differences when embedding or being embedded by negation. This makes it impossible to decide whether they should be placed higher or lower than negation. Volitionality is also an important component. Narrog finds that while nonvolitive markers seem more constrained in their range of use, most volitive markers (most deontic and boulomaic markers) cover a wide area from low-level descriptive use to high-level performative use. The same marker thus can show a behavior typical of higher markers in its performative uses and a behavior typical of lower markers in its descriptive uses.

On the one hand, Narrog's results put the importance of the layered structure of clause models into perspective, showing that they provide a simple yet ad hoc explanation for the scopal behavior of functional categories. On the other hand, his analysis paves the way for a serious reconsideration of the functional complexity underlying the concept of modality. Narrog indeed presents modality as a complex supercategory encompassing a great number of very different conceptual domains. Such domains, too often neglected in the description of modality, appear to be crucial in determining the syntactic behavior of modal markers.

University of Rome 3 PAOLA PIETRANDREA

Correspondence address: pietrand@uniroma3.it

Fernando Zúñiga and Seppo Kittilä (eds.): *Benefactives and Malefactives: Typological Perspectives and Case Studies*. Typological Studies in Language 92. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. x + 440 pp. ISBN 978-90-272-0673-2

The book under review is the first typologically oriented collection of papers specifically devoted to benefactives and malefactives, and originates from the Workshop on the typology of benefactives and malefactives held in Zürich in 2007. This phenomenon has received much attention over the last two decades mostly based on particular languages and/or types of construction, but a comprehensive typology of benefactives and malefactives is still lacking. This volume constitutes considerable progress in the crosslinguistic study of benefactives and malefactives, both from the perspective of meanings and functions subsumed under these headings, and from the point of view of the types of morphosyntactic expression of these functions. It is also noteworthy that the volume aims at covering the semantics and coding of malefaction on a par with those of benefaction, thus trying to overcome the clear bias of the previous studies towards benefactives.

The book consists of eighteen chapters, five of which present different approaches to the typology of benefactives/malefactives, while the remaining thirteen discuss the data of individual languages or groups of genetically or areally related languages. The case studies include languages from the New World (Salish, Toba and Mapudungun), Europe ("Standard Average European" and Finnish), Caucasus (Laz), Africa (Koalib, Gumer, Chamba-Daka, Tashelhiyt), and East Asia (Thai, Korean, and Japanese). Unfortunately, the languages of Australia and Oceania are not represented in these case studies.

In the Introduction "Benefaction and malefaction from a cross-linguistic perspective" (pp. 1–28) Seppo Kittilä and Fernando Zúñiga give a general overview of the typology of benefactive and malefactive constructions. First they provide a working definition of the semantic role of beneficiary ("a participant that is advantageously affected by an event without being its obligatory participant", p. 2) and discuss its prototypical characteristics, such as syntactic optionality and animacy. In addition, Zúñiga and Kittilä point out that in many languages the meaning component "advantageously" (resp. "adversely" for the malefactive) turns out to be irrelevant, beneficiary and maleficiary thus falling under the even more general semantic relation of "affectee". This is followed by a survey of the morphosyntactic types of beneficiary/maleficiary coding attested crosslinguistically, i.e., case marking and adpositions, serial verb constructions, and applicatives. The finer-grained distinction between the three types of benefaction established in Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 383–384), i.e., between recipient benefactive (when the participant benefits from receiving something), deputative benefactive (when the participant benefits from someone else's doing the job instead of him or her), and plain benefactive (when the event occurs to the participant's amusement or joy), is also briefly discussed. This discussion also figures prominently in most of the contributions to the volume. Other important issues covered in the introduction are the semantically determined variation in the encoding of beneficiaries and maleficiaries, and the types of polysemy exhibited by benefactive and malefactive constructions cross-linguistically.

Denis Creissels' "Benefactive applicative periphrases: A typological approach" (pp. 29–69) gives a comprehensive typology of the periphrastic encoding of benefactivity. He defines applicative periphrases as "biverbal constructions functionally comparable to monoverbal constructions headed by applicative verb forms" that "promote participants otherwise encoded as adjuncts to the status of core syntactic terms" (p. 30). Benefactive applicative periphrases (BAP) consist of a lexical verb and an operator verb that acts as a valency operator licensing the benefactive participant. Creissels notes the following characteristics of BAPs which hold cross-linguistically (p. 33): the operator verb is almost always 'give' when used independently, and, notably, "irrespective of the status of the language . . . with respect to constituent order

typology, 'give' almost always occupies the second position in BAPs". Three formal types of BAPs are distinguished: the serializing type (with neither a linking element between the lexical and the operator verbs nor any of the two verbs being subordinate to the other), the marked operator verb type, and the marked lexical verb type. Creissels observes that while the two "marked verb" types of BAPs mainly occur in languages where structurally similar constructions are independently attested as a means of clause combining or complex predicate formation, the distribution of the serialized BAPs is broader than that of the serial verb constructions in general. Further discussion concerns (i) the grammaticalization of BAPs and their further development into constructions with benefactive or dative adpositions/case markers or into complex predicates/applicative derivatives; (ii) the special subtype of benefactive, viz. autobenefactive expressed by 'take' and 'eat' rather than 'give' periphrases; (iii) BAPs with operator verbs other than 'give' (these include, for instance, 'come' in Lahu, 'help' in Cantonese and Dulong, 'put' in Hua, 'do for' in Tukang Besi, 'say' in the Ethiosemitic languages).

In "Cross-linguistic categorization of benefactives by event structure: A preliminary framework for benefactive typology" (pp. 71–95) Tomoko Yamashita Smith supplements the existing semantic typologies of benefactives, viz. the one outlined above proposed by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) and that by Kittilä (2005), by a novel event-based approach. She distinguishes two major types of benefactive constructions, viz. the agentive benefactive, whereby "the agent intentionally carries out the act *for* the beneficiary" (p. 75., emphasis in the original), vs. the event benefactive, which does not need to include an agent. Agentive benefactives are further subdivided into "unrestricted", i.e. the beneficiary may be either the agent him/herself or another person, "non-self-benefactive", where the beneficiary cannot coincide with the agent, and "self-benefactive", where the beneficiary is the agent him/herself (cf. Creissels' "autobenefactive" constructions). Additionally, Smith identifies a rare type of benefactive expressing shared benefit, whereby the agent does something to the beneficiary in addition to doing something for him/herself. Two cross-linguistic generalizations about the relationships between different types of benefactive emerge: (i) the presence of a self-benefactive construction in a language implies the presence of an unrestricted or a non-self-benefactive construction (pp. 84–85); (ii) the presence of an event-benefactive construction in a language implies the presence of an agentive benefactive construction (p. 92).

In "An areal and cross-linguistic study of benefactive and malefactive constructions" Paula Radetzky and Tomoko Smith compare the expression of benefactivity and malefactivity in the languages of Europe and Asia. They arrive at a conclusion that while the languages spoken in the Western part of Eurasia (Europe and the Caucasus) tend to have a generalized "affectedness

construction" underspecified with respect to benefactivity/malefactivity, languages of South, mainland Southeast and East Asia display separate constructions for benefactive and malefactive events. It must be said, however, that Radetzky and Smith's areal generalization can be falsified by the North West Caucasian languages, which show a well-established morphological distinction between the specialized benefactive and malefactive applicatives (cf. Hewitt 1979: 113, 210 on Abkhaz; Colarusso 1992: 96 on Kabardian; Letuchiy 2009 on Adyghe; Dumézil 1975: 140–142 on Oubykh; and Hewitt 2005: 122 in general).

In "The role of benefactives and related notions in typology of purpose clauses" Karsten Schmidtke-Bode discusses semantic and conceptual relations between the notions of benefactivity and purpose (pp. 121–146). He claims that "benefactives surface as either primary or secondary gestalt features of purposive constructions" (p. 121), which is reflected, *inter alia*, in the fact that dative/benefactive markers constitute the most important source of markers of purpose clauses. Schmidtke-Bode discusses the attested polysemy patterns of purpose markers and the specific metonymic extension of benefactive expressions into the domain of purpose marking. In my opinion, this paper could contain more empirical data and less of the somewhat vague discussion pertaining more to the philosophical matters of language and cognition than to the typology of benefactives and purposives.

The remaining thirteen articles contain language-particular studies of benefactive and malefactive constructions, differing in the level of detail and focus and sometimes in the quality of presentation. In "Benefactive and malefactive uses of Salish applicatives" (pp. 147–183) Kaoru Kiyosawa and Donna Gerdts present a thorough comparative study of applicative constructions in the Salish language family, discussing them from semantic, morphosyntactic, lexical and historical perspectives and providing an abundance of well-organized empirical data. In "Beneficiaries and recipients in Toba (Guaycurú)" (pp. 185–201) Marisa Censabella provides a short but very informative overview of different benefactive constructions in an indigenous language from Argentina, surveying their morphosyntactic and semantic peculiarities. In "Benefactive and malefactive applicativization in Mapudungun" (pp. 203–218) Fernando Zúñiga focuses on the lexical distribution of the affixes of benefactive and malefactive and their semantic load with different predicates, trying to systematize different views on these formations presented throughout the four centuries of grammatical studies on Mapudungun.

Timothy Colleman's "The benefactive semantic potential of 'caused reception' constructions: A case study of English, German, French, and Dutch" (pp. 217–243) is a contrastive study of ditransitive (double object or Accusative-Dative) constructions in four European languages. The author shows that while English and certain varieties of Dutch impose restrictions on the use of the

double-object construction, allowing it to denote only recipient-benefaction, German and French exhibit no such restriction. Importantly, it is shown that both English and even to a greater extent Dutch show language-internal variation in this respect, with different dialects showing different degrees of adherence to the recipient-beneficiary prototype. In "Beneficiary coding in Finnish" (pp. 245–270) Seppo Kittilä presents a lengthy and detailed survey of the numerous benefactive constructions in Finnish. He shows that a whole array of different semantic parameters plays a role in the choice between allative and ablative cases and a host of postpositions able to encode different types of beneficiary; the role of verbal transitivity, lexical semantics, and animacy/volitionality of the agent is also discussed. René Lacroix in "Benefactives in Laz" (pp. 271–293) describes the means of expression of benefactivity in the complex verbal morphosyntax of a Kartvelian language spoken in Turkey. In addition to a polyfunctional applicative derivation, Laz has a benefactive postposition; the two formal means are sometimes in free variation, but certain morphosyntactic conditions block the use of the applicative in favor of the postposition. A crosslinguistically infrequent instance of the co-occurrence of the applicative and the postposition is also documented.

Four papers are devoted to the benefactive and malefactive constructions in the languages of Africa. In "Benefactive and malefactive verb extensions in the Koalib verb system" (pp. 295–315) Nicolas Quint discusses the morphological and semantic properties of benefactive and malefactive applicatives in a language of the Heiban branch of Kordofanian, showing that transitivity of the base verb has differential impact on their productivity. Interestingly, Quint presents examples where the benefactive and the malefactive applicatives, as it were, have exchanged their meanings, a formally benefactive formation expressing a malefactive event and vice versa. Sasha Völlmin's "Benefactives and malefactives in Gumer (Gurage)" (pp. 317–330) focuses on an Ethiopian Semitic language where benefactive and malefactive meanings are expressed by special series of object markers. Völlmin discusses the malefactive-locative-instrumental polysemy, which Gurage shares with the closely related Amharic, and presents a peculiar periphrastic benefactive construction based on the verb 'say'. Raymond Boyd's paper entitled "A 'reflexive benefactive' in Chamba-Daka (Adamawa branch, Niger-Congo family)" (pp. 331–349) presents much interesting data, but, unfortunately, the analysis and discussion are very hard to follow. Christian J. Rapold's "Beneficiary and other roles of the dative in Tashelhiyt" (pp. 351–376) surveys different functions of the dative in a Berber language and proposes extensions to the semantic map of the dative (Haspelmath 2003).

"Benefactive strategies in Thai" (pp. 377–392) by Mathias Jenny analyses the various benefactive constructions in Thai, which are expressed by such periphrastic means as prepositions and serial verb constructions, investigating

their syntactic and semantic properties. Interestingly, the Thai data suggests a valid semantic distinction that has not been discussed in the existing typologies of benefactives, that of the "direct" benefactive (the beneficiary is "prototypically highly animate or human, and receives the theme or result of the action consciously" [p. 389]) and the "indirect" benefactive (the beneficiary need "not be conscious of and is not directly affected by the actions" [p. 389]). It must be pointed out, however, that Seppo Kittilä discusses this or a very similar semantic parameter of beneficiary awareness for Finnish, where the benefactive postposition *iloksi* lit. 'for someone's joy' can be used only in "direct" benefactives (p. 265).

Jae Jung Song's "Korean benefactive particles and their meanings" (pp. 393–418) critically reviews the previous analyses of the Korean benefactive constructions, notably that by Shibatani (1994), providing new data and showing that not only the benefactive auxiliary but also the three benefactive "particles" or postpositions should be taken into account for a comprehensive description of the Korean situation. Song argues that the dative/benefactive postposition *-eykey* expresses the meaning of "engagement" ("What Y does in relation to Z when Y engages with Z must be something that humans are expected to do in relation to Z" [p. 408]), thus defining another language-specific variety of benefactive, i.e. the "engager-beneficiary" construction. This notion, Song argues, enables him to explain naturally the restrictions on the use of the Korean benefactive construction without special stipulations or recourse to *ad hoc* metaphorical or metonymic mechanisms. Implications of the Korean benefactive constructions for such theories as Construction Grammar are also discussed. "Malefactivity in Japanese" (pp. 419–435) by Eijiro Tsuboi provides some novel data and interesting observations on the so-called "adversative passive" in Japanese. In particular, the role of contextual factors in the interpretation of the passive are highlighted.

The book contains a useful index of terms (pp. 437–440), but, unfortunately, lacks a language index. The editorial work should also be praised: the number of typographical errors in this book seems to be lower than average.

Overall, the book is a very valuable contribution to linguistic typology in general and to such particular domains as applicative constructions and the semantics of benefactivity and related notions. The book presents a rich variety of valuable data from genetically and geographically diverse languages and contains many descriptive and theoretical insights. However, this volume would have benefited quite a lot from a much higher degree of internal coherence. Except for the Introduction, there are almost no internal cross-references between the articles, though in many cases the authors describe similar phenomena or discuss related notions. To give just a single example, on p. 74 (paper by Tomoko Yamashita Smith) the list of references related to periphrastic benefactive constructions derived from the verb 'give' does not contain the

obvious reference to Denis Creissels' article specifically devoted to this topic. Also, it could well be possible to establish a common terminological basis for the volume, so that different authors won't need to define such notions as 'plain beneficiary' and 'deputative beneficiary' over and over again in more or less the same terms.

To conclude, *Benefactives and malefactives* is a volume of high quality and value, and I would like to recommend it to anyone who is interested in the crosslinguistic aspects of benefactivity and applicative constructions.

Russian Academy of Sciences PETER ARKADIEV

Correspondence address: peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

References

Colarusso, John. 1992. *A grammar of the Kabardian language*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Dumézil, Georges. 1975. *Le verbe oubykh: Études descriptives et comparatives*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2003. The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The new psychology of language*, vol. II, 211–242. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hewitt, B. George. 1979. *Abkhaz*. (Lingua Descriptive Studies.) Amsterdam: North Holland.

Hewitt, B. George. 2005. North West Caucasian. *Lingua* 119(1). 91–145.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Recipient prominence vs. beneficiary prominence. *Linguistic Typology* 9(2). 269–297.

Letuchiy, Alexander. 2009. Affiksy benefaktiva i malefaktiva: sintaksicheskie osobennosti i krug upotreblenij. [The benefactive and malefactive affixes: Syntactic features and the range of uses.] In Yakov G. Testelets (ed.), *Aspekty polisintetizma: Ocherki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* [Aspects of polysynthesis: Essays on the grammar of Adyghe], 329–371. Moscow: RGGU.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. Benefactive constructions: A Japanese-Korean comparative perspective. In Noriko Akatsuka (ed.), *Japanese-Korean Linguistics 4*, 39–74. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. & Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax. A Functional-typological introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.