai tiṟant-u koƚutt-āṉ.
Raajaa Kumaar-DAT door-ACC open-CVB give.PST-3SGM
'Raajaa opened the door for Kumaar.'

Mamatov & al. (2005) mention a 'give' periphrasis of this type in Tajik (Iranian), but it probably constitutes an instance of contact-induced development, since extensive Turkic-Iranian bilingualism is characteristic of the area where Tajik is

spoken, and I have been able to found no other attestation of this construction among Iranian languages.

4.3.2. African attestations

Converbal 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-Vlex 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 *tr̄-* '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 pl̄lïgɼa denjisna* 'he revealed to us' (lit., 'revealing, he gave to us') and M. 7.5-6 *tan` eila` outɼa tɼsna* 'she placed it in his hand'.
>
> Browne (2002:65)

Ijo languages, which constitute an exceptional case of consistenly OV languages in West Africa,[10] should perhaps be considered as having a BAP of this type. According to Williamson (1965), in the BAP of Ịzọn, 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(ị)* if the following word begins with a vowel – Ex. (35).

(35) Ịzọn – Williamson & Timitimi (1983:160)

Okokodị́	*sọkị-n(ị)*	*ị-pịrị́!*
coconut	pick out-*NỊ*	1SG-give.IMP

'Pick the coconut out (of its shell) for me!'

Consequently, the construction has the appearance of a SVC if the word following Vlex begins with a vowel, and of a marked-Vlex construction if the word following Vlex begins with a consonant. Two alternative interpretations can be considered, but the available data do not make it possible to decide which one should be selected:

(a) *-n(ị)* is a converbal ending with a phonologically conditioned zero allomorph, and consequently the construction belongs to the marked-Vlex type;
(b) *-n(ị)* has the purely morphophonological function of preventing the deletion of the final vowel of the first verb (which in Ịzọn would automatically be deleted in contact with another vowel), and consequently the construction belongs to the serial type.

[10] 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.

4.3.2. American attestations

Haboud (1994, 1998:215-223) describes a BAP 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 in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish. An exceptional feature of this "*dar* + gerund" BAP 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 BAP.

Although particularly usual in the imperative, this construction is also used in other TAMs, as illustrated by Ex. (36). Note in particular the possibility to combine *dar* acting as a benefactive auxiliary with *dar* in the gerund form expressing its basic meaning 'give'.

(36) 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*
3SGM D1SG give.PRS.A3SG make.GER DEF.SGM bread
mientras *yo* *lavo.*
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 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 BAPs of the marked-Vlex type. However, this construction does not seem to be attested in other varieties of Quechua, and Haboud observes 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 transfer of syntactic structures typically involves a word-to-word rather than affix-to-word relation.

Although the emergence of this construction must certainly be viewed as an instance of 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, since the Inca had conquered the region just one century before

the arrival of the Spaniards. At the time of the Spanish conquest, 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.

4.4. Correlations

When I began this investigation, my idea was that there should be a correlation between the type of BAP 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, BAPs probably result from the reanalysis of constructions that, originally, express the meaning 'create/manipulate something and give it to someone'.

However, the data just presented suggest a weaker claim. They confirm that, in general, marked-Vlex BAPs 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 BAPs 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, BAPs 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 SVCs, including benefactive ones.

A possible explanation of this imperfect correlation is 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.[11]

5. Grammaticalization

Similarly to other applicative periphrases, BAPs 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 BAPs in particular, is probably a tendency to limit monoverbal constructions to the

[11] On this and next section, see Shibatani & Chung (2007).

expression of arguments, and to make the role of more or less peripheral or optional participants more explicit by using multiverbal constructions. For example, São-Tomense uses a double object construction in order to mention the source/maleficiary argument of *futa* 'steal', whereas an SVC is required to express a beneficiary with the same verb – Ex. (37).[12]

(37) São-Tomense – Hagemeijer (2000:106)

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.'

5.1. From sequential construction to benefactive applicative periphrasis

5.1.1. 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 benefaction 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 (it) 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 longer 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 regarded as a beneficiary.

It is reasonable to assume that the reanalysis of sequential constructions involving a 'give' verb as BAPs develops first with recipient-like beneficiaries (e.g. 'buy

[12] 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 Censabella (this volume) for Toba (Guaycuruan).

something for someone') before being extended to the expression of other subtypes of beneficiaries.

5.1.2. 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, noun 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, such phrases cannot be inserted between the converb and the final verb – Ex. (38b).

(38) Japanese (Miyuki Ishibashi, p.c.)

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 fact that *nyé* 'give' in Vlex role can combine with *nyé* 'give' in Vop role, as in Ex. (39b), provides evidence of the grammaticalization of 'give' as a valency operator.

(39) Igbo – Onumajuru (1985:173)

a. *ọ́-zù-rù ánú nyé ˈányí.*
A3SG-buy-PFV meat give 1PL
'S/he bought meat for us.'

b. *ó-nyè-rè-m̀ jí ˈnyé ˈúbá.*
A3SG-give-PFV-P1SG yam give Uba
'S/he gave me yams for Uba.'

As in other cases of grammaticalization, ambiguities may however subsist (at least if intonation is not taken into consideration) between BAPs and superficially identical constructions still interpretable as sequential constructions – Ex. (40).

(40) Dolakha Newar – Genetti (2007:336)

Lũ=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, BAPs may be bound by semantic restrictions due to the retention of elements of their original signification. For example, as discussed by Shibatani (2003:282-3), in spite of being clearly distinct from a sequential construction, the BAP 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 BAP including an overtly expressed beneficiary – Ex. (41a-b); note however that the same verbs can occur in the BAP provided the beneficiary is not overtly expressed – Ex. (41c-d).

(41) 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).'[13]

[13] Japanese has several 'give' verbs, depending on honorificity level and orientation – Kuno (1973). *Yaru* and *kureru* are both used in neutral speech register but differ in that *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. Cross-linguistically, 'give' verbs including a deictic component in their lexical meaning (either 1 vs. 2/3 or 1/2 vs. 3) are not uncommon – see among others Browne (2002) on Nubian, Asher & Kumari (1997) on Malayalam, Emeneau (1984) on Toda.

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

In BAPs of the marked-Vlex type, and in some of the BAPs of the serial type, ‘give’ in benefactive operator function bears full verbal inflection. A ‘give’ verb 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 ‘give’ verb can be recognized in a diachronic perspective only. This evolution seems to be common among Tibeto-Burman languages.

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

‘Give’ verbs are widely recognized as a possible source of benefactive adpositions – see among others Heine & Kuteva (2002:149-151).

According to Carlson (1991:214), in Tagbana and Jimini (Senufo, Gur), 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”, whereas Karaboro (another Senufo language) has the cognate benefactive postposition *kə̃* but has lost the corresponding form for ‘give’, replaced by another verb *wãr*.

In the same geographic area, Dzùùngoo (Mande) has a benefactive postposition *kɔ̀* whose probable origin is a SVC with the verb *kɔ̀´* ‘give’ in V2 position. However, in the SVCs of Dzùùngoo, 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 *kɔ̀´* – Solomiac (2007).

Like other function words, ‘give’ verbs reanalyzed as benefactive adpositions may become bound forms, and consequently evolve towards the status of benefactive case markers. For example, according to Remijsen (to appear), in Magey Matbat (Austronesian), “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.”

The problem is to determine at which stage of its evolution a ‘give’ verb 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.

5.3.1. Evidence from extraction

Evidence of an ongoing process of grammaticalization from verb to preposition in a benefactive applicative periphrasis has been discussed by Voorhoeve (1975) for Sranan (Creole). He argues that the existence of two alternative cleft constructions shows that for the Sranan speakers who front the phrase *gi* NP, as in (42c), *gi* ‘give’

in the benefactive construction is a preposition, whereas for those who front only the NP following *gi*, as in (42b), it is a verb.

(42) *Sranan* – Vorhoeve (1975), quoted by Lord (1993:42-3)

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, as in (43a), whereas resumptive pronouns do not occur when the complement of a verb is extracted. According to Hagemeier (2000), the fact that 'give' in the BAP behaves like a verb from this point of view, as shown by Ex. (43), provides evidence that it has not fully grammaticalized as an adposition yet.

(43) São-Tomense – Hagemeijer (2000:108)

a. *Ke kwa ku piskado bili vwado ku-e? / *… ku?*
which thingCOMP fisherman open flying fish with-3SG
'With what did the fisherman open the flying fish?'

b. *Ke nge ku Zon tlaba da? / *… d'e?*
which person COMP Zon work give
'For whom did Zon work?'

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

Mandarin Chinese has been mentioned as having a BAP in which 'give' precedes the lexical verb – Ex. (8), repeated here as (44a). (44b) shows that with some lexical verbs at least, 'give' in valency operator function can occur in second position, but with a different meaning.

(44) Mandarin Chinese – Li & Thompson (1981:388)

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

b. *Wǒ jì le yi 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 'give' in second position assigns the recipient role to the NP that follows it, whereas 'give' in first 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. Since phrases headed by coverbs most often precede the verb,[14] 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*.

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

Abui (Papuan) is another case in point. Kratochvíl (2007:394-96) states that SVCs with *l* 'give' in first 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 BAP properly speaking, in spite of the fact that it includes a role assigner etymologically related to a 'give' verb. 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 Yongning Na (Tibeto-Burman), in which *ki*^{33} 'give' has grammaticalized as a dative-benefactive-allative postposition: Yongnin 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).

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

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

When the two verbs constituting a BAP 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

[14] According to Dryer (2003:48-9), this is highly unusual for preposition phrases in a language having SVO order as dominant order at the clause level.

Vlex shows the same suffix as forms productively used to mark non-final verbs in clause chains (Ex. (37) above) provides evidence against analyzing the BAP as involving compounding, in spite of the impossibility to insert anything between Vlex and Vop. However, 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 'give' verb in constructions other than benefactive compounds) may result in the reanalysis of 'give' as an applicative affix.

5.4.1. Benefactive 'give' compounds and applicative affixes cognate with 'give' verbs in Asian languages

Korean has BAPs in which a fully inflected form of *cwuta* 'give (plain)' or *tulita* 'give (humble)' is immediately preceded by a converbal 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. Note however that particles can be inserted, which shows that the construction cannot be straightforwardly described in terms of compounding (Masayoshi Shibatani, p.c.).

(45) Korean (Injoo Choi, p.c.)

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
'Yumi opened the door for Sumi.'

The hypothesis that the Korean BAP 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 perhaps formally more grammaticalized than its Japanese equivalent, the Korean BAP shows similar restrictions due to the retention of its original meaning, as illustrated by Ex. (46).

(46) Korean (Song, this volume)

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 Xakas (Turkic), Anderson (2001) describes a phonologically conditioned zero realization of the converbal suffix in the BAP and other "auxiliary verb constructions", which can be viewed as evidence of evolution towards compounding.

According to Peterson (2007), in Hakha Lai (Tibeto-Burman), the benefactive/malefactive applicative suffix *-piak*, seen in (47a), closely resembles the 'give' verb seen in (47b), "reflecting a grammaticalization path already well established for this verb".

(47) Hakha Lai – Peterson (2007:131-2)

a. *Tsewmaŋ = ni?* *door-ʔa?* *ʔa-ka-kal-piak.*
Tsewmang = ERG market-ALL/LOC A3SG-P1SG-go-BEN
'Tsewmang went to the market for me.'

b. *Tsewmaŋ = ni?* *ʔaar-saa* *ʔa-ka-peek.*
Tsewmang = ERG chicken-meat A3SG-P1SG-give
'Tsewmang gave me chicken meat.'

5.4.2. Benefactive 'give' compounds and applicative affixes cognate with 'give' verbs in the languages of the Pacific

Alamblak (Papuan) has benefactive 'give' constructions identified by Bruce (1984) as verbal compounds – Ex. (48).

(48) Alamblak – Bruce (1984:39)

Na yawyt yimam wikna-ha-më-an-m.
1SG dog people buy-give-R.PST-A1SG-P3PL
'I bought the dog for the people.'

Quigley (2002:58-62) describes benefactive 'give' compounds in Awara (Papuan) and discusses morphological evidence of the distinction between such compounds and biverbal constructions. However, 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 involving benefactive applicative affixes cognate with the homonymous 'give' verb – see Foley (1991:308-9) on Yimas, Anderson (1995) on Usan, Feldman (1986:48-9) on Awtuw.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to see to what extent this choice really reflects differences in the nature of the constructions.

5.4.3. Benefactive 'give' compounds and applicative affixes cognate with 'give' verbs in African languages

Benefactive constructions in which 'give' is contiguous to the other verb involved in the construction have been described in the Khoisan languages Ju|'hoan and ǂHoan – see Dickens (2005) on Ju|'hoan, Collins (2003) on ǂHoan. These constructions, illustrated by Ex. (49) & (50), are currently treated as SVCs, but they could equally be analyzed in terms of compounding, since nothing can be inserted between the two verbs, and this is the analysis reflected by the orthography used by Collins.

(49) Ju|'hoan – Dickens (2005:41)

Dshàú n|óá |ʹàn ha dàʹámá kò ʹmsì.
woman cook give 3SG child PREP food
'The woman cooked food for her child.'

(50) ǂHoan – Collins (2003:2)

Gya"m-|a'a 'a-tsaxo-cu 'am gye ki ||a"e.
child-DIM.PL PROG-cook-give POSS1SG mother PREP meat
'The children are cooking meat for my mother.'

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. (51), but also dative or allative complements.[15]

(51) Igbo – Uchechukwu (2008)

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

[15] 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 SVCs, 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 BAPs 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.

Moreover, some Igbo dialects show evidence that *nyé* in such compounds tends to be reanalyzed as an applicative suffix. According to Uchechukwu (2008), the Ìgbúzọ̀ 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', *zụ́-nyá* 'buy for' vs. *bè-nyè* 'cut out for', *kú-nyé* 'scoop out for' corresponding to Standard Igbo *gbá-nyé*, *zụ́-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 *tr̄-* '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 *-tir-* in Kunuz Nubian – Ex. (52).

(52) Kunuz Nubian – Abdel-Hafiz (1988:231)

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.'

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

Among Amerindian languages, benefactive compounds occur in Kwaza (Amazonian isolate) – Ex. (53). In (53b), the possibility to express 'give for' by means of a compound formally constituted by two occurrences of *wady* 'give' can be viewed as evidence that 'give' in second position in benefactive compounds should rather be analyzed as having grammaticalized as an applicative suffix.

(53) Kwaza – van der Voort (2004:373)

a. *Kudɛrɛ-'wã mãmãñẽ = wa'dy-da-ki.*
Canderé-AO sing = give-1SG-DECL
'I sang for Canderé.'

b. *Wɛra-'wã haru'rai wady = wa'dy-taʔỹ-ra.*
Vera-AO armadillo give = give-P1SG-IMP
'Bring the armadillo (meat) to Vera for me.'

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

Benefactive applicative affixes cognate with a 'give' verb have also been signaled in Sahaptian-Klamath by Rude (1991), in Iroquian by Mithun (2001), in Slave (Athabaskan) by Rice (1989), and in Tonkawa (an extinct language of Texas) by Hoijer (1933).

6. Autobenefactive applicative 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 among others Lacroix (this volume) on Laz) illustrates the possibility of a morphological distinction between non-reflexive benefactive ("objective version") and self-benefactive ("subjective version"). In this section, we examine languages having an autobenefactive applicative periphrasis distinct from the periphrasis licensing a beneficiary other than the subject.

6.1. Autobenefactive 'take' periphrases

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', as illustrated in Ex. (54) from Ojrot (Turkic, also known as Altai-kiži), and in Ex. (55) from Hindi.

(54) Ojrot – Dyrenkova (1940:191)

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

b. *Men balɨk tud-up al-dɨ-m.*
1SG fish catch-CVB take-PFV-A1SG
'I caught (for myself) a fish.'

(55) Hindi – Montaut (2004:125)

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

b. *Maĩ tumhārā kām jaldī kar dũgā.*
1SG your work quickly do give.FUT
'I will do your work quickly.'

Not all languages that have BAPs have developed this expression of autobenefaction: 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. 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 by Krueger (1964).

References on autobenefactive 'take' periphrases in Mongolic languages include among others Skribnik (2003:117) on Buryat,[16] Nugteren (2003:281) on Shira Yughur,[17] Hugjiltu (2003:342) on Bonan,[18] and Kim (2003:360) on Santa.[19]

References on autobenefactive 'take' periphrases in Turkic languages include among others Bodrogligeti (2001:287) on Chagatay,[20] and Grunina (2005:287) on Turkmen.[21] As signaled in Section 4.3.1, Tajik (Iranian) has a 'give' periphrases expressing benefaction that probably developed under the influence of Turkic languages; not surprisingly, Tajik also has a 'take' periphrasis expressing autobenefaction, as in *navišta giriftan* 'write down for oneself', lit. 'take writing' vs. *navišta dodan* 'write down for someone', lit. 'give writing' – Mamatov & al. (2005).

Anderson (2001, 2002) analyzes the 'give' vs. 'take' contrast in Turkic BAPs. 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, Uyγur, Tatar, Xalağ and Čuvaš, and Old Turkic". He concludes that this feature dates back to Proto-Turkic times.

References on autobenefactive 'take' periphrases in Indo-Aryan languages include among others Bhatia (1993:326-7) on Punjabi,[22] Paul (2003:3) on Bengali,[23] and Pradeshi (2001) on Marathi.

Among Dravidian languages, an autobenefactive 'take' periphrases is signaled by Krishnamurti (2003:381) in Telugu.[24]

---

[16] "Other common auxiliaries include … *üge-* 'to give' vs. *aba-* 'to take' [benefactive]."

[17] "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)."

[18] "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'."

[19] "The two auxiliaries *agi-* 'to take' (irregularly from **ab-*) vs. *ogi-* 'to give' (<**ög-*) indicate that the action has a beneficiary ('for')."

[20] "[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."

[21] "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."

[22] "*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."

[23] "Consider a verbal root *Sajano* 'decorate'. It participates in following compound verb constructions: *Sajiye deoya* 'decorate for other's benefit' ... *Sajiye neoya* 'decorate and the result is directed towards the actor'."

Among 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, and Okell & Allott (2001:176) mention the use of the Burmese verb *yu* 'take' as a postverbal marker expressing 'V and take', 'V for oneself'.

Among Austroasiatic languages, an autobenefactive 'take' periphrasis is signaled by Jenny (2005:204) in Mon.[25]

6.2. Autobenefactive 'eat' periphrases

'Eat' verbs 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 'eat' verbs can grammaticalize as operators in autobenefactive periphrases.

Mundari and Ho (Munda) attest the grammaticalization of *jom-* 'eat' as an autobenefactive operator – Hook (1991). Munda languages attest other grammaticalized uses of the same root:

- as already mentioned in Section 2.3, Santali uses *jɔm-* 'eat' as an operator in passive periphrases;
- in Kharia, *jom-* is not used as a full verb anymore, but subsists as an "autopoesis" marker whose meaning has a clear connection with autobenefaction, since it denotes "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).

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

7. Benefactive applicative periphrases with verbs other than 'give' in valency operator function

When discussing the existence of BAPs with verbs other than 'give' in valency operator function, true periphrases involving a verb grammaticalized as a valency operator must be distinguished from biverbal constructions in which a benefactive meaning is implied by the inherent semantics of the verb in second position, but in

[24] "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-goʈʈ-u-kon-* 'to break (a body part) by oneself'."

[25] "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."

which this verb retains its specific semantics, as discussed for Thai by Jenny (this volume).

The Tibeto-Burman language Lahu uses *pî* 'give' for third person beneficiaries only, and uses a particle cognate with *là* '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* (< *là* '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'."[26]
>
> Matisoff (2003:21)

BAPs with a verb glossed 'help', 'put', 'do/act for' in valency operator function are sporadically attested.

In Cantonese, *béi* 'give' occurs in V2 position in SVCs with a dative rather than benefactive function – Ex. (56a), and typical beneficiaries are introduced by *bōng* 'help' in the construction illustrated by Ex. (56b).

(56) 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.'[27]

LaPolla (2003b) mentions a BAP involving a verb glossed 'help' in Dulong (Nungish, Tibeto-Burman). In contrast to Cantonese, 'help' occurs in second position. As illustrated by Ex. (57), Dulong also has a benefactive construction involving a "benefactive auxiliary" *č* taking verb inflection and occupying a position that could be identified as the V2 position in a SVC, but apparently devoid of independent verbal uses. The etymology of this "benefactive auxiliary" is not discussed by LaPolla (2003b).

[26] Vh = 'main verb' in a verb concatenation, Vv = post-head 'versatile' verb, Pv = verb particle.

[27] 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*.

(57) Dulong – LaPolla (2003b:678)

a. *àŋ ɕɯ̄ŋ ǎgɔ̀ tɛ̌ rī sǎnāŋ.*
3SG wood 1SG ERG carry help.1SG
'I carry wood for him' (lit. 'I help carry his wood')

b. *ǎgɔ̀ tɛ̌ àŋ ɕɯ̄ŋ rī čŋ.*
1SG ERG 3SG wood carry BEN.1SG
'I carry wood for him.'

The use of a verb glossed 'put' as a valency operator in a BAP has been signaled in Hua (Papuan) – Ex. (58), and in Telugu (Dravidian) – Ex. (59).[28]

(58) Hua – Haiman (1980), quoted by Foley (1986:98)

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

(59) Telugu – Krishnamurti (2003:381)

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

The use of a verb glossed 'do for' as a benefactive operator is found in Tukang Besi (Austronesian) – Ex. (60).

(60) Tukang Besi – Donohue (1999:187)

No-wila kua daoa ako te ina-no.
A3PL-go ALL market do for CORE mother-3PL
'They went to the market for their mother.'

The use of verbs glossed 'say' licensing the expression of a beneficiary is less easy to analyze. In Amharic, Gumer and other Ethiosemitic languages, the mention of a beneficiary may require the use of a periphrasis involving a converbal form of a verb glossed as 'say', as illustrated by Ex. (61) from Amharic.

[28] In Telugu, according to Masayoshi Shibatani (p.c.), this meaning can be expressed without the use of 'put'. Many native speakers find it difficult to distinguish the meaning of this expression with or without 'put'. Some detect the 'in preparation for the future action' meaning when 'put' is used.

(61) Amharic – Azeb Amha (p.c.)

Arägga lä-Abbäbä bilo Käbbädä-n gäddälä.
Aregga DAT-Abbebe say.3SGM.CVB Kebbede-ACC kill.3SGM.PST
'Aregga killed Kebbede for (the sake/benefit of) Abbebe.'
(lit. 'Aregga killed Kebbede saying "for Abbebe".')

In this construction, the converbal form of 'say' clearly has an applicative function. However, the role of beneficiary is not encoded by the applicative operator itself (the converbal form of 'say'), but by the dative case. In other words, this construction is not inherently a BAP, since it dissociates the applicative function proper from the role assignment function.[29]

In Gumer, according to Völlmin (this volume), beneficiaries occur in the dative case, and applicative 'say' is required when another dative-marked NP is present in the construction of the lexical verb – in particular, in the presence of a patient NP requiring dative marking, as in Ex. (62).

(62) Gumer (Völlmin, this volume)

Arəgga yə-Kəbbədə y-Abbəβə t-i-βɨr
Aregga DAT-Kebbede DAT-Abbebe when-A3SGM-say.IPFV
k'^{w}ət'ər-ə-n-ɨm.
kill.PFV-A3SGM-P3SGM-???
'Aregga killed Kebbede for Abbebe.'

In other words, the use of 'say' in applicative operator function in Gumer can be viewed as a disambiguating strategy aiming to avoid the presence of two NPs with identical case marking in the construction of the same verb. Here again, in spite of the fact that this construction may be obligatory in order to express benefaction, it would not be correct to identify it as a BAP.

BAPs involving verbs glossed 'show' are sometimes mentioned, in particular in Akan (Kwa). 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.

Aikhenvald (2006b:437) argues that Tariana (Maipurean, Amazonia) has benefactive SVCs 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 SVCs seems highly dubious:

[29] The applicative use of 'say' verbs must be explained in the light of their well-known tendency to develop polysemous meanings including in particular volition. Note also that the use of 'say' verbs in light verb constructions in which most languages use 'do' verbs is particularly widespread in Ethiosemitic and neighboring languages. A converbal form of a 'say' verb may thus grammaticalize as an applicative operator whose presence is required in order to expand the construction of an action verb.

– 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 assignment 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 SVC with the meaning ‘Make them eat manioc’.

8. Conclusion

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

(a) BAPs using verbs 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 BAPs (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 BAPs of the marked-Vlex type are sporadic, whereas the serial type of BAP 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: 1rst / 2nd / 3rd person
A: person mark referring to the agent of prototypical action verbs
ACC: accusative
ACT: active
ALL: allative
AN: animate
AO: animate object
BEN: benefactive
CAUS: causative
CLF: classifier
COMP: complementizer
CORE: core argument
CVB: converb
D: person mark referring to a participant represented by a dative NP
DAT: dative
DECL: declarative
DEF: definite
DEM: demonstrative
DS: different subject
ENUNC: enunciative particle
ERG: ergative
EXC: exclusive
FOC: focalization
FUT: future
GEN: genitive
GER: gerund

IMP: imperative
IND: indicative
INDma: indicative, male addressee
INF: infinitive
IPFV: imperfective
IPRF: imperfect
LOC: locative
P: person mark referring to the patient of prototypical action verbs
PFV: perfective
PL: plural
POSS: possessive
PREP: preposition
PRF: perfect
PROG: progressive
PRS: present
PST: past
REFL: reflexive
REL: relativizer
R.PST: recent past
SBJ: subject
SEQ: sequential
SG: singular
SGF: singular feminine
SGM: singular masculine
TOP: topic

References

Abdel-Hafiz, Ahmed S. 1988. 'A reference grammar of Kunuz Nubian'. PhD thesis. State University of New York at Buffalo.

Abraham, Roy C. 1962. *Dictionary of Modern Yoruba*. 2nd edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006a. 'Serial Verb Constructions in typological perspective'. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions*. 1-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006b. *A grammar of Tariana, from Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ameka, Felix K. 2003. 'Multiverb constructions in a West African areal typological perspective'. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Serial Verb Constructions. La Trobe.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 1995. 'Ditransitives, possessor raising, copying-to-OBJ: Animacy in morphosyntax'. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 31. 1-17.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2001. 'Subject version and object version in Tofa auxiliary verb constructions'. *Turkic Languages* 5/1. 240-269.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2002. 'Auxiliary verb constructions in Old Turkic and Altai-Sayan Turkic'. Paper presented at the Old Turkic Symposium. Frankfurt.

Asher, Ronald E. & T. C. Kumari. 1997. *Malayalam*. London / New York: Routledge.

Azeb, Amha & Gerrit Dimmendaal. 2006. 'Converbs from an African perspective'. In Ameka, Felix, Alan Dench & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *Catching language: Issues in grammar writing*. 393-440. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bhatia, Tej. 1993. *Punjabi, a cognitive-descriptive grammar*. London / New York: Routledge.

Bodomo, Adams & Marc van Oostendorp. 1993. 'Serial verb nominalization in Dagaare'. Paper presented at the 24th Annual Conference on African Linguistics. Colombus, Ohio.

Bodrogligeti, András J. E. 2001. *A grammar of Chagatay*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.

Browne, Gerald M. 2002. *Old Nubian grammar*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.

Bruce, Leslie P. 1984. *The Alamblak language of Papua New Guinea East Sepik*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Butt, Miriam & Alexandros Tantos. 2004. 'Verbal semantics via Petri nets'. Paper presented at the LFG04 Conference. University of Canterbury.

Carlson, Robert J. 1991. 'From verb to preposition in Senufo'. In Traugott, Elisabeth & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization* vol. II. 201-223. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Censabella, Marisa. This volume. 'Beneficiaries and recipients in Toba (Guaycurú)'.

Christaller, Johann G. 1933. *Dictionary of the Asante and Fante language called Tshi (Twi)*. 2nd edition revised and enlarged. Basel: The Basel Evangelical Missionary Society.

Collins, Chris. 2003. 'The internal structure of vP in Ju|'hoansi and ǂHoan'. *Studia Linguistica* 57. 1-25.

Creissels, Denis. 2005. 'S-O-V-X constituent order and constituent order alternations in West African languages'. In Cover, Rebecca T. & Yuni Kim (eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the*

Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on Languages of West Africa. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 37-52.
Creissels, Denis. 2006. *Syntaxe générale, une introduction typologique. Vol. 2 : la phrase*. Paris: Hermès.
Crowley, Terry. 2002. *Serial verbs in Oceanic, a descriptive typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dauphin, Antoine. 1977. *Cours de Vietnamien*. Paris: L'Asiathèque.
Dickens, Patrick J. 2005. *A concise grammar of Ju|'hoan*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Dryer, Matthew S. 2003. 'Word order in Sino-Tibetan languages from a typological and geographical perspective'. In Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. 43-55. London / New York: Routledge.
Dyrenkova, Nadežda P. 1940. *Grammatika ojrotskogo jazyka*. Leningrad: Akademia Nauk SSSR.
Ebert, Karen. 1994. *The structure of Kiranti languages*. Universität Zürich: Seminär für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
Ebert, Karen. 1997. *A grammar of Athpare*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
Emeneau, Murray B. 1984. *Toda grammar and texts*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
Feldman, Harry. 1986. *A grammar of Awtuw*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
Foley, William A. 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Foley, William A. 1991. *The Yimas language of New Guinea*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Gaunt, John & L. Bayarmandakh. 2004. *Modern Mongolian: a course-book*. London / New York: Routledge.
Genetti, Carol. 2007. *A grammar of Dolakha Newar*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Grunina, El'vira A. 2005. *Turkmenskij jazyk*. Moscow: "Vostočnaja literatura" RAN.
Haboud, Marleen. 1994. 'On language contact and grammaticalization in Ecuadorian Highland Spanish'. Ms. University of Oregon.
Haboud, Marleen. 1998. *Quichua y castellano en los Andes Ecuatorianos, los efectos de un contacto prolongado*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
Hagemeijer, Tjerk. 2000. 'Serial Verb Constructions in São-Tomense'. Masters thesis. University of Lisbon.
Haiman, John. 1980. *Hua, a Papuan language of the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hendriksen, Hans. 1944. *Syntax of the infinite verb forms of Pāli*. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.
Hoijer, Harry. 1933. *Tonkawa: An Indian language of Texas*. New York: Columbia University. (Extract from *Handbook of American Indian languages*, Vol. 3)
Hook, Peter E. 1991. 'The compound verb in Munda: An areal and typological overview'. *Language Sciences* 13/2. 181-195.
Hugjiltu, Wu. 2003. 'Bonan'. In Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 325-45.
Ikoro, Suanu M. 1996. *The Kana language*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.
Iwasaki, Shoichi & Foong-Ha Yap. 2000. '*Give* constructions in Thai and beyond: A cognitive and grammaticalization perspective'. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Tai Studies*, July 29-31, 1998. 371-382. Bangkok: Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University.
Jakobi, Angelika & Joachim Crass. 2004. *Grammaire du beria (langue saharienne)*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.
Jenny, Mathias. 2005. *The verb system of Mon*. Universität Zürich: Seminär für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
Jenny, Mathias. This volume. 'Benefactive strategies in Thai'.
Kim, Stephen S. 2003. 'Santa'. In Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. 346-63. London / New York: Routledge.
Kratochvíl, František. 2007. *A grammar of Abui, a Papuan language of Alor*. Utrecht: LOT.
Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2003. *The Dravidian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Krueger, John R. 1964. 'The Turco-Mongolian benefactive'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84/4. 410-1.
Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Lacroix, René. This volume. 'Benefactives in Laz'.

Lai, Huei-Ling. 2001. 'On Hakka BUN: a case of polygrammaticalization'. *Language and Linguistics* 2/2. 137-153.
LaPolla, Randy J. 2003a. 'Overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax'. In Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. London / New York: Routledge. 22-42.
LaPolla, Randy J. 2003b. 'Dulong'. In Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. 674-82. London / New York: Routledge.
Leroy, Jacqueline. 2003. 'Grammaire du mankon'. Thèse de doctorat d'état (Habilitation thesis). University of Paris 3.
Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese, A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press
Lidz, Liberty A. 2006. 'A synopsis of Yongnin Na (Mosuo)'. Paper presented at the 39th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. Seattle: University of Washington.
Lord, Carol. 1977. 'How Igbo got from SOV serializing to SVO compounding'. *Studies in African Linguistics* Supplement 7. 145-155.
Lord, Carol. 1993. *Historical change in Serial Verb Constructions*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Lord, Carol, Foong-Ha Yap, & Shoichi Iwasaki. 2002. 'Grammaticalization of 'give': African and Asian perspectives'. In Wischer, Ilse & Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New reflections on grammaticalization*. 217-235. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Mamatov, Jahangir, S. J. Harrell, Kathy Kehoe & Karim Khodjibaev. 2005. *Tajik-English dictionary*. Springfield VA: Dunwoody Press.
Margetts, Anna & Peter K. Austin. 2007. 'Three-participant events in the languages of the world: towards a crosslinguistic typology'. *Linguistics* 45/3. 393-450.
Matisoff, James A. 1991. 'Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu'. In Traugott, Elisabeth & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 2. 383-453. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Matisoff, James A. 2003. 'Lahu'. In Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages*. 208-21. London / New York: Routledge.
Matthews, Stephen & Virginia Yip. 1994. *Cantonese: A comprehensive grammar*. London / New York: Routledge.
Mithun, Marianne. 2001. 'Understanding and explaining applicatives'. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 37/2. 73-97.
Mixco, Mauricio. 1997. *Mandan*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
Montaut, Annie. 2004. *A grammar of Hindi*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
Moser, Rosmarie. 2005. 'Grammaticalization chains of the verb *kàre* 'to give' in Kabba'. In Voeltz, Erhard F. K. (ed.), *Studies in African linguistic typology*. 277-301. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Neukom, Lukas. 2001. *Santali*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2004. 'Some thoughts on the Serial Verb Construction'. Workshop 'La notion de "construction verbale en série" est-elle opératoire?'. Paris: EHESS.
Nugteren, Hans. 2003. 'Shira Yughur'. In Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. 265-85. London / New York: Routledge.
Okell, John & Anna J. Allot. 2001. *Burmese/Myanmar dictionary of grammatical forms*. London: Curzon.
Onumajuru, Emeka M. 1985. 'Système verbal de la langue igbo (parler d'Orlu)'. PhD thesis. University of Grenoble.
Palayer, Pierre. 1989. 'La langue sar (sud du Tchad)'. Thèse de doctorat d'état (Habilitation thesis). University of Tours.
Palmer, Bill. 1999. 'A grammar of the Kokota language, Santa Isabel, Solomon Islands'. PhD thesis. University of Sidney.
Pardeshi, Prashant. 2001. 'The explicator compound verb in Marathi: Definitional issues and criteria for identification'. *Kobe Papers in Linguistics 3*. 94-111.
Paul, Soma. 2003. 'Composition of compound verbs in Bangla'. In Beermann Dorothee & Lars Hellan (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop on Multi-Verb Constructions*. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
Paul, Waltraud. 2004. 'The "Serial Verb Construction" in Chinese: a Gordian knot'. Workshop 'La notion de "construction verbale en série" est-elle opératoire?'. Paris: EHESS.
Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, John. 2006. 'Kharia, a South Munda language. Volume 1: Grammatical analysis' Ms. University of Osnabrück.
Quigley, Suzan R. 2002. *The Awara verbal system*. Master Thesis. University of North Dakota.
Radetzky, Paula & Tomoko Yamashita Smith. This volume. 'An areal and typological study of benefactive and malefactive constructions.
Rai, Novel K. 1985. 'A descriptive study of Bantawa'. PhD thesis. University of Poona.
Remijsen, Bert. To appear. 'Nouns and verbs in Magey Matbat'. In Klamer, Marian & Michael Ewing (eds.), Typological and areal analyses: Contributions from East Nusantara. Leiden: KITLV Press.
Rice, Keren. 1989. *A grammar of Slave*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Rowlands, Evan C. 1969. Teach yourself Yoruba. Teach Yourself Books.
Rude, Noel. 1991. 'Verbs to promotional suffixes in Sahaptian and Klamath'. In Traugott, Elisabeth & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 2. 183-99. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Salas, Adalberto. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano*. Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
Shibatani, Masayochi. 2003. 'Directional verbs in Japanese'. In Shay, Erin & Uwe Seibert (eds.) *Motion, direction and location in languages*. 259-286. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2006. 'On the form of complex predicates. Demystifying/demythologizing serial verbs'. *Seminario de complejidad sintáctica*. Hermosillo, Sonora.
Shibatani, Masayoshi & Sung-Yeo Chung. 2007. 'On the grammaticalization of motion verbs: A Japanese-Korean perspective'. *Japanese/Korean linguistics* 15.
Skribnik, Elena. 2003. 'Buryat'. In Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. 102-28. London / New York: Routledge.
Solomiac, Paul. 2007. 'Phonologie et morphosyntaxe du dzùùngoo de Samogohiri'. PhD thesis. University of Lyon.
Song, Jae-Jung. This volume. 'Korean benefactive particles and their meanings'.
Tamura, Suzuko. 2000. *The Ainu language*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
Tida, Syuntarô. 2006. 'A grammar of the Dom language'. PhD thesis. University of Kyoto.
Toronzoni, Ngama-Nzombio T. N. 1989. 'Description du ngbandi'. PhD thesis. Université libre de Bruxelles.
Tsumagari, Toshiro. 2003. 'Dagur'. In Janhunen, Juha (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. 129-53. London / New York: Routledge.
Uchechukwu, Chinedu. 2008. 'The grammaticalization of prepositional markers in Igbo: the example of the verb root *-nyé* 'give''. In Asbury, Anna, Jakub Dotlacil & Berit Gehrke, *Syntax and semantics of spatial P*. 398-407. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
van der Voort, Hein. 2004. *A grammar of Kwaza*. Berlin / New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
Van Valin, Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Vogel, Sylvain. 2006. *Introduction à la langue et aux dits traditionnels des Phnong de Mondulkiri*. Phnom Penh: Editions Funan.
Völlmin, Sascha. This volume. 'Benefactives and malefactives in Gumer (Gurage)'.
Voorhoeve, Jan. 1975. 'Serial verbs in Creole'. Paper presented at the International Conference On Pidgins and Creoles. University of Hawaii.
Welmers, William E. 1973. *African language structures*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.
Werner, Roland. 1987. *Grammatik des Nobiin (Nilnubisch)*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
Williamson, Kay. 1965. *A grammar of the Kolokuma dialect of Ịjọ*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Williamson, Kay & A. Timitimi. 1983. *Short Ịzọn-English dictionary*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
Zúñiga, Fernando. This volume. 'Benefaction and malefaction in Mapudungun'.