BOOK REVIEWS

Nikolas Gisborne. 2010. *The event structure of perception verbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 317. ISBN 978-0-19-957779-8.

Reviewed by RICHARD J. WHITT, University of Strathclyde

The verbs of perception provide an ideal avenue to study the syntax-semantics interface, for they evince a number of different complementation patterns as well as a high degree of polysemy. In *The event structure of perception verbs*, Nikolas Gisborne explores a number of syntactic and semantic issues related to perception verbs, and he anchors his approach squarely in the tradition of Word Grammar (hereafter WG).

In Chapter 1, Gisborne provides an introduction to his study of perception verbs, subdividing this group of verbs into agentive LISTEN-class verbs (as in *I listened to the tenor*), experiencer HEAR-class verbs (*I heard him struggle*), and percept SOUND-class verbs (*The high C sounded flat*). Matters concerning (non-finite) complementation, dependency relations, evidentiality, and epistemic meaning are all of interest to Gisborne, who provides us with insights provided by WG (Hudson 1984, 1990, 2007), whereby language "is nothing but a network – there are no rules, principles, or parameters to complement the network. Everything in language can be described formally in terms of nodes and their relations" (Hudson 2007: 2). WG is thus a dependency theory of syntax anchored in the tradition of Cognitive Linguistics. Although such theories tend to be applied to usage-based data, Gisborne notes that his study of perception verbs is limited to mostly introspective data of contemporary English.

Chapter 2 is devoted to an introduction of Word Grammar, which postulates an intra-mental – as opposed to objectivist – theory of reference. That is, WG contrasts with objectivist semantics in that it views language as a reflection of mental constructs rather than depictions of objects 'in the world'. Language is composed of network dependencies of words, rather than phrase structure. Relational concepts form these dependencies, and the non-relational concepts (words' senses) serve as the nodes in the network. The importance of the notion of inheritance to WG establishes a taxonomic system of grammar that is more encompassing than hyponymy; and the *Isa* 'is an instance of' relation is often employed in WG analysis. Gisborne points out that argument linking is also of key importance to

Folia Linguistica 45/2 (2011), 535–548.
ISSN 0165–4004, E-ISSN 1614–7308
DOI 10.1515/FLIN.2011.019

Fernando Zúñiga & Seppo Kittilä, eds. 2010. *Benefactives and malefactives – Typological perspectives and case studies*. (Typological Studies in Language 92.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. x + 440. ISBN 978-90-272-0673-2.

Reviewed by DANIEL HOLE, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

The volume on benefactives and malefactives under review here contributes to filling a dramatic gap in the theory and typology of semantic roles. No comparable collection of papers with an exclusive focus on benefactives and malefactives has ever appeared in print before. Other notions which would seem to be on a par with benefaction/malefaction, such as agentivity, experiencerhood, patienthood or incremental themehood have received much more attention in the literature. Therefore, the linguistic community will no doubt benefit in many ways from the collaborative effort of the contributing authors and the editors Fernando Zúñiga and Seppo Kittilä, who were also the organizers of the workshop at the University of Zurich in 2007 from which the volume has emerged. The book is (implicitly) divided into three sections. The introduction (first section) is followed by four typological studies with a global, or at least transcontinental, scope (second section); the large third section encompasses thirteen studies on individual languages, language families or other smaller groups of languages. Regions covered in this section are the Americas, Europe, Africa and East and South-East Asia. The studies are ordered along a rough west-to-east axis (as applicable to a map with Africa and Europe in the center). A diligently prepared index of three-and-a-half pages concludes the book. Quite incomprehensibly, it does not include language names.

The introduction, jointly authored by the editors, sets the stage by providing and explicating a tentative definition of 'beneficiary', by identifying coding devices (case, adpositions, serial verb constructions, applicativization) and by distinguishing three major kinds of benefaction largely following Van Valin and LaPolla (1997). 'Plain benefactives' signal that "the action of the [agent] provides [the beneficiary] with amusement, enjoyment or other kind of benefit" (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 384; for unclear reasons, the introduction reduces this generalization to "[plain] benefaction consists in amusing/entertaining the beneficiary" on p. 14). The 'benefactive–recipient' is an (intended) recipient for whom the reception of the involved theme is (likely to be) beneficial as in *bake s.o. a cake*. 'Deputative–benefactives', finally, signal that the relevant participant benefits from some-

body else instead of the deputative–benefactive carrying out the action described in the clause, as in *John painted the house instead of/for me*. The overarching characterization of 'beneficiary' provided by the authors is as follows (p. 2; in their aptly modest tone, the authors call it their "working definition"):

> The beneficiary is a participant that is advantageously affected by an event without being its obligatory participant (either agent or primary target, i.e. patient). Since normally only animate partcipants are capable of making use of the benefit bestowed upon them, beneficiaries are typically animate.

Malefaction is hardly mentioned in the introductory text. There are good reasons why malefaction may be even more elusive than benefaction, but it is certainly against the expectations of the reader that malefactives play no role at all, or only a marginal one, in a text called 'Benefaction and malefaction from a cross-linguistic perspective'.

Refinements and polysemy patterns that are discussed in the second half of the introduction as well as the merits and limitations of the above characterization and subclassification of beneficiaries will be discussed after the survey of individual contributions to the volume.

Denis Creissels's chapter, 'Benefactive applicative periphrases' (BAPs) is the first one of the typological section. It is one of the outstanding papers of the volume; the reviewer considers it the best one. BAPs are biverbal constructions functionally comparable to monoverbal constructions which are headed by applicative verb forms (related to 'give', 'come', 'help' and some others) whose function is to license beneficiaries. This kind of serial verb construction may occur in one of three inflectional shapes: (i) none of the verbs involved in the construction is in a form implying a non-autonomous status (typical of verb-serializing languages of West Africa, South-East Asia, New Guinea and Western Austronesian; *the serializing type*); (ii) the applicative verb licensing the beneficiary is in a non-autonomous form (one which may not be used alone in a matrix clause, whereas the lexical verb carries normal autonomous inflection (mainly Bantu and non-Bantu Benue-Congo languages; *the marked-Vop* (*Verb operator*) *type*); (iii) the applicative verb licensing the beneficiary carries the normal autonomous inflection of matrix clauses, whereas the lexical verb is in a non-autonomous (converb) form (mainly the verb-final languages of Asia; *marked Vlex type*). BAPs are like a crossroads of grammaticalization. They are likely to represent a stage between biclausal constructions and mono-

clausal constructions with applicative morphology or ditransitive argument structure, and as such they may allow the typologist to draw conclusions concerning implicational links between fully grammaticalized verbal applicative categories and verb serialization types. What Creissels finds in this domain is that the similarity between BAPs and biclausal SVCs in a given language is not as close as one might think, and that (if I interpret the author correctly), the type of BAP found in a language rather correlates with the pattern of fully grammaticalized mono-clausal argument structure patterns. This would imply that the shape of structures in a BAP grammaticalization channel is not so much determined by the origin of the structure, but rather by the target of grammaticalization (this being the reviewer's universalist rendering of what may be implied by Creissels's findings). Whatever the right conclusions at this general level are, Creissels's paper abounds with other concise observations and generalizations that cannot be summarized here (about autobenefactive BAPs 'do sth. for oneself', for instance, which involve 'take' verb operators instead of 'give' almost without exception).

Tomoko Yamashita Smith is the author of the second contribution with a broad empirical scope ('Cross-linguistic categorization of benefactives by event structure'). She proposes a classification of benefactives which distinguishes between benefactive constructions that imply the presence of an agent in the event and others which do not. Among the agentive events with beneficiaries she assumes four subtypes: (i) Agent=Beneficiary ('do s.th. for oneself'; autobenefactive/self-benefactive, grammaticalized in languages of India, Mongolic, Turkic); (ii) Agent ≠ Beneficiary ('do s.th. for s.o. else'; non-self-benefactive, grammaticalized in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian); (iii) Agent < Beneficiary ('do s.th. for oneself and somebody else'; shared benefit, grammaticalized in Haka Lai and Thai); (iv) unrestricted, no statement of (non-)identity between Agent and Beneficiary implied. The reviewer thinks that this classification, especially the subdivision of the agentive construals, has the potential to become the standard classification of benefactive constructions, because it would allow one to draw parallels to the expression of reflexivity in a given language (i.e. grammaticalized binding of internal arguments by Agents), and because this classification would, on the content side, be based on simple relations of (non-)identity and part-whole-structures. Unfortunately, Yamashita Smith does not even mention the parallels of her classification with that underlying reflexive sentences vs. canonical transitive sentences. What is

more, the notion of binding (as opposed to co-reference) is not made use of. I take this gap between a tremendously promising initial insight and the absence of theoretical reasoning to be exemplary for the dangerous drifting-apart of functional and formal linguistics. Instead of being presented with an attempt at abstract representations, the stunned reader is informed that the semantics of the grammaticalized shared benefit construction 'do s.th. for oneself and s.o. else' "is quite clear and practical. This type of benefactive situation occurs frequently in daily life: doing laundry for oneself and for other members of family [sic!], fixing breakfast for oneself and for a guest, or making photocopies for oneself and a classmate" (p. 84).

The paper 'An areal and cross-linguistic study of benefactive and malefactive constructions' is jointly authored by Paula Radetzky and Tomoko Smith (whose surname lost its first half on the way from the previous article to this one). The authors allot 24 pages to observing that European languages typically have nominal arguments dative-marked for general affectedness, whereas languages of South, East and South-East Asia typically distinguish explicitly between beneficial and adversative affectedness. Promissory notes in the abstract and in the conclusions hypothesize that there may be a cultural reason for this having to do "with societal values and cultural practices" (p. 117).

The fourth typological contribution, 'The role of benefactives and related notions in the typology of purpose clauses', by Karten Schmidtke-Bode, is an elegantly written "survey of the variegated functions of benefactives in the encoding of purposive relations" (p. 121). The investigation is based on a controlled sample of 80 languages. Major findings include that benefactive secondary marking of purpose clauses mainly competes with allative, recipient or dative marking and that 'negative purpose'/'lest'-clauses do not make use of beneficiary marking as a coding device.

As said above, the remaining bulk of thirteen papers discusses individual languages or smaller languages families. Unfortunately it is impossible to review each of these papers in detail given the limitations of space. However, some of the remaining contributions have particularly instigated the interest of the reviewer, because they combine the important task of writing grammar fragments with a broader perspective or important insight that goes well beyond a single language or small language group.

The first such paper is by Timothy Colleman: 'The benefactive semantic potential of "caused reception" constructions: A case study of English, German, French and Dutch'. By carving out in great detail the restrictions

of the pertinent constructions in the closely related languages under scrutiny, the reader, among many other things, receives reliable information on the variation in acceptability found with English ditransitive structures like *wash s.o. a shirt*, or on the Modern Dutch contiguity constraint which allows the use of two objects only in those cases in which the event of creating or preparing the theme is more or less the same as the event of giving it to the recipient. Unfortunately, so-called 'possessor' datives with German datives do not receive the same attention that they get in the French part of the study (even though the expression of possession is probably not the right generalization in either German or French for the function of the 'possessor' datives). Towards the end of his study, Colleman admits that it "is tempting to relate the observed contrasts between the four languages under discussion to the presence or absence of overt dative case marking on the recipient/beneficiary" (p. 240). The author hastens to hedge this claim, but it would still seem to the reviewer to be worthwhile to pursue this thought further.

René Lacroix's 'Benefactives in Laz' (South Caucasian, spoken in North-East Turkey) is a beautiful example of a rigorous study dedicated to a grammar fragment of a small 'exotic' language which deserves a broad readership. As in the related Georgian, Laz has an elaborate system of benefactive and middle marking ('version') which, among other things, distinguishes between a middle/autobenefactive category (Agent = Benefactive; cf. above) and an applicative/benefactive category (Agent ≠ Benefactive).

'Benefactive and malefactive verb extensions in the Koalib verb system' by Nicholas Quint deals with the Niger-Kongo language Koalib and explores the possibly locative/directional grammaticalization source of benefactive and malefactive markers in that language. Moreover, 'iudicantis' uses of the malefactive marker ('too ADJ for s.o.') are noted. While I cannot do justice to the wealth of Quint's other findings here, I would at least like to mention that the author provides highly welcome frequency data and that he presents his data in a particularly interesting way which always discusses form–function matches and mismatches side by side.

'Benefactive strategies in Thai' is the topic of Matthias Jenny's contribution. Thai uses verb serialization, prepositions and verb markers/particles to signal beneficiary and maleficiary semantics, and it is the only language covered in the volume with a conventionalized Agent < Beneficiary strategy (the agent plus somebody else is the beneficiary of the event at hand). What lifts Jenny's study well above some others is the concise way in which

truth-conditionally important parameters, such as event (non-)awareness on the part of the beneficiary/recipient, are discussed. It is also one of the papers in which the frequent link between the expressions used for benefaction and for causation is made explicit. Some language insecurities should have been leveled out, though.

Jae Jung Song is the author of 'Korean benefactive particles and their meaning'. It is a highly refreshing study on the intricate interplay of Korean DP/dependent-marking devices to express benefaction and head-marking *cwu-* 'give'. Again, it is impossible to do justice to the wealth of Song's diligently presented and universally important results, among them the proposal of an engager-benefactive category, a category which is only licensed if the relevant participant can engage with the theme of the event at hand in some purposeful action. Another facet of the paper which renders it highly enjoyable is the tension that is caused by the fact that the author feels the need to argue against some components of Matt Shibatani's pioneering work in the domain covered. Lively debates with an anonymous reviewer in footnotes add to the pleasure of reading.

'Benefactive and malefactive uses of Salish applicatives' by Kaoru Kiyosawa and Donna B. Gerdts is a comprehensive overview of benefactive and malefactive applicative markers in all Salish languages, both diachronic and synchronic. Marisa Censabella directs her attention at beneficiaries and recipients in Toba (Guaycurú). Toba is mainly spoken in the Chaco region of Argentina. Fernando Zúñiga's contribution is entitled 'Benefactive and malefactive applicativization in Mapundungun'. Mapundungun is a language isolate of Southern Chile and Argentina. Zúñiga uses a thoroughly philological approach in order to clarify the allomorphy patterns found with applicative markers in his language of study. 'Beneficiary coding in Finnish' by Seppo Kittilä investigates the array of benefactive markers in Finnish. Truth-conditionally relevant generalizations are stated, but the paper lacks the beneficial conciseness of, for instance, Jenny's contribution. Sascha Völlmin reviews benefactives and malefactives in Gumer (Gurage), a South-Ethiosemitic language spoken south-west of Addis Ababa/Ethiopia. Raymond Boyd's contribution is entitled 'A "reflexive benefactive" in Chamba-Daka (Adamawa branch, Niger-Congo familiy)'. The data patterns and the syntactic reasonings of this paper are very interesting, especially since it is one of the papers dealing with an Agent = Benefactive category. In 'Beneficiary and other roles of the dative in Tashelhiyt' (Berber), Christan J. Rapold tentatively adapts

semantic maps from the literature to accommodate the Tashelhiyt dative uses. The author presents a wealth of interesting data, but not all phenomena appear to the reviewer to be classified properly. Locatives, in particular, end up in other classes repeatedly (pp. 358 (13)/(14), 362 (24), 363 (25)). Eijiro Tsuboi, finally, provides an overview of malefactivity in Japanese.

The volume assembled by Zúñiga and Kittilä is a big achievement in the domain of the theory and typology of benefactives. Researchers from diverse frameworks and with different language backgrounds will find invaluable material in this book which, in many cases, is presented in an exemplary manner. Even though the reviewer comes from a research background which differs from that of the contributing authors, he feels highly inspired by the studies in the volume, even more so since the most promising attempt at a classification (the one proposed by Yamashita Smith), may, once it has been elaborated in more detail, contribute to bridging the harmful gap between formal and functional approaches which threatens the discipline. Something that the reviewer could not make sense of in the design of the volume is the fact that practically all authors allot some (frequently inconclusive and disintegrated) discussion to Kittilä's (2005) attempt at a typology of benefactives, while Kittilä, in his own contribution, almost exclusively relies on Van Valin and LaPolla's classification. Another shortcoming concerns malefaction; this category continues to be the stepbrother of benefaction, and it is as unclear as before what causes the asymmetry in this domain, be it in the data or in the description. Another overall critical remark concerns the fact that Van Valin and LaPolla's classification of benefaction is used so much throughout the book. It seems to be a classification based on the polysemy of English *for*, and nothing else. Worse still, it suffers from the serious defect that the notions that are used to derive subnotions (deputative benefactive, recipient benefactive) are only *compatible* with true benefaction, but do not *entail* benefaction. This leads to a situation where many examples are discussed under the heading of benefaction which do not entail benefaction proper. This may be valuable to explain patterns of polysemy, but it does not seem to me to be the best way of designing a typology or classification. A last critical remark concerns the fact that the use of the notion 'applicative' as rendered popular by Liina Pylkkänen in the formal semantics and generative syntax framework is not taken note of at all in the volume. On the clearly positive side, the volume opens up some perspectives that the reviewer was not aware of at all, or only to a lesser extent, before he read this highly recommendable book.

Two of them are: (i) the polysemy patterns of markers used to express benefaction often include causativity; (ii) the polysemy patterns of markers used to express benefaction often include a locative category.

Given the overwhelming empirical wealth of the volume, the reviewer is sure that all readers doing research in the domain of benefactives, in particular, and in the domain of semantic role theory, in general, will find information and inspiration in this book that cannot be found anywhere else.

References

Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Recipient-prominence vs. beneficiary-prominence. *Linguistic Typology* 9: 269–297.

Van Valin, Robert D. & Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reviewer's address
Institut für deutsche Sprache und Literatur
Dorotheenstr. 24
10117 Berlin, Germany
E-mail: holedan@googlemail.com

Received: 14 September 2011