Russian State University for the Humanities

as a manuscript

Natalia A. Solomkina

**BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN MODERN JAPANESE SPEECH:
A CORPUS STUDY**

Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics

Academic Supervisor:
PhD., Prof. Vera I. Podlesskaya

Moscow 2023

The dissertation was prepared at the Russian State University for the Humanities.

Publications

The four articles listed below have been submitted for defense, in all four of which the applicant is the sole author:

1. Solomkina N. Features of Monoclausality and Polyclausality in Japanese Benefacvtives: A Corpus Study. *Vestnik NGU. Series: History and Philology*. 2022. Vol. 21. Issue 10: Oriental Studies. Pp. 110-125. Citation database: Scopus.

2. Solomkina N. Semantics of Japanese Benefactive Constructions: A Corpus-based Research. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies*, 2022. Vol. 14. Issue 3. Pp. 469-487. Citation database: Scopus.

3. Solomkina N. Japanese Benefactives and Direct-inverse Systems. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*. 2021. Vol. 17. Issue 2. Pp. 184-204. Citation database: Scopus.

4. Solomkina N. Main Verb Transitivity in Japanese Benefactive Constructions in the Light of Corpus Data. *Ural-Altaic Studies*. 2021. Issue 02 (41). Pp. 133-144. Citation database: Q2 Scopus.

Conference presentations and public reports on the findings of the research

The key outcomes and conclusions of the present study have been presented in 2017–2022 as oral presentations at the four international conferences:

1. 19th Conference on Typology and Grammar for Young Scholars, 24-26 November 2022, Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (Saint Petersburg, Russia). Talk: Syntactic and morphological binding of Japanese benefactive constructions.

2. 16th International Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies, 24-28 August 2021, online.

Talk: A corpus-based approach to personal deixis in Japanese benefactives.

3. Japanese Philology and Methods of Teaching Japanese, 25-26 October 2019, Institute of Asia and Africa of MSU (Moscow, Russia).

Talk: Japanese benefactives: perspectives of a teacher and of a researcher.

4. 15th International Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies, 30 August – 2 September 2017, New University of Lisbon (Lisbon, Portugal).

Talk: Benefactive constructions in modern Japanese: a corpus-based approach.

1. Topic, contents, and structure of the paper

The proposed thesis focuses on comprehensive analysis of syntax and semantics of Japanese benefactive constructions. The research object is Japanese benefactive constructions in various

types of discourse, primarily in modern Japanese oral and informal written speech. The research subject is the structural properties of these constructions, their distribution, and semantics. The main **research method** is the corpus research method, which uses the body of texts (corpus) to analyze the frequency and co-occurrence of certain elements within the corpus. This study is based on the data from three corpora run by the National Institute of Japanese Language: Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese (BCCWJ), Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese (CSJ) and NPCMJ (NINJAL Parsed Corpus of Modern Japanese). We have also used the JaTenTen web corpus and data from the ValPal project (Valency Patterns Leipzig).

The purpose of the study is theoretical development, typological grounding and empirical verification for models describing the usage of benefactive constructions in modern Japanese. To achieve this aim, the following **goals** have been set:

1) To describe valency classes of verbs that can be used in Japanese benefactive constructions as main verbs.

2) To describe the functioning deictic components in modern Japanese benefactive constructions.

3) To build an inventory of key meanings Japanese benefactive constructions can convey and highlight specifics of their usage; to establish correlations between the meanings and the auxiliary verbs included in benefactive constructions.

4) To study Japanese benefactives in terms of their syntactic and morphological unity.

The novelty and theoretical significance of the study lies in the fact that benefactive constructions have been analyzed by using relevant corpus data, including examples of oral and informal written speech (online blogs). It is the first time Japanese benefactives have been studied by both qualitative and quantitative methods, and the hypotheses have been applied to all Japanese benefactives as a unified system, not to each construction separately. The obtained descriptive results have a comprehensive theoretical foundation and are placed in an appropriate typological context.

The study has **practical significance** as its results can be used for a variety of educational purposes, such as designing a practical course of Japanese, teaching manuals on theoretical grammar of the Japanese language or other teaching materials.

The main findings of the dissertation (thesis statements) to be defended are:

1. In the Japanese language, benefactive constructions can include main verbs of all valency types, however, Japanese benefactive constructions impose restrictions on the main verb associated with it's transitivity.

2. With auxiliary verbs meaning 'to give' it is possible to use intransitive verbs in case the recipient is not explicitly stated. However, for auxiliary verbs meaning 'to receive' we do not find any restrictions linking the degree of transitivity of the main verb to the explicit mention of the

benefactor (the giver) or beneficiary (the recipient).

3. The terms 'direct-inverse system' and 'direct-inverse coding' do not give a full picture of how Japanese benefactives are used. Their coding is not governed by the person hierarchy, but by the empathy hierarchy. Unlike the canonical direct-inverse systems, the leading factor is the hierarchy of psychological closeness, the ability (to a certain degree) to identify with the speaker: the 'psychologically close > psychologically distant' dichotomy.

4. The described semantics of Japanese benefactive constructions is based on three semantic features: the speaker's attitude, volition of the logical subject performing an action, presence of a sentient beneficiary. These features determine six basic meanings of benefactive constructions: strictly benefactive, etiquette, positive emotivity, monstrative, intensification, malefactive.

5. Structural components of Japanese benefactives exhibit morphological independence (except for contracted colloquial forms). From the syntactic point of view, the components show signs of both autonomy and integration. At the same time, 'indirect' benefactives with the verb *morau* ('to receive') can also demonstrate features of monoclausality, which was thought to be typical for so-called 'direct' and 'possessive' benefactives.

The sections below provide detailed information on the outcomes of the study and the content of each of the articles submitted for defense.

2. Japanese Benefactive Constructions

In this paper, we define the Japanese beneficative construction primarily formally, rather than semantically, as a construction consisting of a sense verb in the *-te/de* converb form and one of the seven auxiliary verbs. This is partly due to the corpus method, using which we often have to proceed from the form. It is also due to some conflict between the cognitivist and typological definitions of benefactives. M. Shibatani [Shibatani 1994: 46] speaks of Japanese benefactives as constructions describing the direct or metaphorical transfer of some entity from the benefactor (the subject of the action) to the beneficiary (the participant experiencing the result of this action). In the typological monograph on Japanese benefactives [Zúñiga, Kittilä 2010: 2] the authors focus on the definition of the beneficative situation through the beneficiary as a favorably affected non-obligatory participant of the situation. In this approach, when the meaning of the beneficative construction shifts to malefactive and other meanings, the non-obligatory participant affected in some way must be preserved. For details on the transitivity of main verbs and transmitted objects, see Section 3 and [Solomkina 2021a: 135-136], and on presence of beneficiaries and possible meanings of the construction, see Section 5.

The auxiliary verbs used in Japanese beneficatives differ in terms of politeness (see Table 1) and the involvement of the beneficiary in the speaker's ingroup: *yaru, ageru* and *sashiageru* 'give from

the speaker's ingroup' (1), *kureru* and *kudasaru* 'give towards the speaker's ingroup' (2), *morau* and *itadaku* 'receive' (3). Japanese native-speakers are deeply aware of the 'ingroup-outgroup' (*uchi-soto*) contrast, on which the inclusion or non-inclusion of a situation participant in the speaker's sphere is based, and which manifests itself in various forms of politeness. At the same time, this dichotomy is relative, and in different situations a participant's belonging to the speaker's sphere may be defined differently. Sometimes only the speaker himself is included in the speaker's sphere, as in example (1):

(1) 私が弟に本を読んであげた 。

watashi	*ga*	*otooto*	*ni*	*hon*	*o*	***yon-de***	***age-ta***
I	NOM	younger.brother	DAT	book	ACC	read-CNV	give-PST

'I read a book to the younger brother.'

In example (1), the action is directed from the speaker's ingroup (that is, from himself) to his younger brother, who is formally lower in the hierarchy, but in this case the neutral verb ageru is used in relation to him.

In example (2), people (including the speaker) and the environment are contrasted as "ingroup" and "outgroup," and the action is directed from the environment to the people.

(2) 環境は私達に、私達がどんな人間であるかを知らせてくれるだけ。

kankyou		*wa*	*watashitachi*	*ni*	*watashitachi*	*ga*	*donna*	*ningen*
environment		TOP	we	DAT	we	NOM	what	person

de	*ar-u*	*ka*	*o*	*shirase-te*	*kure-ru*	*dake*
COP.CNV	AUX-PRS	Q	ACC	let.know-CNV	give-PRS	only

'Environment only lets us know what kind of people we are.' [BCCWJ]

(3) 荷物は一時預かりしてもらえます。

nimotsu	*wa*	*ichiji*	*azukari-shi-te*	***mora-e-mas-u***
luggage	TOP	temporary	keep-VRB-CNV	receive-POT-ADR-PRS

'You can leave your luggage [there] for a while.' [BCCWJ]

Benefactive auxiliary verbs differ in politeness levels. In Japanese, the speaker chooses between three classes of polite forms to express a certain attitude towards a person mentioned: honorific (respectful, used for someone not belonging to the speaker's ingroup), neutral, and self-deprecatory (modest, used for someone belonging to the speaker's ingroup). Table 1 shows correlations between benefactive auxiliary verbs and different politeness levels. An 'object of social deixis' is a participant in a situation whose position in the social hierarchy is indicated by the speaker. This position is relative, the reference point is typically the social position of the speaker or someone from his/her in-group. In case of the verbs *yaru/ageru/sashiageru*, the social status of the beneficiary (the receiver) is indicated, in case of other verbs the status of the

benefactor (the giver) is indicated.

Table 1. Benefactive auxiliaries and social deixis

politeness level	status of the object of social deixis	'give' (from the speaker's ingroup)	'give' (towards the speaker's ingroup)	'receive'
honorific	*higher*		*kudasaru*	
neutral	*equal*	*ageru*	*kureru*	*morau*
self-depreciatory	*higher*	*sashiageru*		*itadaku*
non-polite	*lower*	*yaru*		

In this study, we do not consider the depreciatory verb *sashiageru*, since it seldomly occurs in corpus search results. *Sashiageru* diverges from the auxiliary verbs *ageru* and *yaru* only in its politeness degree, so we expect all three to behave similarly in terms of their syntactic functions and co-occurrence with main verbs.

If a benefactive construction is built with auxiliary verbs *yaru, ageru, kureru, kudasaru*, its valency patterns remain as defined by the main verb [Alpatov, Arkadiev, Podlesskaya 2008. p. 341]. However, when the main verb is paired with auxiliary verbs *morau* and *itadaku*, valency patterns change [Alpatov, Arkadiev, Podlesskaya 2008. p. 342], and that is one of the reasons why benefactive constructions and their syntactic properties attract so much attention from researchers [Matsumoto 1996; Kikuta 2018]. This diathesis alternation due to adding *morau* and *itadaku* is reminiscent of the active-to-passive-voice transformation, and indeed, these two constructions have similar syntactical properties (see more on that below). Cf. the following benefactive construction and the passive one featuring the verb *annnai suru* ('to show around'). In both examples, the subject is the accompanied person, and the accompanying person becomes an indirect object:

（4）引き続きＹさんに案内してもらう。
*hikitsudzuki Y   san   ni   **annai-shi-te   mora-u***
then   Y   san   DAT   guidance-VRB-CNV   receive-PRS
'Then Y will show [me] around.' [BCCWJ]

(5) 男子のボランティアに案内された
*danshi   no   boranchia   ni   **annai-s-are-ta***
man   GEN   volunteer   DAT   guidance-VRB-PASS-PST
'[He] was taken there by the male volunteer.' [BCCWJ]

3. Main verb transitivity

Since benefactive constructions describe the transfer of a certain resource, it is expected that they would feature transitive verbs. Building a benefactive construction with intransitive verbs is more challenging (see, for example, [Shibatani 1996: 160]) and often requires a special context. Shibatani [Shibatani 1994, 1996] believes that the main verb in a benefactive construction does not have to be transitive, but in this case the beneficiary should be able to take advantage of the situation created.

To analyze valency of main verbs used in benefactives on the corpus data, we have adopted [Solomkina, 2021a] valency patterns (frames) grouped in valency classes from the ValPal dataset [Kishimoto, Kageyama, Sasaki 2015] . According to ValPal, Japanese has six valency classes. Below we provide examples for one pattern in each class (this pattern is not always the only possible option):

intransitive (1-NOM V *hasiru* 'to run'),
double subject (1-NOM 2-NOM V *kayui* 'itching'),
semi-intransitive (1-NOM 2-DAT V *au* 'to meet'),
semi-transitive (1-DAT 2-NOM V *hitsuyooda* 'to be necessary'),
transitive (1-NOM 2-ACC V *tateru* 'to build'),
ditransitive (1-NOM 2-DAT 3-ACC V *ataeru* 'to give').

Using the data from the BCCWJ and CSJ corpora, we have analyzed the usage of benefactive constructions with predicates of all valency classes except for the double subject one, since this class mainly includes adjectives that do not form benefactive constructions. We also considered causative forms as a separate valency class, since they frequently occur in benefactive constructions changing the original valency structure of the main verb.

Table 2. Main verb valency classes in CSJ

verb valency class	-te yaru	-te ageru	-te kudasaru	-te kureru	-te morau	-te itadaku	random verb forms
intransitive	2	2	7	10	7	2	27
semi-intransitive	0	3	0	0	1	0	3
semi-transitive	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

transitive	90	73	81	79	81	45	58
ditransitive	26	34	32	27	21	5	30
causative form	2	8	0	4	10	68	1
total	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
P-value for benefactive construction compared to random verb forms	$8.626*10^{-08}$	$6.639*10^{-07}$	0.0001523	0.001645	$1.202*10^{-05}$	$<2.2*10^{-16}$	

Table 3. Main verb valency classes in BCCWJ

verb valency class	-te yaru	-te ageru	-te kudasaru	-te kureru	-te morau	-te itadaku	random verb forms
intransitive	11	7	26	18	12	5	31
semi-intransitive	3	1	3	4	5	2	14
semi-transitive	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
transitive	57	64	49	51	50	39	42
ditransitive	26	22	21	26	15	12	13
causative form	3	6	1	1	17	41	0
total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
P-value for benefactive construction compared to random verb forms	$1.359*10^{-5}$	$8.376*10^{-9}$	0.01704	0.002517	$5.419*10^{-7}$	$<2.2*10^{-16}$	

The outcomes of the analysis (Tables 2 and 3) confirm statistically significant differences between the distribution of main verb valency classes in benefactive constructions and the distribution of

valency patterns in a randomly created pool of verb forms. Although the distribution of valency classes in benefactive constructions differs significantly from that for other verb forms, each auxiliary verb in the studied sample occurred in benefactives with intransitive and semi-intransitive main verbs (such as *au* 'to meet (someone)', *tsuku* 'to arrive (somewhere)').

Our data are consistent with the restriction proposed by Shibatani: benefactive constructions with auxiliaries meaning 'to give' and intransitive main verbs can be formed only in case the beneficiary is not explicitly stated [Shibatani 1996: 186]:

(6) *Kinoo wa   o-tomodachi   ga   o-mimai   ni   **ki-te**   **kure-te,***
yesterday TOP HON-friend   NOM HON-visiting.ill.people DAT   **come-CNV**   **give-CNV**
hisashiburi   ni   koe   o   da-shi,   wara-i,   tanoshi-i
long.time   DAT   voice   ACC   take.out-CNV   laugh-CNV   funny-PRS
jikan   o   sugos-u   koto   ga   deki-mash-ita.
time   ACC spend-PRS   NML   NOM   can-ADR-PST
'Yesterday my friend came to visit me as I am ill, so for the first time after a long while we could talk, laugh and have fun.' [BCCWJ]

However, with intransitive main verbs and using the auxiliary verbs *morau* and *itadaku* meaning 'to receive', there are no restrictions on the explicitness of the benefactor or the beneficiary. In example (7) below, the beneficiary is *jyosi* 'girl', while in example (8) the beneficiary is *shujin* 'husband':

(7) *asa   kara   **jyosi ni**   ki-te   morat-te   meiku   no*
morning   from   girls   DAT   come-CNV   receive-CNV   makeup   GEN
rensyū-si-te-mas-ita   yo
practice-VRB-CNV-AUX:ADR-PST   PRT
'In the morning girls came [for me], and I practiced some makeup.' [BCCWJ]

(8) ***shujin ga***   *tomodachi ni   mukae ni   **ki-te**   morat-ta*
husband   NOM friend   DAT   meeting DAT   come-CNV   receive-PST
'[My] husband was met by a friend.' [Solomkina 2021a: 142]

4. Japanese benefactives and direct-inverse alignment

Many researchers [Nariyama 2003; Shibatani 2003; Koga, Ohori 2008] contrast benefactive auxiliary verbs of the *yaru/ageru/sashiageru* group to the *kureru/kudasaru* group by using the terms 'inverse systems', 'direct-inverse coding' and 'direct-inverse alignment'. Descriptions of direct-inverse systems usually involve references to the person hierarchy and the animacy hierarchy proposed in [DeLancey 1981]. In [Solomkina 2021b], we discuss potency of these descriptions and test them on corpus data.

Nariyama [Nariyama 2003: 107] offers the following version of the person hierarchy for the Japanese language:

Human (1 > 2 > 3 person) > Animate > Inanimate

— Direct alignment (subject > non-subject)

— Inverse alignment (subject < non-subject)

If the beneficiary (the receiver) is higher in the hierarchy than the benefactor (the giver), an inverse auxiliary verb (*kureru/kudasaru*) should be used. If the benefactor is higher or equal to the beneficiary in the hierarchy, the speaker is likely to choose a direct verb (*yaru / ageru / sashiageru*). In [Jacques, Antonov 2014] the canonical direct-inverse systems are described with the use of criteria from which Japanese deviates quite strongly:

1. All personal indicators are neutral with regard to syntactic roles;

2. The ambiguity of role coding arising due to property 1 is resolved by obligatory mutually exclusive markers (directive and inverse), whose distribution is described with the help of referential hierarchies;

3. inverse and direct verb forms have the same diathesis and do not differ in terms of syntactic transitivity.

In canonical direct-inverse systems, the opposition of direct and inverse forms makes it possible to determine which participant is the agent and which is the patient, as in the following example from Plain Cree (Algonquin):

(9) *ni-sēkih-**ā**-w*
1-пугать-DIR-3
'I scare him.' [Zúñiga 2006: 76]

(10) *ni-sēkih-**ikw**-w*
1-пугать-INV-3
'He scares me.' [Zúñiga 2006: 76].

In Japanese benefactive constructions, despite the absence of person and number markers, there is no ambiguity of role coding due to the presence of case postpositions. Thus, Japanese benefactives correspond only to the third feature of canonical direct-inverse systems.

Testelets [Testelets 1989: 137] insists on less rigid characteristics of direct-inverse systems:

1) there is a morphological, syntactic, or lexical paradigm of non-divisible forms;

2) each element of the paradigm simultaneously expresses the person of two participants to the situation;

3) each element contains disjunctively more than one possible value for each of the participants;

4) applicable values for each element of the paradigm cannot violate the hierarchy 1 > 2 > 3.

In Japanese, the first three characteristics are observed while the fourth one is often violated. We see it in benefactives with the 'direct' verbs *yaru* and *ageru*: the benefactor is lower in the hierarchy

1 > 2 > 3 than the beneficiary, so the verbs should not be used (for instance, in situations where a material or symbolic benefit is transferred from the third to the second person), but they still occur. See the example with the 'direct' verb *yaru* below with the transfer from the second to the first person:

(11) ＵＰ画像が前にＵＰしていても笑って許してやってください
up   gazoo   ga   mae   ni   up   shi-te   i-te
upload   image   NOM   before DAT   upload   VRB-CNV   AUX.PRG-CNV
*mo   warat-te   **yurushi-te**   **yat-te**   **kudasai***
even   laugh-CNV   forgive-CNV   give-CNV   AUX.IMP
'Even if I have already uploaded this picture, please forgive me this with a smile.' [blogs BCCWJ]

Here we see an attempt to use the auxiliary verb *yaru* as a self-depreciatory verb: the speaker seeks to emphasize his inferior position in relation to the listener. In this case, the focus of empathy is placed on the listener, and the action is described as directed from one's ingroup to the inferior outgroup member.

Similarly, the 'inverse' verbs *kureru* and *kudasaru* should not theoretically function in constructions where the second person does something for the third person, but they do occur in such in Japanese. See the example below with the 'inverse' verb *kureru* describing a transmission from the second to the third person:

(12) あなたが弟にプレゼントをくれた。
Anata   ga   otooto   ni   purezento o   kure-ta.
 you   NOM   younger.brother   DAT   present   ACC   give-PST
'You gave my brother a present.' [Nariyama 2003: 111]

(13) 秋雄君やい、ちょっとおじさんに手を貸してくれ。
*Akio   kun   yai   chotto **ojisan ni**   te   o*
Akio   kun   hey   a.little uncle DAT   hand   ACC
kash-ite   kure
lend-CNV   give.IMP
'Hey, Akio, give your uncle a hand *(the speaker is likely to refer to himself)*' . [NPCMJ]

The 1 > 2 > 3 person hierarchy does not quite explain cases where the benefactor and the beneficiary are the same person. The example below is about the second person:

(14) 我慢した自分を褒めてあげましょう～～＾＾
*gaman   shi-ta   **jibun o   home-te   age-mash-yoo***
patience   VRB-PST   oneselfACC   praise-CNV   give-ADR-HOR
'Praise yourself for being so patient.' [BCCWJ]

Below are corpus data on the distribution of the situation participants' persons in benefacative

constructions from the written corpora BCCWJ and NPCMJ. The dark gray color indicates the zone of the canonical direct alignment use (subject > non-subject), and the light gray color indicates the zone of the canonical inverse alignment (subject < non-subject). In our data we encountered a large number of examples where the action is directed from one third person to another. We also observe few examples of action directed from one first person to another first person, and examples of going outside the "directive" and "inverse" zone, which, however, require specific context (see examples 11, 13, 14)

Table 4. Direct / inverse alignment in examples with *yaru*

Examples in total: 165		Beneficiary with *yaru*				
		1	2	3 animate	3 inanimate	no referent
Benefactor with *yaru*	1		35	91		6
	2	1		2		
	3 animate			29		
	3 inanimate				1	
	no referent					

Table 5. Direct / inverse alignment in examples with *ageru*

Examples in total: 136		Beneficiary with *ageru*				
		1	2	3 animate	3 inanimate	no referent
Benefactor with *ageru*	1	2	18	70	1	
	2			10		
	3 animate		1	35		
	3 inanimate					
	no referent					

12

Table 6. Direct / inverse alignment in examples with *kureru*

Examples in total: 374		Beneficiary with *kureru*			
		1	2	3 animate	3 inanimate
Benefactor with *kureru*	1				
	2	103		1	
	3 animate	176	5	44	
	3 inanimate	36	1	8	

Table 7. Direct / inverse alignment in examples with *kudasaru*

Examples in total: 140		Beneficiary with *kudasaru*				
		1	2	3 animate	3 inanimate	no referent
Benefactor with *kudasaru*	1					
	2	25				
	3 animate	99	1	15		
	3 inanimate					
	no referent					

In Japanese grammar there is no regular opposition between proximate (more communicatively salient) and obviate (less communicatively salient) third persons, which is characteristic of Algonquin languages. However, in benefactive constructions when describing an action directed from one third person to another, the focus of empathy (for the term see [Kuno, Kaburaki 1977]) may be placed on either the beneficiary or the beneficiary, depending on the choice of verbs of the *yaru* or *kureru* groups. It is not the hierarchy of persons, but the hierarchy of psychological closeness, the ability to identify with the speaker, empathy (as understood by S. Kuno and E. Kaburaki) that plays the leading role in the choice of the auxiliary verb: the psychologically close > psychologically distant hierarchy.

This hierarchy often overlaps with the person and animacy hierarchies, since the speaker is obviously psychologically closer to himself than the second and third persons, and it is easier for the speaker to show empathy towards animate participants of the situation than to inanimate ones.

Yet when it comes to the third person scenarios, the person and animacy hierarchies are clearly not enough to explain the usage of Japanese benefactives.

5. Semantics of Japanese benefactives

Existing semantic classifications of benefactive constructions, the ones considering the Japanese language only [Toyoda 1974; Wang 2008] or largely universal [Zúñiga, Kittilä 2010: 71–96], are based on features associated with the semantic roles of the situation participants: their animacy or agentivity and sentience. The significant shortcoming of the Japanese language works is that semantic classifications are created separately for each group of the auxiliary verbs. In our earlier paper [Solomkina 2022a], we proposed the following universal (applicable to benefactives with any auxiliary verb) criteria for describing the semantics of benefactive constructions:

- the speaker's attitude: positive, neutral or negative (whether the speaker evaluates the result of an action as beneficial, neutral or harmful for the beneeficiary);

- volition of the logical subject of an action (whether the subject intended an action or not): volitional or non-volitional subject;

- presence of a sentient beneficiary: present or not.

We use the term 'sentient' (i.e. capable of feeling) in a narrower sense, as capable of experiencing and evaluating an impact of the described action as positive or negative. This characteristic does not necessarily imply that the beneficiary is animate.

This classification is similar to typological classifications of benefactives in that it is based, among other things, on the degree of benefactor's agentivity (see, for example, "agentive benefactivees" and "event-based benefactives" [Zúñiga, Kittilä 2010: 71-97]).

The correlation of assigned meanings and these criteria is presented in Table 8, the meaning where the subject of an action is not volitional is highlighted in gray.

Table 8. Criteria for distinguishing meanings of Japanese benefactive constructions

sentient beneficiary present	speaker's attitude				
	positive			neutral	negative
+	strictly benefactive and etiquette	positive emotivity			malefactive
-			monstrative	intensification	

1. By strictly benefactive meaning we understand the examples of a resource transfer from a volitional benefactor to a sentient beneficiary. This meaning is represented by the examples (1) and (2), among others.

The combination of the criteria values for this meaning involves: positive speaker's attitude, volitional benefactor, sentient beneficiary.

2. In the etiquette meaning usually the depreciative auxiliary verb *itadaku* 'to receive towards the speaker's ingroup' is used, and the main verb includes the causative marker *-(s)ase-* [Alpatov, Arkadiev, Podlesskaya 2008]. This construction is often used for requests.

Criteria values: positive speaker's attitude, volitional benefactor, sentient beneficiary.

(15) お伺いさせて頂きます。
o-ukagai-s-ase-te   *itadak-imas-u*
HON-inquire-VRB-CAUS-CNV   receive-ADR-PRS
 'Please let me inquire (lit. 'give me permission to inquire').'[BCCWJ]

Formally, the strictly benefactive and etiquette usages of the benefactive constructions coincide in all three criteria values. However, from a pragmatic point of view, in etiquette meaning the focus shifts from resource transfer to manifesting courtesy.

3. The meaning of positive emotivity was proposed by I. I. Bass in the article [Bass, 2014] for the auxiliary verbs *kureru* and *kudasaru*, but we also can find it in other auxiliary verbs. This meaning is associated with a non-volitional (most often inanimate) beneficiary and "emphasizes positive attitude of the beneficiaries to subjects' manifestations rather than their deliberate actions in the interests of the beneficiaries."

Criteria values: positive speaker's attitude, non-volitional benefactor, sentient beneficiary.

(16) コスモスの可憐な花が私たちのこころを和ませてくれています。
kosumosu   *no*   *karen*   *na*   **hana**   **ga**   *watashi*   *tachi*
kosmos   GEN   cute   PRT   цветок   NOM   я   PL
no   *kokoro*   *o*   **nagom-ase-te**   **kure-te**   **i-mas-u**
GEN   heart   ACC   soften-CAUS-CNV   give-CNV   AUX-ADR-PRS
'Touchingly lovely cosmos flowers soften our hearts.' [BCCWJ]

4. Monstrative meaning usually occurs when the auxiliary verbs *yaru* and *ageru* are used for instruction or demonstration (in cooking recipes, at conferences, etc.).

Criteria values: neutral speaker's attitude, volitional benefactor, no sentient beneficiary.

(17) 後は自分なりにカレー粉を調合して後はスパイスなどを調合してやればまたもっと
おいしいカレーができるんではないかと思います
ato   *wa*   *jibunnari*   *kareeko*   *o*   *choogoo-shi-te*   *ato*   *wa*   *supaisu*
then   TOP   one's own.way   curry   ACC   mix-VRB-CNV   then   TOP   spice
nado   *o*   **choogoo-shi-te**   **yar-eba**   *mata*   *motto*   *oishi-i*
etc   ACC   mix-VRB-CNV   give-PMT   yet   more   tasty-PRS
karee   *ga*   *deki-ru*   *n*   *de*   *wa*   *na-i*   *ka*   *to*   *omo-imas-u*

curry NOM can-PRS NML COP.CNV TOP AUX.NEG-PRS Q QUOT think-ADR-PRS
'Then add curry powder to taste, then other spices etc., in that case, I think, you'll get a better tasting curry.' [CSJ]

5. The usage of the benefactive construction in the meaning of intensification does not imply the speaker's unequivocally positive or negative attitude to the action, but serves to express a strong intention to perform an action.

Criteria values: neutral speaker's attitude, volitional benefactor, no sentient beneficiary.

(18) 春休みは、思いっきりあそんでやんぞー
haruyasumi   *wa*   *omoikkiri*   **ason-de**   **yan**   *zoo*
spring.break   TOP   hard   have.fun-CNV   give.PRS   PRT
'During the spring break I'll have the utmost fun!' [BCCWJ]

6. Malefactual usage of the construction helps to describe a situation where one participant performs an action to the detriment of another, which is characteristic of constructions with *yaru* 'to give' (19), but can be also found with *kureru* 'to give to speaker's ingroup' (20).

Criteria values: negative speaker's attitude, volitional benefactor, sentiental beneficiary.

(19) 犯人見つけて・・・腹裂いてハラワタ引きずり出してやる。
hannin   *mitsuke-te*   *hara*   *sa-ite*   *harawata*
criminal   find-CNV   belly   tear-CNV   guts
hikizuridas-ite   **ya-ru**
pull-CNV   give-PRS
'When I find the criminal, I'll tear his belly open and pull his guts out.' [BCCWJ]

(20) あいつは 俺 に 感謝 する どころか 、 おれ の 顔 に 泥 を ぬる よう な こと ばかり して くれる
aitsu   *wa* *ore* *ni* *kansha-su-ru*   *dokoroka* *ore* *no*   *kao*
that.suy   TOP I   DAT gratitude-VRB-PRS   far.from I   GEN face
ni *doro* *o* *nu-ru*   *yoo*   *na* *koto* *bakari* **shi-te**   **kure-ru**
DAT mud   ACC smear-PRS like   ATR thing only   do-CNV   give-PRS
'He'd rather fling mud at me than thank me.' [NPCMJ]

The article [Solomkina 2022a] presents quantitative data on the distribution of the meanings for each benefactive auxiliary verb.

Constructions with the auxiliary verb *yaru* demonstrate the greatest variety of possible meanings: all mentioned above options are possible there, except for the meaning of positive emotion. With the verb *ageru*, there is no evidence of its etiquette and malefactive usage. This might relate to the fact that the verb *ageru* is neutral in terms of the politeness level, and malefactive and etiquette usages are possible in those cases when the benefactor and the beneficiary differ in their social status.

16

With the auxiliary verb *kureru* the construction might acquire strictly benefactive and malefactive meanings, as well as positive emotivity one. The verb *kudasaru* has not been found in malefactive and positive emotivity examples, which also can be associated with its level of politeness: neither the malefactor nor the non-volitional (often inanimate) benefactor can be higher in the social hierarchy than the beneficiary from the speaker's ingroup.

The auxiliary verbs *morau* and *itadaku* have been found in our data in strictly benefactive and etiquette meanings. Remarkably, there is a shift of etiquette usage from *itadaku* to *morau*, though the latter is not a polite (depreciative) verb.

6. Morphological and syntactic integration of the parts of benefactive construction

In [Solomkina, 2022b], we regard Japanese benefactives as one of the subclasses of Japanese converb constructions and analyze the signs of morphological and syntactic unity they demonstrate using corpus data.

The first part of the article describes the arguments given by researchers when discussing the morphological and syntactic status of these constructions. Corpus research methods cannot be applied to all tests used in the literature, so we selected the following tests:

a) inserting focal particles *mo* ('too'), *nante* ('such as'), *nanka* ('such as'), *sae* ('if only'), etc. between the components of a benefactive construction;

A large number of particles with a wide range of meanings are found between the parts of the benefactive construction, which confirms their morphological independence. Despite the obvious morphological independence of the benefactive construction parts in the standard language, contracted colloquial forms of the auxiliary verb *ageru* like *yondageru* (from *yonde ageru*) 'I will read [to someone outside the speaker's ingroup]' occur in vernacular speech, and they clearly demonstrate morphological unity.

b) replacing the main verb with pro-form *soo suru*.

The use of this test in Japanese requires a separate explanation. Usually, the morphological status of a construction is checked by replacing its part with a pro-form, since parts of compound words are anaphoric islands, while parts of phrases are not. However, in Japanese the possibility of substitution for *soo suru* often distinguishes constructions with more and fewer polypredicative properties, for example, forms of the desiderative mood with nominative-accusative and binominal marking of participants, permissive and persuasive (factual) causatives [Matsumoto 1996: 110, 142].

Replacing the semantic verb with *soo suru* ('to do so') turned out to be possible for all auxiliary verbs, which indicates the independence of Japanese benefactive constructions' parts:

(21) もちろん、そうしてあげよう
mochiron   soo   shi-te   age-yoo
sure   so   do-CNV   give-HOR
'Sure, let me do so.'

c) meeting the locality condition for the restrictive particle *shika* 'only / except for' provided the main verb is in the negative form;

Dividing the actants of a benefactive construction into those belonging to the auxiliary verb and belonging to the main verb, we follow the approach of Matsumoto, who within the framework of lexical-functional grammar, considers the benefactor and beneficiary to be direct dependents of the auxiliary verb, and the remaining groups are dependents of the main verb [Matsumoto 1996: 53]. There is a semantic rationale here, as, in example (19) *raamen* ('ramen soup') is a dependent component of the verb *taberu* ('to eat').

According to the locality condition, *shik*a ('only') can only be added to an NP that is in the same clause as the negative verb.

In the first case the negation marker is attached to the main verb. If, in this case, the NP with *shika* is located to the right of all the actants and adjuncts of the auxiliary verb, and not to the left of some of them, then this can serve as an indication of the biclausal structure of the construction. In our corpus data, *shika* is always located to the right of all dependents of auxiliary verbs:

(22) もし『煙は害』を口にするなら、その人には完全健康食品しか食わないで頂きたい
moshi kemuri   wa   gai   o   kuchi   ni   su-ru   nara
in.case smoke   TOP harm ACC mouth   DAT   do-PRS   if
*sono   hito   ni   wa   kanzen   kenkoo   shokuhin   **shika***
this   person DAT   TOP completely health   food   only
kuw-ana-ide   itadak-ita-i
eat-NEG-CNV   get-DSD-PRS
'If the person is saying, that cigarette smoke is harmful, we'd like him to eat completely healthy food only.' [BCCWJ]

d) fulfilling the locality condition for *shika* ('only / except for') provided the auxiliary verb is in the negative form.

According to the locality condition, *shika* must follow the NP, which depends on the auxiliary verb with the negation marker. The vast majority of NPs with *shika* are dependants of the main verb, which is an example of 'monoclausal' behavior:

(23) 最初のデートでラーメンしか食べさせてくれない人ってどうですか？
*Saisho   no   deeto   de   **raamen shika tabe-sase-te   kure-na-i***
first   GEN   date   LOC   ramen   only eat-CAUS-CNV   give-NEG-PRS

18

hito   tte doo des-u   ka
person   TOP how COP.ADR-PRS Q
'How do you like men who treat [a girl] to ramen only on their first date?' [BCCWJ]

Kikuta [Kikuta, 2018, p. 173], in the section of the monograph devoted to complex predicates in Japanese, does not classify Japanese beneficiaries with *morau* as either monoclausal or biclausal constructions. The researcher proposes regarding them by analogy with direct, possessive and indirect passive constructions: the first and second types are considered monoclausal, and the third one – biclausal. The following examples present benefactive constructions with *-te morau* of three types: direct (24), possessive (25) and indirect (26), as well as 'original' structures in the active voice.

(24) a. *Syota ga   Kyoko   ni   homete   morat-ta.*
Syota   NOM   Kyoko DAT   praise-CNV receive-PST
'Syota was praised by Kyoko (for his benefit).' [Kikuta 2018: 175]
b. *Kyoko ga   Syota   o   home-ta*
Kyoko   NOM Syota   ACC   praise-PST
'Kyoko praised Syota.'

(25) a. *Syota ga   Kyoko   ni   kodomo o   home-te   morat-ta.*
Syota   NOM   Kyoko DAT child   ACC praise-CNV   receive-PST
'Syota had Kyoko praise his child (for Syota's benefit).' [Kikuta 2018: 175]
b. *Kyoko   ga   (Syota   no)   kodomo   o   hometa.*
Kyoko   NOM   Syota   GEN   child   ACC   praise-PST
'Kyoko praised (Syota's) child.'

(26) a. *Syota ga   Kyoko   ni   deteit-te   morat-ta.*
Syota   NOM   Kyoko DAT   go.out-CNV   receive-PST
'Syota had Kyoko get out (for his benefit).' [Kikuta 2018: 175]
b. *Kyoko   ga   (*Syota   o/ni)   deteitta*
Kyoko   NOM   (*Syota ACC/GEN)   go.out-PST
'Kyoko left (*for Syota).'

However, in our sample we have 31 examples with *shika … -te morawanai* showing 'monoclausal' behavior, and only 27 examples can be classified as direct or possessive benefactive constructions, while 4 of them are indirect. In the example below we can see indirect benefactive construction with *shika*, which indicates the syntactic unity of the construction's parts:

(27) a. コンピュータの心臓部であるＣＰＵにはこの「機械語」しか理解してもらえないのです。
konpyuuta   no   shinzoobu   de   aru   CPU ni   wa
computer   GEN   central.part   COP.CNV AUX-PRSCPU   DAT   TOP
kono kikaigo   shika rikai-shi-te   mora-e-nai   no   des-u
this   machine.language only   understand-VRB-CNV give-POT-NEG   NML   COP-PRS
'The central processing unit, which is the main part of the computer, does not understand

19

anything other than this machine language.'

b. *CPU   ga   kikaigo   o   (*watashitachi   ni)   rikai-shi-mas-u*
CPU   NOM machine.language ACC we   DAT   understand-VRB-ADR-PRS
'The CPU understands the machine language (*for us)'

Thus, the opposition of direct and indirect benefactive constructions as demonstrating mono- and biclausal behavior, respectively, is not strict and unambiguous.

7. Conclusion

In this study, we comprehensively verify and complement existing descriptions of the system of Japanese benefactual constructions based on the corpus data. Benefactives can be formed with main verbs of different transitivity degrees, however, there are some restrictions in the choice of the main verb and explicit manifestation of the situation participants. These constructions are deictically marked and contain an indication of the relative social status and degree of psychological proximity of the speaker and other situation participants. However, they do not contain a direct indication of a grammatical person. These constructions can be used in various meanings, along with the strictly benefactive one. We have identified five such meanings.

Japanese benefactive constructions demonstrate morphological independence, however, from the syntactic point of view, their components have both signs of autonomy and signs of integration.

Returning to the definitions of benefactive constructions discussed in Section 2, we can say that Japanese benefactive constructions do not always require the presence of a transmitted object (i.e., being uses with a main verb of high transitivity level) and the presence of a sentient beneficiary (see monstrative and intensification meanings in Section 5). It can be said that both the abstract transmitted object and the abstract beneficiary are present in these cases, but they are moved from the sphere of semantics into the sphere of pragmatics.

Abbreviations

ACC — accusative; ADR — addressive; ATR — attributive forrm; AUX — auxiliary; CAUS — каузатив; CNV — converb; COND — coditional form; COP — copula; DAT — dative; DSD – desiderative; EVD — evidentiality; GEN — genitive; HON — honorative; HOR — hortative; IMP — imperative; INS — instrumental case; LOC — locative; NEG — negation; NML — nominalizer; NOM — nominative; PRS — present tense; PRT — particle; PST — past tense; Q — question marker; TOP — topic; VRB — verbaliser.

References

Alpatov V. M., Arkad'iev P. M., Podlesskaya V. I. Theoretical grammar of Japanese. Moscow, Natalis, 2008. 560 p. (in Russian)

Bass I. I. Benefactive Constructions in Japanese. RUDN University Bulletin Linguistics Series, 2014, vol. 2, pp. 159–169. (In Russian)

DeLancey S. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns // Language. 1981. Vol. 57. No. 3. C. 626–657.

Jacques G., Antonov A. Direct / inverse systems // Language and Linguistics Compass. 2014. Vol. 8. Iss. 7. P. 301–318.

Kikuta, Chiharu Uda. Complex Predicates in Japanese. New York, Routledge, 2018. 375 c.

Kishimoto, Kageyama, Sasaki 2015 — Kishimoto H., Kageyama T., Sasaki K. Valency classes in Japanese // Valency classes in the world's languages. Berlin — Boston, 2015. P. 765—805.

Koga, Ohori 2008 — H. Koga, T. Ohori. Reintroducing inverse constructions in Japanese: The deictic verb kuru 'to come' in the paradigms of argument encoding // R. D. Van Valin Jr. (ed.). Investigations of the syntax-semantics-pragmatics interface. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2008. P. 37–58.

Kuno S., Kaburaki E. Empathy and syntax. Linguistic inquiry. Vol. 8. No. 4. 1977. P. 627–672.

Matsumoto, Yo. Complex predicates in Japanese. Tokyo & Stanford, Kuroshio Shuppan & CSLI, 1996. 359 p.

Nariyama. S. Ellipsis and reference tracking in Japanese. (Studies in Language Companion Series, 66). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2003.

Shibatani M. Benefactive constructions: A Japanese-Korean comparative perspective // Japanese / Korean Linguistics. 1994, 4. P. 39—74.

Shibatani M. Applicatives and benefactives: A cognitive account // Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning. Oxford, 1996. P. 157—194.

Shibatani M. Directional verbs in Japanese // Shay E., Seibert U. (ed.). Motion, direction and location in languages: In honor of Zygmunt Frajzyngier. – John Benjamins Publishing, 2003. – T. 56. – P. 259-286.

Solomkina N. Main Verb Transitivity in Japanese Benefactive Constructions in the Light of Corpus Data. Ural-Altaic Studies. 2021a. Issue 02 (41). P. 133-144. (In Russian)

Solomkina N. Japanese Benefactives and Direct-inverse Systems // Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. 2021b. Vol. 17. issue 2. P. 184-204. (In Russian)

Solomkina N. Semantics of Japanese Benefactive Constructions: A Corpus-based Research Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies, 2022a, vol. 14, issue 3, pp. 469-487. (In Russian)

Solomkina N. Features of Monoclausality and Polyclausality in Japanese Benefacvtives: a Corpus Study. Vestnik NGU. Series: History and Philology. 2022b. vol. 21, issue 10: Oriental Studies. P. 110-125. (In Russian)

Toyoda T., Hojodooshi yaru kureru morau ni tsuite [Regarding the Auxiliary verbs yaru, kureru and morau]. *Bulletin of Japanese Language School*, 1974, Vol. 1, pp. 77-96. (in Japanese)

Testelets Ya. G. Direct / Inverse Systems: Definition and Attempt at Typology. V. I. Podlesskaya, L. I. Kulikov (eds.). Problemy semanticheskoy I sintaksicheskoy tipologii [Problems of semantic and syntactic typology]. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. P. 135–146. (In Russian)

Toyoda T., Hojodooshi яру курэру морау ni tsuite [Regarding the Auxiliary verbs Яру, Курэру and Морау]. *Bulletin of Japanese Language School*, 1974, Vol. 1, pp. 77-96. (in Japanese)

Yan Wang. Te yaru no haseiteki na imi kinoo ni tsuite [An Approach to the Derivative Sense of "-teyaru"]. *Hokuriku University Bulletun*, 2008, Vol. 32, pp. 193-210. (in Japanese)

Zúñiga, F., Kittilä S., eds. Benefactives and malefactives: Typological perspectives and case studies. Vol. 92. John Benjamins Publishing, 2010.

Zúñiga F. Deixis and alignment: Inverse systems in indigenous languages of the Americas. (Typological Studies in Language, 70). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2006.

Sources

BCCWJ – Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese. URL: https://chunagon.ninjal.ac.jp/

CSJ — Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese. URL: https://chunagon.ninjal.ac.jp/csj/

JaTenTen – Japanese WebCorpus. URL: https://www.sketchengine.eu/jatenten-japanese-corpus/

NPCMJ — NINJAL Parsed Corpus of Modern Japanese. URL: http://npcmj.ninjal.ac.jp/

ValPal — Kishimoto H., Kageyama T. Japanese (standard) Valency Patterns // Valency Patterns Leipzig, 2013. URL: http://valpal.info/languages/japanese-standard/

Appendix 1.

Possible Meanings of Japanese Benefactive Constructions

Table 1. Meanings of *yaru* and *ageru* found in the corpus data

	yaru			ageru		
meanings:	BCCWJ	NPCMJ	CSJ	BCCWJ	NPCMJ	CSJ
strictly benefactive	73	39	20	99	34	97
etiquette	4					
mostrative			74			23
intensification	2	9	16	1		
malefactive	21	17	9			
positive emotivity						
total	100	65	120	100	34	120

Table 2. Meanings of *kureru* and *kudasaru* found in the corpus data.

	kureru			kudasaru		
meanings:	BCCWJ	NPCMJ	CSJ	BCCWJ	NPCMJ	CSJ
strictly benefactive	90	253	116	100	40	120
etiquette						
mostrative						
intensification						
malefactive		1				
positive emotivity	10	21	4			
total	100	274	120	100	40	120

Table 3. Meanings of *morau* and *itadaku* found in the corpus data.

	morau			itadaku		
meanings:	BCCWJ	NPCMJ	CSJ	BCCWJ	NPCMJ	CSJ
strictly benefactive	83	81	110	59	44	52
etiquette	17		10	41	20	68
monstrative						
intensification						
malefactive						
positive emotivity						
total	100	81	120	100	64	120