Grammaticalization of Benefactive Constructions and Their Synchronic Variations:
A Cross-linguistic Perspective

[Category: cognitive/functional syntax/semantics]

Shibatani (1996) provides a cognitive account for the cross-linguistic variations of 'benefactive constructions.' According to Shibatani's insightful analysis, benefactive constructons are based on GIVE schema (structure: [NP1 NP2 NP3 GIVE]) and the ungrammaticality of the benefactive expressions is explained in terms of the mismatch between the schema and the concerned situations described. As the structure of GIVE schema shows, he focuses on the benefactive constructions in which the beneficiaries/recipients are coded as dative arguments as in (2). This paper extends Shibatani's pionnering analysis by considering other kinds of benefactive constructions and analizes their sychronic variations (or construction types) in terms of the cross-linguistic grammaticalizational analysis.

Japanese benefactive constructions with GIVE verbs *kureru* (centripetal) and *yaru* (centrifugal) can be classified into four construction types as in the following data:

(1) *Ken-ga   Hanako-ni   okane-o   {kure/yat}-ta.*   **(MV (Type 1))**
     Ken-NOM   Hanako-DAT   money-ACC   give-PAST
     'Ken gave Hanako a money.'

(2) *Ken-ga   Hanako-ni   ie-o   tate-te-{kure/yat}-ta.*   **(AuxV (Type 2))**
     Ken-NOM   Hanako-DAT   house-ACC   build-CON-give-PAST
     'Ken built hanako a house.'

(3) *Ken-ga   Hanako-o   home-te-{kure/yat}-ta.*   **(AuxV (Type 3))**
     Ken-NOM   Hanako-ACC   praise-CON- give-PAST
     'Ken praised Hanako.'

(4) a. *ame-ga   fut-te-{kure/*yat}-ta.*   b. *Atatakakunat-te-{kure/*yat}-ta.*   **(AuxV (Type 4))**
      rain.N-NOM   rain- CON- give-PAST   become warm-CON-give-PAST
      'It rained (and I am thankful for that).'   'It became warm (and I am thankful for that).'

The structures (forms) of the above four consruction types can be analyzed as follows (*yaru* cannot occur in Type 4):

(5) a.   Type 1:   **X ga   Y ni   Z o   kureru/yaru**

 b.   Type 2:   **[X ga$_i$ Y ni [PRO$_i$ Z o   V] te-kureru/te-yaru]**

 c.   Type 3:   **[X ga$_i$ [PRO$_i$ ⋯   V] te-kureru/te-yaru]**

 d.   Type 4:   **[[(X ga)   ⋯V] te-kureru/*te-yaru]**

The semantic and syntactic criteria that distinguish the four construction types in (5) are as follows:

	MV	AuxV		
	(Type 1)	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
Criterion A: transfer of the object	○	△	×	×
Criterion B: intentionality of subject	○	○	○	×
Criterion C: the class of V$_1$		verbs of creation,etc	agentive verbs	non-agentive verbs
Criterion D：the number of arguments	3	3	2	1

Table 1 Semantic and syntactic properties in four types of Japanese benefactive constructions with GIVE verbs

We can safely assume that the structural patterns in (5) reflect the grammaticalization patterns in (6):

(6) **the cline of grammaticalization patterns:**   MV (Type 1) →AuX(Type 2) →AuX(Type 3) →AuX(Type 4)

The structural patterns in (5) also show the important fact that the more the verbs of giving are grammaticalized, the fewer the number of their arguments become, and that at the last stage of grammaticalization *kureru*, but not *yaru*, loses its selectional restriction on its subject to express the propositional attitude of the speaker.

The following data show that our grammaticalization pattern model can be applied to the benefactive constructions with GIVE verbs in other languages:

Korean

(7) *kheyn-i   hanakko-eykey   chayk-ul   cwu-ess-ta.*   **(Type 1)**
     Ken-NOM   Hanako-DAT   book-ACC   give-PAST-DECL
     'Ken gave Hanako a book.'

(8) *kheyn-i   hanakko-eykey   cip-ul   ci-e   cwu-ess-ta.* **(Type 2)**
     Ken-NOM   Hanako-DAT   house-ACC   build-CON   give-PAST-DECL
     'Ken built Hanako a house.'

(9) *kheyn-i   hanakko-lul   chingchanha-y   cwu-ess-ta.* **(Type 3)**
     Ken-NOM   Hanako-ACC   praise-CON   give-PAST-DECL
     'Ken praised Hanako.'

(10) a. (?) *pi-ka   w-a   cwu-ess-ta.* **(Type 4)**   b. **ttattushayc-ye   cwu-ess-ta.* **(Type 4)**
          rain-NOM   rain-CON give-PAST-DECL   become warm-CON   give-PAST-DECL
          'It rained (and I am thankful for that).'   'It became warm (and I am thankful for that).'

Lai (from Smith (2010)) (The lexical GIVE verb in Lai is *peek* and *piak* has grammaticalized from *peek*.):

(11) *tsewmaŋ   tsa-ʔuk   ka-tsook-piak* **(Type 2)**   (12) *tsewmaŋ   door   ka-kal-piak* **(Type 3)**
     Tsewmang   letter-cover   1s-buy$_2$-BEN   Tsewmang   market   1s-go-BEN
     'I bought Tsewmang a book.'   'I went to market for Tsewmang.'

(13) a. *paŋpaar   niʔ   ʔan-kan-paar-piak* **(Type 4)**   b. *ti   niʔ   ʔa-ka-roʔ-piak*   **(Type 4)**
        Flowers   ERG   3p-1p-bloom-BEN   water   ERG   3s-1p-be cold-BEN
        'The flowers bloomed for us.'   'The water is cold for us.'

Marathi (from Pardeshi (1998)):

(14) *mI   rAm-lA   AmbA   di-l-A* **(Type 1)**
     1SG   Ram-DAT   mango.M   give-PAST-M
     'I gave a mango to Ram.'

(15) *rAm-ne   sitA-lA   pustak   (wik-at)   ghe-Un   di-l-e* **(Type 2)**
     Ram-ERG   Sita-DAT   book   (sell-MAN)   take-PTCPL   give-PAST-N
     'Ram bought Sita a book.'

(16) **sitA-ne   winnantI   ke-lI   mhaNun,   mI   bAjArA-t   jA-Un   di-l-e* **(Type 3)**
     Sita-ERG   request   do-PAST   because   1SG   market-to   go-PTCPL   give-PAST-N
     'Because I was asked to by Sita, I went to the market for her.'

The synchronic variations of benefactive constructions in the above languages can be summarized as follows:

	Marathi	Japanese	Korean	Lai	Japanese
	deNe	*yaru*	*cwuta*	*peek*	*kureru*
Type 1	√	√	√	√	√
Type 2	√	√	√	√	√
Type 3	*	√	√	√	√
Type 4	*	*	??	√	√

Table 2 Synchronic variations in benefactive constructions with GIVE verbs

Table 2 indicates the difference of the progress of grammaticalization of the GIVE verbs in the above languages as follows:

(17) **Progress of the grammaticalization in GIVE verbs** (more grammaticalized > less grammaticalized)**:**
     kureru (J), *peek* (L) > *cwuta* (K) > *yaru* (J) > *deNe* (M)

Table 2 also suggests the following implicational hierarchy which shows the likelifood that the benefactive construction types appear in the given language:

(18) **Implicational Hierarchy:** Type 1 < Type 2 < Type 3 < Type 4

(18) shows that for example, if a language has Type 4, then it also has Type 1, 2 and 3; and that if a language has Type 3, then it also has Type 1 and 2, etc.

References Pardeshi, P. 1998. A Contrastive Study of Benefactive Constructions in Japanese and Marathi. *Japanese-Language Education around the Globe.* 8./Shibatani, M. 1996. Applicatives and Benefactives: A Cognitive Account. In: Shibatani, M. and S. A. Thompson (eds.) *Grammatical Constructions.* Oxford University Press./Smith, T. Y. 2010. Cross-linguistic Categorization of Benefactives by Event Structure: A Preliminary Framework for Benefactive Typology. In: Zúñiga, F. and S. Kittilä (eds.) *Benefactives and Malefactives.* John Benjamins.