Grammaticalization of Benefactive Constructions and Their Synchronic Variations:  
A Cross-linguistic Perspective
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Shibatani (1996) provides a cognitive account for the cross-linguistic variations of ‘benefactive constructions.’ 
According to Shibatani’s insightful analysis, benefactive constructors 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 (Type 1) 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 kureru/te-yaru. (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-kureru/te-yaru. (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-kureru/te-yaru. (AuxV (Type 3))
    Ken-NOM Hanako-ACC praise-CON-give-PAST
    ‘Ken praised Hanako.’

(4) a. ame-ga fut-te-kureru/*te-yaru. b. Atatakakunat-te-kureru/*te-yaru. (AuxV (Type 4))
    rain-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 construction 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] Z o V] te-kureru/te-yaru
    c. Type 3: [X ga_{i} [PRO] … V] te-kureru/te-yaru
    d. Type 4: [[X ga_{i} … V] te-kureru/*te-yaru]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>(Type 1)</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Transfer of the object</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Intentionality of subject</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: The class of V</td>
<td>verbs of creation, etc</td>
<td>agentive verbs</td>
<td>non-agentive verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: The number of arguments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) kheyin i hanakko-eykey chayk-ul cvu-ess-ta. (Type 1)
    Ken-NOM Hanako-DAT book-ACC give-PAST-DECL
    ‘Ken gave Hanako a book.’
Table 2 Synchronic variations in benefactive constructions with GIVE verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Marathi</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Lai</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deNe</td>
<td>yaru</td>
<td>cwuta</td>
<td>peek</td>
<td>kureru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

- **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.
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