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Introduction

This paper tackles the issue of language-internal variation and is concerned with the semantics of the English argument structure illustrated in the example below, which will henceforth be referred to as the **BENEFACTIVE DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION** (or DOC). Syntactically speaking, the double object construction combines a verb with a subject and, as its label indicates, a direct object with a zero-marked indirect object. From a semantic perspective, these arguments prototypically “encode the agent, theme and recipient participant in a ‘transfer of possession’ event, respectively” (Colleman, 2009a:191). However, in many languages it is possible to use the DOC to encode a variety of benefactive scenes in addition to its basic transfer of possession sense (Colleman, 2010). This means that in combination with certain verbs from particular semantic classes, the construction is able to express a situation involving a beneficiary rather than a recipient. Consider the following examples from Colleman and De Clerck (2011:195):

\[a\) She bought me a book, She sewed me a dress, She found me a job, ... \]

\[b) \quad *She opened me the door, *She watered me the plants, *She cleaned me the windows, ... \]

The DOC’s in example (a) encode the transfer of a book, a dress and a job from one domain of possession to another. Simultaneously, they denote a situation in which the action is carried out for the benefit of someone else. That is, the indirect object referent in (a) is the one who benefits from the event because something previously unavailable is made accessibly as a result. From the grammaticality contrast with example (b), it is clear that the benefactive DOC in English is bound to certain restrictions. In the literature, this is often formulated in terms of the **INTENDED RECEPTION CONSTRAINT**, which posits that for the benefactive DOC in English to be acceptable, the beneficiary has to be involved as the intended recipient of the theme (Colleman, 2009b). Thus, while in example (b) the indirect object referent is the one who benefits from the event, he/she does not receive something by instigation of the agent. Because you cannot receive the door by opening it, you cannot receive the plants by watering them, and you cannot receive the windows by cleaning them, the DOC in example (b) is ungrammatical.

This paper will look further into the nature of the different kinds of benefaction accommodated by the DOC in English. With respect to the intended reception constraint, the construction will be shown to be subject to a certain degree of intra-lingual variation (Colleman, 2010). That is, the constraint will be argued to have “fuzzy edges” (Fellbaum, 2005:209) and, additionally, to be “more strictly adhered to by some speakers of English than others” (Colleman, 2010).

---

1 All capitalizations, henceforth, are my own and serve to highlight new and important terminology.
These observations are not new, but regularly accounted for in the literature. There is an extensive body of research on use of the DOC in different varieties of English, as well as on the functional role of beneficiaries, and on the nature of benefaction in general. As such, part I of this study frames the construction under investigation within the relevant linguistic literature. Then, on the basis of insights from such existing research, part II presents a corpus investigation into the semantics of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English. On the basis of data gathered from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and the British National Corpus, this study will map and compare the semantic ranges of the construction in the two major national varieties of English. More specifically, it will try to account for the observed variation in terms of the intended reception constraint.

This paper is structured as follows. The literature review in Part I starts off with an introductory first chapter in which the benefactive DOC is situated within the broader framework of ditransitive argument structures. That is, as a participant constellation combining a verb with an agent, a theme and a beneficiary participant. In English, this particular use in which there is a beneficiary rather than a recipient as third participant, will be shown to be restricted by the intended reception constraints.

In chapter 2, the construction under investigation will be further embedded within the cognitive-functional paradigm. All these approaches share the common assumption that “structure interacts – and is motivated by – semantic-pragmatic and cognitive factors” (Siewierska & Hollemann, 2007:2), but account for the benefactive DOC in different terms. In order to have a thorough understanding of the construction in question, this paper explores an array of different views. Section 2.1 looks into the construction grammar approach, which introduces the benefactive DOC as an argument structure construction systematically related to the more prototypical DOC encoding caused reception. Key resources are Goldberg (1995), and Colleman and De Clerck (2011). In section 2.2, typologies of benefaction focus on the nature of the different kinds of benefactive events people experience in their every day lives, and categorize the types of benefactive constructions which exist accordingly in the languages of the world. Key resources are Van Valin and Lapolla (1997), Kittilä (2005), Song (2007), and Smith (2010). Section 2.3 accounts for research within systemic-functional linguistics (henceforth SFL), which introduces the beneficiary role within a transitivity network central to the experiential organisation of a clause. Key resources are Halliday (2014), Fawcett (1987) and Davidse (1996a,b;1998).

Chapter 3 elaborates further on the nature of the posited intended reception constraint and explores how this particular restriction has been investigated in earlier works. Section 3.1 demonstrates how the constraint is soft and exposed to frequent extension and violation and, consequently, how the semantic range of the benefactive DOC is subject to language-internal variation. Section 3.2 presents the main
findings of Allerton’s (1978) preliminary questionnaire study assessing the acceptability of forty benefactive double object clauses in British English. Section 3.3 introduces Fellbaum’s (2005) re-examination of the constraints on the benefactive DOC by using the world wide web as a corpus. Lastly, section 3.4 addresses the idea of an alternative semantic account proposed by Takami (2003), who investigates the requirements that the construction must satisfy.

To summarize, chapter 4 formulates the literature review’s main assumptions and provides a schematized overview of the terminology that will be used in the analysis.

Then, in part II of this paper, chapter 1 outlines the aim and methodology of the corpus research. That is, on the basis of corpus data gathered from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and from the British National Corpus, this study aims to map and compare the semantic ranges of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English. Additionally, it demonstrates how this research retrieved from a total of nearly 2 million occurrences of a set for 31 test verbs, exactly 6,603 benefactive constructions which remained for closer analysis.

The second chapter focuses on the design of the data and introduces a set of 31 test verbs of which the relevant semantic features are discussed. By framing the verbs within the existing literature, this chapter motivates why each verb is relevant for the present purpose and how it contributes to a better understanding of the semantic range of the benefactive DOC.

Chapter 3 presents the analysis and the results of the data retrieved from the two corpora. For each of the 31 test verbs, the observed ditransitives are turfed and compared to the total number of occurrences. Each double object clause is then further analysed according to the particular type of benefaction it denotes. As such, by testing the distribution of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English, this chapter aims to establish which verbs adhere more strictly to the intended reception constraint and how this differs in the two major national varieties of English.

The results from the analysis are further interpreted and discussed in chapter 4, which aims to account for the observed differences in the attested frequencies between the COCA and BNC database. Additionally, through the semantic map method, as developed by Haspelmath (2003) among others, it tries to map and compare the semantic ranges of the construction under investigation. A major question that will be addressed is whether the intended reception constraint is more strictly adhered to in one variety of English than the other.

Finally, the conclusion in chapter 5 presents an overview of the main findings of this research.
PART I – Literature Review

Chapter 1. The Benefactive Double Object Construction

Many languages have a three-participant argument structure which combines a verb with three obligatory arguments: an agent, a theme and a recipient. A participant constellation as such is called a DITRANSITIVE CONSTRUCTION and is, typologically speaking, considered to be “the most typical three-argument construction” (Malchukov, Haspelmath & Comrie, 2007:2). In most cases, as Malchukov et al. (2007) indicate, ditransitive constructions “contain a verb of physical transfer …, describing a scene in which an agent participant causes an object to pass into the possession of an animate receiver” (2). From a syntactic perspective, then, Malchukov et al. (2007) argue that there are different ways in which ditransitive constructions are encoded across languages; in English, this is most often realized through either indirective or neutral alignment3. Consider the following examples from Malchukov et al. (2007:3-4):

a) Mary gave a pen to John.
b) Mary gave John a pen.

Through indirective alignment with give (a), the recipient is treated differently from the theme and from the monotransitive patient4. Malchukov et al. (2007) label this the “DATIVE CONSTRUCTION” or the “INDIRECT OBJECT CONSTRUCTION” (3), because the indirect object John receives adpositional marking with the preposition to. The neutral pattern with give (b) on the other hand, encodes both object arguments in the same way and is therefore labelled as the “DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION” (Malchukov et al., 2007:4). In what follows, when referring to the construction specified in (b), the terms DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION and DITRANSITIVE CONSTRUCTION will be used interchangeably, a usage found especially in English linguistics (Malchukov et al., 2007). When referring to the construction in (a) on the other hand, the term PREPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTION will be used.

In this paper, the ditransitive construction or DOC thus refers to the argument structure where a verb, a subject and two unmarked NP objects are combined. In semantic terms, the subject, direct object and indirect object argument prototypically encode “the agent, theme and recipient participant

---

2 Other possible three-argument constructions are, for instance, I put the pen in the box, where the prepositional phrase expresses a location; and They called her Vera, where the noun phrase vera functions as a predicative complement (Malchukov et al., 2007:2).
3 There is however, a third variant of ditransitive encoding which is found in certain British English dialects. When both objects are realized by a pronoun, it is possible for the theme to precede the recipient as in “I gave it him” (Gast, 2007:31) or “Give it me!” (Gerwin, 2007:461). This pattern is referred to as the “ALTERNATIVE DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION” by Gast (2007) and Gerwin (2014), among others.
4 See Malchukov et al. (2007) for more info on alignment, i.e. “refers to the comparison of the properties of arguments across constructions” (3). They distinguish three basic alignment types, “in terms of the encoding of T (theme) and R (recipient) compared to monotransitive P (patient)” (Malchukov et al., 2007:3).
in a transfer of possession event, respectively” (Colleman, 2009a:191). However, in many languages it is possible to use the DOC to encode a variety of benefactive scenes in addition to its basic transfer of possession sense (Colleman, 2010). This means that in combination with certain verbs from particular semantic classes, the construction is able to express a situation involving a beneficiary rather than a recipient (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:194). Consider the following examples in Polish, from Colleman (2009b:193-194):

c)  *Dał jej obraz.*
   *He gave her a picture.*

d)  *Magda kupiła Wojtkowi książkę.*
   *Magda bought Wojtek a book.*

e)  *Krystyna otworzyła Oli drzwi.*
   *Krystyna opened Ola the door.*

In all of the examples (c-e), the Polish construction with dative and accusative marking for the indirect and direct object respectively, is used to encode both transfer of possession events and events “in which somebody carries out an action for the benefit of somebody else” (Colleman, 2009b:193). The dative object codes the recipient in (c) with *give*, and the beneficiary in (d-e) with *buy* and *open*. This illustrates that in Polish, it is possible for the DOC to encode events of caused reception (c), as well as benefaction (d-e). The latter, at last, introduces the construction under investigation, which will henceforth be referred to as the **benefactive double object construction**.

Central to the present paper, however, is the use of the benefactive DOC in present-day English and, as the glosses of the Polish examples (c-e) indicate, this use is somewhat more restricted than in Polish. Within the literature, these restrictions are often accounted for in terms of the notion of possession. That is to say, for the English benefactive DOC to be acceptable, the beneficiary has to be involved as the intended recipient of the theme; hence the grammaticality contrast between the English glosses in (c-d) and (e) (Colleman, 2009b). This contrast is signalled by many authors and is often described as the **intended reception constraint**. Consider the following examples, from Colleman (2010:222):

f)  *The man bought the boy an apple.*

   g)  *Shall I fry you some eggs?*

   h)  *My wife knitted me a sweater.*

   i)  *Albert made Erica a picture.*

j)  *John opened Mary the door.*

k)  *Uncle Jim cleaned Margret the windows.*

l)  *Uncle Jim watched Margret a television programme.*

m)  *Sue fixed Bill the radiator.*
All the examples (f-m) denote an event of benefaction where “someone does an action for the sake of another” (Smith, 2010:72). The indirect object referent, then, is the one who benefits from the actions of the subject (Colleman, 2010). This is confirmed by the fact that all the expressions can be paraphrased by the [V + NP + for + NP] pattern, i.e. the prepositional alternant of the benefactive DOC. Consider the possibility of, for instance, “The man bought an apple for the boy” with buy in (f), or “John opened the door for Mary” with open in (j). However, as shown by the grammaticality contrast between (f-i) and (j-m), the nature of the benefaction differs and determines the acceptability of the construction. That is to say, with buy in (f), for example, the action of buying an apple is “aimed at a subsequent transfer of an apple to the boy in question” (Colleman, 2010:222). Similarly, with fry, knit and make in (g-i), the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of some eggs, a sweater and a picture. In examples (j-m), on the other hand, a different kind of benefaction is involved: the agent simply carries out an action instead of the beneficiary. In terms of the intended reception constraint, the verbs open, clean, watch and fix in (j-m) fail to construe the beneficiary as the one who “ultimately receives something by instigation of the agent” (Colleman, 2009b:194), which rules out the use of the double object form in English.

Present-day English thus exhibits a ditransitive construction which can be used to encode benefaction in addition to the more prototypical caused reception. The extent to which the English DOC accommodates different kinds of benefaction, however, seems to be restricted by what is often posited in the literature as the intended reception constraint.
Chapter 2. Different Perspectives

2.1. Benefactive Ditransitives in Construction Grammar

Over the past three decades, a new family of construction-based theories has emerged as an alternative to mainstream generative linguistics. Today, an array of different versions of construction grammar exists. As all these different perspectives have their own take on language data and appropriate methodology, it is not surprising that construction grammar is considered to be a relatively heterogeneous family (Gries, 2013). Shared by all constructionist approaches, however, is the basic assumption that form-meaning pairings, known as CONSTRUCTIONS, are to be taken as the basic units of language (Goldberg, 1995). According to Goldberg’s (2003) definition, “[c]onstructions are stored pairings of form and function, including morphemes, words, idioms, partially lexically filled and fully general abstract linguistic patterns” (219). By including not only lexemes but also the more schematic linguistic patterns, this definition does not distinguish between different kinds of form-meaning correspondences and as such, any kind of linguistic pattern is recognized as a construction (Goldberg, 2003). Goldberg (1995) thus claims that while lexical and syntactic patterns may differ in internal complexity, both “are essentially the same type of declaratively represented data structure: both pair form with meaning” (7).

One of the most influential works within the construction grammar approach is Goldberg’s (1995) study of argument structure constructions as “a special subclass of constructions that provide the basic means of clausal expression in a language” (3). In her seminal work, “systematic differences in meaning between the same verb in different constructions are attributed directly to the particular construction” (Goldberg, 1995:4). Taking the DOC as a key example, Goldberg (1995) further argues that the nature of constructional meaning is polysemous, i.e. that “[c]onstructions are typically associated with a family of closely related senses rather than a single, fixed abstract sense” (31).

Within this particular framework of ditransitive expressions, Goldberg (1995) also introduces the so-called “FOR-DATIVE” (32) expression, which she later labels “BENEFACTIVE DITRANSITIVE” (36). Consider the following example, from Goldberg (1995:32):

\[ a) \quad \text{Chris baked Jan a cake.} \]

While Goldberg (1995) posits that successful transfer of possession is the basic sense of the DOC, the sentence in (a) however, does not “strictly imply that the patient argument is successfully transferred to the potential recipient” (32). In (a) with bake, the act of baking \textit{a cake} for Jan does not guarantee that Jan indeed receives the cake and will be able to enjoy the cake. In contrast with verbs of giving,
the event denoted by bake does not rule out the possibility of Chris being robbed on his way to Jan, or the cake being eaten by Chris’ dog in the process. What is more, in this example with bake it is only implied that Chris baked a cake with the intention of giving the cake to Jan (Goldberg, 1995).

Regarding the benefactive DOC, Goldberg (1995) thus distinguishes an additional subsense associated with the semantic classes of creation an obtainment. That is to say, while DOC clauses with verbs such as give instantiate the construction’s basic sense “Agent successfully causes Recipient to receive Patient”, verbs such as buy, build and bake, on the other hand, instantiate a subsense paraphrasable as “Agent intends to cause Recipient to receive Patient” (Goldberg, 1995:38). In her semantic network model, Goldberg (1995) represents the English DOC not as an unstructured set of constructions, but as a radial network of related subsenses organized around one central sense. As the fifth extension of the DOC, the benefactive construction constitutes a minimally different construction, semantically motivated by the central sense, which posits that for the benefactive ditransitive to be possible, the beneficiary has to be involved as the intended recipient of the theme (Goldberg, 1995).

Within this view of the DOC as a prototypically structured category not fundamentally different from other more concrete linguistic items such as lexemes, a lot of work has gone into the elucidation of its the semantic properties (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011). Often, those construction-based studies have been carried-out at the level of the standard language, abstracting away from the variation and change inherent to real language usage. Also Goldberg’s (1995) seminal analysis of the English DOC for example, does not take into account the different kinds of language-internal variation present in even the most abstract patterns of language⁷. As Colleman and De Clerck (2011) point out, “it is only in recent years that intralingual variation and change in the formal and semantic make-up of constructions has come to the force as constituting a crucial and fruitful area of investigation in its own right” (184).

Relevant for a better understanding of the English benefactive DOC is the work of Colleman and De Clerck (2011), in which the issue of diachronic variation in argument structure semantics is addressed. Starting from the premise that “schematic argument structure constructions are meaningful linguistic entities in their own right just like lexical items are, one can also expect that, on careful examination, constructional meanings will be subject to a certain degree of diachronic variation as well” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:185). On the basis of data from the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts, they explore the semantic evolution of the DOC by comparing its semantic range in 18th century English to the construction’s present-day semantics. As such, they are able to distinguish

---

⁷ Goldberg’s (1995) model, nevertheless, as Colleman and De Clerck (2011) further argue, “seems to be best equipped for handling diachronic data” (205). That is to say, “[i]n a polysemous account of constructional semantics which distinguishes between central and less-central uses, it is possible to argue that the further a particular use is removed from a construction’s core meaning, the more vulnerable it is to processes of semantic change” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:204).
a number of subtle diachronic shifts in the lexical and semantic possibilities of the construction. Colleman and De Clerck (2011) consider this “an exercise in diachronic constructional semasiology” (185) and therefore, analogous with variation in lexical items, propose that the DOC has undergone “a process of semantic specialization” (185). In other words, similar to previous claims, Colleman and De Clerck (2011) argue that “the array of verbs compatible with the English DOC has been more and more reduced to verbs of giving and closely related classes” (188). Consider the following examples from Colleman and De Clerck (2011:195-197):

b) ...so snatching out his pocket-book, and the young Benedictine holding him the torch as he wrote, he set it down as a new prop to his system of Christian names. (Sterne, 1767)

c) A new fragment of Dion shows shrewdness in the character of Julian. When the senate voted him a golden statue, he preferred one of brass, as more lasting. (Gibbon, 1776)

d) He would expect his wife to hand him the coach, to open him the door, to reach him a chair. (The Sporting Magazine, 1819)

e) Let a French woman nurse me when I am ill, let an English woman clean my house, and an Englishman write me my poetry! (Jean Ingelow, 1882)

f) ...but a mischievous mob of soldiers...attacked us in the street...and spoiled me a complete set of blond lace triple ruffles, not a pin the worse for the ware. (Smollett, 1751)

g) Then shall I false her my promise (Lord Berners, 1540)

The 18th-century examples (b-c) accommodate events that are not possible in the present-day DOC. At one time, the DOC could be used to encode an event where an agent simply carries out an act instead of someone else, as in (b). Today, this is no longer the case; the DOC is considered to be restricted to acts of obtainment and creation (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011). To be more specific, there is no intended reception involved with hold (b), where the benefaction simply consists in Benedictine holding the torch instead of the beneficiary, so that he does not have to hold it himself and is able to write something down instead. Also with vote (c), it is difficult to construe the beneficiary as the intended recipient of the theme. That is to say, Julian will not end up receiving a golden statue; “rather, he is the intended honouree of the yet-to-be-erected statue” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:196).

Similar observations can be made from the 19th-century examples (d-e), where the DOC denotes an event where there is no subsequent transfer of possession involved (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011). With open in (d), the benefaction consists in his wife opening the door instead of the beneficiary, so that he does not have to open it himself. Similarly with clean and write in (e), the beneficiary does not end up receiving my house and my poetry; rather, the cleaning and the writing events are carried out instead of the beneficiary.

Examples (f-g), on the other hand, illustrate that in earlier phases, the DOC could also be used to denote events of malefaction. This too, supports the semantic specialization hypothesis which
proposes that the DOC used to be less restricted and more flexible, i.e. covering a wider semantic range (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011). Thus, Colleman and De Clerck (2011) indicate that in the DOC in Late Modern English it was possible for the indirect object referent to denote both a person who is advantageously or disadvantageously affected by the events. With *spoil* in (f), for instance, the actions of the agent have undesirable consequences for the indirect object referent, i.e. because of the attack, *her blond lace triple ruffles* are ruined. Similarly, with *false* in (g), the indirect object referent is disadvantageously affected when being lied to.

The above mentioned examples show that the DOC in 18th and 19th-century English allows what are now considered to be obsolete or marginalized uses (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011). This means that what is now encoded as a prepositional, could be encoded as a zero-marked object in the DOC in earlier phases of the language. Similarly, the fact that malefactive uses were much more common, “illustrate[s] the wider range of possibilities in Late Modern English” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:197). In terms of the semantic specialization hypothesis, such attestations serve as evidence that the benefactive DOC has lost a number of semantic possibilities and is “associated with a narrower range of meaning” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:201). Colleman and De Clerck (2011) therefore conclude that “the ‘intended reception’ constraint on the use of the benefactive DOC is a fairly recent phenomenon” (196).

2.2. Typologies of Benefactive Expressions

Typological accounts of the expression of benefaction/malefaction aim at discussing those notions from a perspective which allows “comparison of different instances of benefaction …both in individual languages and cross-linguistically” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010:2). Such research acknowledges that there are different types of benefaction that need to be distinguished, since, in the words of Kittilä and Zúñiga (2010), “beneficiaries can benefit from events in different ways, which has consequences for their linguistic encoding” (14). As such, “different authors have suggested different typologies of benefactive expressions, based on semantic and morphosyntactic considerations” (Jenny, 2010: 378).

Van Valin and Lapolla’s (1997) classification is based on three different types of benefactive events of which only the first two, “PLAIN BENEFACTIVE” and “DEPUTATIVE BENEFACTIVE” (383), are labelled as beneficiary. In the first case, the benefaction consists in enjoying or amusing the the beneficiary, while in the second case, “someone is substituting for the beneficiary as the agent of the denoted event” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010:14). The third type, which Van Valin and Lapolla (1997) label “BENEFACTIVE-RECIPIENT” (383), is used to describe a situation where “the beneficiary is also a

---

8 According to Colleman and De Clerck (2011) this observed semantic specialization, i.e. the fact that the DOC now covers a narrower semantic region in functional-semantic space, can be considered “a long-term effect of deflection” (202).

9 Henceforth, the label benefaction will comprise both events of benefaction and events of malefaction. As such, benefaction and malefaction are interpreted as two more specific instantiations of the broader beneficiary category.
recipient” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010:14). Consider the following examples from Kittilä and Zúñiga (2010:14):

   a) The mother is *singing* for the children.

   b) John *painted* the house for me.

   c) The father *baked* his daughter a cake.

With *sing* in (a), the benefaction consists in entertaining the children and is to be interpreted as an event of plain benefaction. As beneficiary, the children benefit from the singing of the mother. With *paint* in (b), on the other hand, the benefaction consists in not having to carry out the denoted event and is to be interpreted as an event of deputative benefaction. In other words, John substitutes for the beneficiary as the agent of the painting event. This can be paraphrased as “John *painted the house instead of me*” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010). With *bake* in (c), the beneficiary is involved as the recipient of the theme and, therefore, construed as the benefactive-recipient of the denoted event. That is to say, the father is baking a cake with the intention of giving it to his daughter, and since receiving that cake is deemed beneficial, the daughter is both the recipient and the beneficiary of that item (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010).

Along similar lines, Kittilä’s (2005) “feature-based model” (Jenny, 2010: 378) distinguishes between the roles of RECIPIENT, BENEFICIARY and “RECIPIENT BENEFICIARY” (260) on the basis of the notions of RECEPTION and BENEFACTION. According to Kittilä’s (2005) definition, reception “refers to the fact that as a result of an event a (concrete) entity enters a recipient’s sphere of control or domain of possession” (273). Benefaction, on the other hand, is further subcategorized as “SUBSTITUTIVE BENEFACTION” and “CONCRETE BENEFACTION” (273), of which Kittilä (2005) considers only the former to be a relevant feature in the division of the roles. Kittilä (2005) defines substitutive benefaction as an event “in which benefaction consists in not having to carry out the profiled event oneself” (273). In other words, the action is carried out instead of the beneficiary. The notion of concrete benefaction refers to a situation in which benefaction consists in being able to use the result of an event for particular purposes, “but in contrast to reception, without receiving anything concrete” (273). Consider the following examples, from Kittilä (2005: 273):

   d) The teacher *parked* the car for me.

   e) The professor *built* a house for me.

---

10 In a terminological note, Kittilä (2005) distinguishes between the notions of semantic role and argument. While the label semantic role is used in a non-linguistic sense, the term argument is purely syntactic and refers to the formal manifestation of semantic roles. In other words, “roles are encoded, while arguments are marked” (272).
In an event of substitutive benefaction, the action is carried out instead of the beneficiary as in (d). In an event of concrete benefaction as in (e), the beneficiary is able to gain direct benefit from the action (Kittilä, 2005). In other words, with park (d), the beneficiary benefits from the action performed by the agent, since he/she is expected to carry out the act him/herself otherwise. More specifically, *the teacher* substitutes for the indirect object referent in the event of parking a car, which relieves the beneficiary of having to park *the car* him/herself. With build (e), the beneficiary was not expected to build *a house* him/herself, but through the action of the agent he/she is able to use the house for occasional accommodation (Kittilä, 2005).

In his study, Kittilä (2005) focuses on the encoding of the dual role of the recipient-beneficiary from a cross-linguistic perspective and examines how different languages encode this role. He argues that, since reception and substitutive benefaction are the characteristic features of the recipient role and the beneficiary role respectively, the dual role of the recipient beneficiary represents a combination of both, which has consequences for its formal manifestation. As such, Kittilä (2005) categorizes languages based on whether they encode the recipient beneficiary as recipient, i.e. when the notion of reception determines the encoding, or as beneficiary, i.e. when the notion of substitutive benefaction determines the encoding. In Kittilä’s (2005) terms, languages are therefore either “RECIPIENT-PROMINENT”, “BENEFICIARY-PROMINENT” or “NEUTRAL” (277).

English, however, belongs to none of the above mentioned types. With a formally distinct encoding for each of the three semantic roles ([Rec] ≠ [RB] ≠ [Ben]), English can be classified as a “TRIPARTITE” language; a type which “seems to be rather rare crosslinguistically” (Kittilä, 2005:278). Consider the following examples for the recipient, the recipient-beneficiary and the pure beneficiary, respectively, from Kittilä (2005: 278):

- f) *She gave the book to me.*
- g) *She gave me the book.*
- h) *She baked a cake for me.*
- i) *She baked me a cake.*
- j) *She went to the market for me.*
- k) *She went me to the market.*

The examples with *give* illustrate how the recipient role in English can be encoded either with the preposition *to* (f), in what Kittilä (2005) labels as the “antidative” (279, cited from Dryer), or without a preposition in the DOC (g). As such, the English language provides two forms for the recipient argument. This is the same for the recipient beneficiary, as illustrated in *bake* (h-i), but instead of the preposition *to*, the preposition *for* is used. However, since both allow the dative shift, the marking of the recipient is only “(optionally) different” (Kittilä, 2005:279) from the marking of the recipient beneficiary. True beneficiaries, on the other hand, only have one form; that is, marked with
preposition *for*. This means, as Kittilä (2005) further argues, that in English, the marking of the recipient beneficiary “is a genuine combination of [r]ecipient and [b]eneficiary properties” (279). As such, “English … nicely illustrates the dual nature of the [recipient beneficiary] formally” (Kittilä, 2005:279).

Song (2010) makes a similar distinction in his classification of Korean benefactives, but speaks of “ENGAGER-BENEFICIARIES” instead of recipient-beneficiaries because a participant “does not need to be a genuine recipient for being encoded as a recipient-benefactive” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010:14). According to Song’s (2010) definition, it suffices that the participant engages with the theme. Consider the following examples in Korean, from Kittilä and Zúñiga (2010:11):

\begin{align*}
1) & & \text{Kihoka Yenghieykey}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ mwunul}_{\text{ACC}} \text{ yelecwuessta}. & & \text{Keeho opened the door for Yonghee.} \\
2) & & \text{*Kihoka Yenghieykey}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ mwunul}_{\text{ACC}} \text{ tatacwuessta}. & & \text{Keeho closed the door for Yonghee.}
\end{align*}

The examples (*l*-m) show that in the Korean construction with dative and accusative marking for the indirect and direct object respectively, there is a difference in acceptability between the verb yelecwuessta in (*l*), i.e. *open*, and tatacwuessta in (*m*), i.e. *close*. This difference is attributed to the fact that in the latter, one cannot engage with the theme. As for the beneficiary in (*l*), he/she can be interpreted as being able to engage with the theme and use the opened door, for instance, to enter a Keeho’s house. In the second case (*m*), the beneficiary cannot engage with the theme, since “a closed door cannot be engaged with in any customarily/culturally relevant fashion” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010:11-12). The unacceptability of *close* in (*m*) is thus based on a pragmatic restriction Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010).

There are other typological studies which take on a different focus. Smith’s (2010) study, for example, classifies languages not on the basis of the nature of benefaction, but instead, focuses on the features of the beneficiary and the agent. As such, Smith (2010) identifies two major basic types of benefactive constructions. According to Smith (2010), the “AGENTIVE BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION … expresses that the agent intentionally varies out an act for the sake of the affectee”, while the “EVENT BENEFACTIVE CONSTRUCTION … expresses that the affecting event may or may or may not have an agent” (71). These two major types are then further subcategorized, but for present purposes, this paper only discusses one: “UNRESTRICTED AGENTIVE BENEFACTIVES” (Smith, 2010:71). An example of this type is English, since the benefactive construction allows the beneficiary to be anybody, including the agent him/herself (Smith, 2010). Consider the following examples from Smith (2005:77-78):

\begin{align*}
1) & & \text{Do it for your family.}
\end{align*}
He works for himself.

Mark wrote Linda a letter.

Mark wrote himself a letter.

In the examples (n-q) it is clear that there are no restrictions on the beneficiary, i.e. “the beneficiary can be any animate entity” (Smith, 2010: 76). Both the prepositional construction and the DOC can denote a situation where the beneficiary and the agent are referring to the same person, and one where they are not. In other words, the constructions do not formally distinguish between “self-benefactives”\(^{11}\) and “non-self-benefactives” (Smith, 2010:78). In (n-o) for instance, the beneficiary is marked with the preposition for, both in the non-self benefactive and in the self-benefactive construction. Similarly, in (p-q) with the DOC, it is not relevant whether it is the agent him/herself or someone else who is benefitting from the events.

2.3. The Beneficiary Problem in SFL

The systemic-functional tradition approaches transitivity from the perspective of the experiental organization of a clause, “affecting not only the verbs serving as process but also the participants and the circumstances” (Halliday, 2014:227). In some of those process and participant constellations, the beneficiary is introduced as rather general and additional participant “to whom or for whom the process is said to take place” (Halliday, 2014:345).

This view is developed by Halliday (2014), who argues that the “two functions of [r]ecipient and [c]lient resemble one another in that both construe a benefactive role” (237). According to Halliday (2014), both notions “represent a participant that is benefitting from the performance of [a material] process, in terms of either goods or services” (237). To be more specific, “the [r]ecipient is the one that goods are given to; the [c]lient is the one that services are done for” (2014, 1967:237). Halliday’s (2014) conceptualisation, attributes to beneficiaries features of both participants and circumstances. When they enter the clause as nominal, they function as participants; when they enter the clause as prepositional phrase, they function as circumstance. Halliday (2014) further acknowledges that while both roles may occur with or without preposition, but that “clients tend to be more restricted than recipients” (237).

Fawcett (1987) offers a re-interpretation of the beneficiary role described by Halliday (2014) and argues that clauses which add a recipient are to be interpreted as relational processes instead of material processes. In contrast to the similarity which Halliday (2014) assigned to recipients and clients, Fawcett (1987) proposes that, in transitivity terms, those two notions are not closely related.

\(^{11}\) It should be mentioned that the self-benefactive constructions in English, i.e. where agent and beneficiary are identical, are always syntactically reflexive. (Smith, 2010:78). If not, the argument is no longer considered to be a true participant, but rather functions as a personal dative (see Part II, chapter I: ex. a-f; and for more information see Conroy, 2007; Horn, 2008; Webelhuth & Dannenberg, 2006)
i.e. they “do not simply expound two sub-categories of [beneficiary, marked by to and for in the related prepositions” (147). On the contrary, it is argued that a client is always circumstance, even when it occurs as primary object in the DOC or as subject in a passive. A recipient, then, is always a participant, however not the beneficiary in a material process but the “affected-carrier” (Fawcett, 1987:143) in a relational process. Consider the following example from Fawcett (1987:146):

a) I’ve given Oliver a tie.

Fawcett (1987) interprets (a) as a possessive relational process with a “third party causative” (143), instead of a two-role process. He argues that there is a compound role of affected-carrier, functioning as the entity affected by the actions of the agent, and simultaneously, as the carrier of the attribute (Fawcett, 1987). In (a), Oliver is therefore affected in relation to the agent and carrier in relation to a tie. By analysing ditransitives as caused attributive possession, Fawcett distinguishes recipients from clients and, simultaneously, moves away from the idea of a general beneficiary as optional participant role.

The reason then, that the double object pattern with a circumstantial beneficiary occurs, is to invoke the semantics of give-clauses through similarity of form (Fawcett, 1987). On the basis of the possibility to be further integrated into the clause, Fawcett (1987) distinguishes three types of circumstantial beneficiary roles. Consider the following examples from Fawcett (1987:146-150):

b) I’ve made Frederick a jacket.

c) Fred bought a present for his wife.

d) I’m doing this for Mary.

e) Play Mary a tune.

f) Kill me that guy.

g) Ivy’s arms were full, so Phoepe opened the door for her.

h) Could you open the door for Ivy for me?

The first type Fawcett (1987) distinguishes is the beneficiary paraphrasable as “for X to have” (147) such as with the verb make (b), which can be re-expressed as “I’ve made a jacket for Frederick to have”, and with buy (c), which can be re-expressed as “Fred bought a present for his wife to have”. Moreover, the indirect object referent in this type is interpreted as “one that is intended to have something” (Fawcett, 1987:148). Therefore, corresponding to Halliday’s (1967) terminology, this circumstantial role receives the label “CLIENT” (147). The occurrence of this type without preposition is frequently used to invoke the semantics of a giving situation. In example (b), for instance, making someone a jacket almost becomes giving someone a jacket.

Fawcett’s (1987) second type, illustrated in (d-e), is paraphrasable as “to please X” or “for X’s good” (148). The verb do (d), for instance, can be re-expressed as “I’m doing this to please Mary” or “I’m
*doing this for Mary’s good* when Mary is unaware of the actions of the agent. Also with the verb *play* (e), the beneficiary is the one who is pleased by the act of playing *a tune*, which can be re-expressed as “*I’m playing a tune to please Mary*”. In what Fawcett (1987) labels “PLEASEE” (148), the indirect object referent is interpreted as “one who is to be pleased” (148). Regarding the possibility of the double object form, it is only with a handful verbs that this type is further integrated into the DOC, i.e. material processes with a range (Fawcett, 1987). However, since it is possible for verbs without a range, e.g. *kill* (f), to enter the DOC, Fawcett (1987) argues that these extensions can be regarded as “part of a wider pattern making possible the integration as pseudo-(or semi-?) participant roles of both clients and pleases” (149).

The third and last type is the “REPLACEMENT” (Fawcett, 1987:148) beneficiary paraphrasable as “in place of X”, as in *for her* with the verb *open* (g). In this example, the act of opening *the door* is not simply carried out to please Ivy; rather, because Ivy couldn’t open the door herself. This can be re-expressed as “*Ivy’s arms were full, so Phoebe opened the door in place of her*”. The fact that this particular type of beneficiary cannot be equated with the pleasee, is further illustrated in (h), where *for Ivy* is the pleasee, and *for me* is the replacement. In this context, the speaker is the one who wants to open *the door* to please Ivy, for instance, because he’s a gentleman and wants to woe her, however, due to certain circumstances the speaker is unable to do so, and therefore, asks someone else to open *the door* in his place.

While Fawcett’s (1987) ditransitive analysis excludes beneficiaries and focuses on the role of affected-carrier in caused attributive possession, Davidse’s (1996a) analysis, in contrast, includes beneficiaries and “hinges crucially on the relation between [d]ative and [p]atient being identifying, and, therefore, reversible” (95). Additionally, in the context of the dative12 alternation, Davidse (1996a) argues for a metafunctional description, as advocated by the systemic-functional approach. That is, not only in terms of the process-participant constellation, i.e. the EXPERIENTAL metafunction, but also with respect to the broader discourse context and information flow, i.e. the TEXTUAL metafunction and, additionally, with attention for the organization of the clause as a speech event between interactants, i.e. the INTERPERSONAL metafunction.

Regarding the experiental metafunction, Davidse (1996a) proposes a new interpretation of ditransitivity understood as involving the two dimensions of causation and possession, which she labels “EVENT TRANSITIVITY” and “RELATIONAL TRANSITIVITY” (92), respectively. Ditransitives code, in other words, “causation by an [a]gent of a possessive implication between [d]ative and [p]atient” (Davidse, 1998:148). While the semantics of caused having have been brought to attention quite regularly in other works, as Davidse (1996a) indicates, “a step which has not generally been

---

12 In Davidse’s (1996a,b; 1998) description, the term dative does not refer to a morphological category or case marking, but is used to refer to the third participant who is, next to the agent and the patient, involved in a ditransitive process.
taken is to correlate this to a grammatical analysis in terms of grammar of possession” (95). Therefore, somewhat different than Fawcett (1987), the dative alternation is perceived by Davidse (1996a) as a “specific submode of identifying relational construals” (86).

As such, Davidse (1996a) reformulates the traditional two-way contrast of the dative alternation, i.e. between the double object form, i.e. neutral alignment, and the prepositional dative, i.e. indirective alignment. Based upon Halliday’s distinction between “DIRECTION OF IDENTIFICATION” and “DIRECTION OF REPRESENTATION”, she develops an eight-cell paradigm for the construal of “identifying possession” (Davidse, 1996a:108). Then, along similar lines for ditransitives, it is possible to subcategorise the relationship between dative and patient in terms of “DIRECTION OF IDENTIFICATION” and “DIRECTION OF POSSESSION” (Davidse, 1996a:140). Consider for instance the following ditransitives from Davidse (1996a:109-113):

\[
\begin{align*}
i) & \quad \text{Does that give you rights?} \\
j) & \quad \text{You can’t give cheques to people.} \\
k) & \quad \text{It gave Sir Gerald rights.} \\
l) & \quad \text{I had to give the post to Joaquin.} \\
m) & \quad \text{You can’t explain algebra to a dog.} \\
n) & \quad \text{Whosoever attributes to God the power of begetting himself.} \\
o) & \quad \text{Don’t mention Dentophil to him.} \\
p) & \quad \text{He could have explained to him all about the potion.}
\end{align*}
\]

The perspective on possession differs in (i-l) and (m-p) with respect to directionality. Davidse (1996a) proposes that in (i-l) the dative is construed as the implicans (Is) which implicates the patient, i.e. the implicatum (Im). Put differently, the dative (Is) is the whole, to which the patient (Im) is related as part. This directionality is inverted in (m-p), where the patient is the implicans defining the environment “by which [the dative] can be implicated” (Davidse, 1996a:111). From this perspective, the patient (Is) is construed as the entity to which the dative (Im) can be located. The invertibility of the implicative dimension is responsible for the break between paradigm I (Par I) and paradigm II (Par II) or, put differently, between a “MERONOMIC” and “TRANSFER” (Davidse, 1996a:140) subparadigma of caused possession.

In addition to the possibility of inverting the directionality of possession (dative as Is in Par I vs. patient as Is in Par II), there is a “constant-variable dimension to possession” (Davidse, 1996a:114). This can be disambiguated by “fixing the direction of identification in either possible direction” (Davidse, 1996a:107). As such, the identifying dimension further subdivides the two subparadigma depending on which participant is the variable, i.e. the identifier (Ir), and which the constant, i.e. the identified (Id). This results in a shift from a “DONATORY” to a “DESTINATORY” perspective, where in the former the concern is with “what is given”, and in the latter with “the participant it is given to”
(Davidse, 1996a:128). To be more specific, the perspective is donatory when the patient is Ir (i-j,o-p) and destinatory when the dative is Ir (k-l,m-n).

As such, analogous to the paradigm for possessive identifying clauses, Davidse (1996a) develops an eight-way paradigmatic contrast in which “the relation between [d]ative and [p]atient can be subcategorized in terms of two independently variable functional configurations of identifying possession” (140). What is more, when these abstract formal contrasts are interpreted functionally, they can “form a heuristic to the semantics of the construction” (Davidse, 1998:147). For instance, the contrast between direction of possession in Par I and Par II, correlates with a difference in the grammatical status of the dative and, consequently, with a difference in degree of affectedness (Davidse, 1996a). That is, while the dative is “obligatory prepositional” (Davidse, 1996a:120) in Par II, this is not the case in Par I. What is more, in Par I, the prepositional realizations of the dative are the marked alternants of the nominal dative and, consequently, interpreted as “voice reversal” (Davidse, 1996a:131) and therefore not defining for the experiential organization of the clause. As such, Davidse (1996a) argues that “with these abstract grammatical contrasts correlate general semantic differences” (133); that is, while the agent acts primarily on the patient in Par II, the dative is clearly the primary affectee in Par I.

As for the benefactive DOC, Davidse (1996a,b) proposes that its occurrence in Par II would be rather exceptional. This is motivated by the higher degree of affectedness between agent and dative in Par I, but also by the fact that Par I “may convey the [d]ative’s vested interest in his getting the [p]atient” (Davidse, 1996a:136). This is even more so for the pleasee subtype, where the dative has a “symbolic interest in the carrying out of the actions denoted by the whole clause” (Davidse, 1996a:137), which restricts the construction to Par I exclusively. Par I is therefore also labelled the “BENEFITTER” (Davidse, 1996b:326) model, indicating that “the ditransitive action is primarily one of benefitting someone by anchoring some possession … to them” (Davidse, 1998:149).

While the “semantic contrast between agent and affected is concerned with the causal chain represented by the clause” (165), i.e. the experiential dimension, there is an additional semantic contrast between subject and object which is concerned with the “the actual communicative exchange” (Davisde, 1998:165), i.e. the interpersonal dimension. In a “form-functional approach” (145) to both levels of organization, Davidse (1998) argues that the functional meaning of the subject-object layer “is that of anchoring the utterance to the … the ground” (151). That is, similar to a nominal group, the clause can be regarded as being ground into the speech event.

Davidse (1998) further develops her claim based on Lancgacker’s “type-instantiation motif” and Halliday’s interpretation of the clause being constituted by two main parts, i.e. the finite part or the “mood element” and the non-finite part or the “residue” (151). As such, she proposes that while the residue is responsible for the “TYPE SPECIFICATION”, the mood element is responsible for the
“INSTANTIATION” (161). To be more specific, this means that the general type specification of the process is realized by the predicator or, in other words, that the non-finite verbal element designates the type of process expressed in the clause. Additionally, objects can further “elaborate [this] into a more delicate type specification” (Davidse, 1998:158). However, without the mood element, these process types “cover classes, rather than instances, of situation” (Davidse, 1998:159). The finite clause is therefore responsible for the instantiation of the type designated by the non-finite clause (Davidse, 1998). Thus, in terms of tense and modality, the finite verbal element is able to ground the clause into the speech situation, i.e. give “the proposition a point of reference in the here-and-now of the speech event” (Davidse, 1998:156). Additionally, this instantiation depends crucially on “being tied to the grammatical person explicated by the subject” (Davidse, 1998:161). From the perspective of the entire clause, the subject has an “instantiating function”, and the objects have a “type-specifying function” (Davidse, 1998:161).

In the DOC, however, indirect objects are characterized as “a-typical objects with the referential and collocational tendencies of subjects” (Davidse, 1998:173). This is even more so when the indirect object has the role of a beneficiary, since they are optional participants rather than semantically entailed (Davidse, 1998). Consequently, such indirect objects cannot be prominent in the type specification of the clause. On the other hand, they are often realized by a person pronoun and, additionally, “typically associated with offers and commands” (Davidse, 1998:177). On the basis of this particular analogy with the instantiating function of the mood element, such indirect objects are considered to be “referentially very close to the ground” (Davidse, 1998:177). Especially in the case of the pleasee, which functions almost “purely interpersonally”, the indirect object “interacts most closely with the subject in the grounding of the utterance and the expression of its speech function” (Davidse, 1998:177). Mapping this onto the experiental dimension, then, the dative is often construed as “the implied agent of the command” (Davidse, 1996b:327). With the pleasee in such cases, “the benefiter model is expressive of the vested interest of the [d]ative” (Davidse, 1996b:327).
Chapter 3. The Intended Reception Constraint

3.1. Benefaction and Caused Reception

Traditionally, it is assumed that the beneficiary has to be involved as the intended recipient of the theme for the benefactive DOC in English to be acceptable (Colleman, 2009b). The possibilities of the English DOC are in other words, restricted by the intended reception constraint.

Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that these restrictions are not always clear-cut and that it is possible that they are more strictly adhered to by some speakers than others (Colleman, 2010). As such, in some varieties of English, the semantic range of the benefactive DOC is broader than in other varieties. Consider the following examples, from Colleman (2010:225):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a)] Can you \textit{iron} me a shirt?
  \item[b)] Ok, can you \textit{weed} me that garden over there in two hours? If you can, you’re hired.
\end{itemize}

The intended reception constraint in extended with the verb \textit{iron} (a), where there is no straightforward transfer of possession, because the indirect object referent is already in possession of the theme. That is to say, a \textit{shirt} already belongs to the beneficiary before the ironing event takes place. On the other hand, it is possible to interpret the event as one where “something previously unavailable to the beneficiary would be made available … as a result of the desired act” (Colleman, 2010:225). The fact that the beneficiary will end up with ironed shirts instead of the otherwise creased shirts, satisfies the intended reception constraint for some speakers, but not for others (Colleman, 2010). The posited constraint in other words, “comes with a certain amount of inherent fuzziness, i.e. whether a given event can be construed as involving intended causation of reception is a matter of degree rather than kind” (Colleman, 2010:224).

The intended reception constraint is violated with the verb \textit{weed} (b), where there is no transfer of possession, “not even under a broad interpretation of that notion” (Colleman, 2010:225). To be more specific, the indirect object referent does not end up receiving \textit{that garden over there}, not even under the interpretation that the garden is now free of weed. The event denoted by the verb \textit{weed} is of a more demonstrative meaning, i.e. someone weeds the garden to demonstrate his/her weeding skills to someone else. The possibility of the DOC, in other words, does not always depend on the notion of possession; and in this case, it suffices that the action of the agent is carried out for the enjoyment of the beneficiary. Although these uses are marginal, they still show that the intended reception constraint is adhered to more strictly by some speakers than others; and that not only events of recipient-benefaction are accommodated by the DOC in English. (Colleman, 2010).
From the examples above it becomes clear that the semantic range of the benefactive DOC is subject to language-internal variation. First of all, whether the beneficiary can be interpreted as the intended recipient is a matter of degree rather than kind (Allerton, 1978; Fellbaum, 2005), as illustrated in example (a). Additionally, in certain varieties of English it is possible to use the DOC to encode other kinds of benefactive events where there is no possession involved (Takami, 2003), as illustrated in example (b).

3.2. Allerton’s (1978) Preliminary Questionnaire Study

In his preliminary questionnaire study, Allerton (1978) starts off with a theoretical remark, declaring that “the more data we examine, the more complex the whole question becomes” (21) and by this, he presents the benefactive DOC as a key example of this kind of problem. Allerton (1978) further indicates that the difficulty with the benefactive DOC, which he calls “FOR INDIRECT OBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS”, lies in the fact that constructions as such “exhibit no clear boundary between acceptable and unacceptable but a whole range of degrees from fully unacceptable to fully acceptable” (23). Moreover, he predicts that it is not the lexical verb alone that determines the potential for a prepositionless construction, but that “the degree depends on a number of interacting factors” (Allerton, 1978:23).

To test this hypothesis, Allerton (1978) designed an acceptability test in which he asked a group of fifty British university students to judge a series of forty indirect object sentences of the pattern Could you V me NP? as either ‘acceptable’, ‘marginal’ or ‘impossible’, given that it corresponded in meaning to a prepositional construction with for. From his findings, he attempted “to describe the range of meanings possible for for-phrases” (26) and discriminated between four possible patterns. Consider the following examples for Pattern F.I, F.II, F.III and F.IV respectively, from Allerton (1978:27-30):

\[ a) \quad \text{Uncle Jim } \text{bought Margret some chocolates.} \]
\[ b) \quad \text{Uncle Jim } \text{knitted Margret some sock.} \]
\[ c) \quad \text{Uncle Jim } \text{cleaned Margret some shoes.} \]
\[ d) \quad \text{Uncle Jim opened Margret a door.} \]

The semantic range of the first possible pattern is broadly comparable with that of verbs taking to indirect objects, but instead of an “IMMEDIATE [or] DIRECT RECIPIENT” as indirect object, verbs such as buy (a) accommodate an indirect object which represents the “ULTIMATE [or] INDIRECT RECIPIENT” (Allerton, 1978:26). As such, Allerton (1978) describes the meaning of Pattern F.I as an “act of
(indirect) giving or plan/duty to give” (26). Thus, in (a) uncle Jim performs an act of indirect giving by buying some chocolates for Margret, who is the ultimate or indirect recipient of the chocolates.

For the second pattern, verbs referring to a “variety of productive processes” (Allerton, 1978:27) are grouped together, for instance with the verb knit (b), which denotes an “act of making” (27). According to Allerton (1978), the for indirect object refers to the “EVENTUAL RECIPIENT [or] INTENDED FIRST OWNER” of the direct object entity “once it is made” (27). In (b) this means that uncle Jim performs an act of making by knitting some socks for Margret, who is the eventual recipient or the intended first owner of the socks, once they are made.

Regarding the third pattern, Allerton (1978) indicates that in “various kinds of reparative processes” (28) such as clean (c), the indirect object is presented as the “OWNER” (28) of the direct object entity. Through an “act of repairing/improving” (Allerton, 1978:28), the indirect object gets back his/her property, which makes him/her also a recipient, however, not in the traditional sense of the word. Thus, in (c) uncle Jim performs an act of improving by cleaning some shoes for Margret, who, as the owner of the shoes, gets her property back in a better condition.

For the fourth and final pattern, Allerton (1978) argues that with verbs describing “any act” (30), such as open (d), the indirect object cannot be interpreted as the owner or owner-to-be of the direct object entity, but merely as the one who benefits from the activity carried out by the agent “in the sense that he is relieved of the need to undertake that activity himself” (Allerton, 1987: 29). As such, uncle Jim in (d) performs a simple act by opening a door for Margret, the “DEPUTOR who benefits by not having to undertake the act [her]self” (30).

Allerton (1978) argues that the mixed acceptability judgements in the examples above illustrate that “an act of giving is crucial” (31). According to this study, verbs belonging to Pattern F.I such as buy, save and order, permit the prepositionless construction since the indirectness of the giving is part of the semantic frame of the verb itself. Also for Pattern F.II with verbs such as knit, cook and paint, the prepositionless construction is judged highly acceptable, because “the giving is presupposed as the reason why the act of making is undertaken” (Allerton, 1978:27). The possibility of a prepositionless construction with verbs such as clean, wash and sharpen as in Pattern F.III, depends on whether there is an indirect giving implied (Allerton, 1978). This can only be the case when the noun phrase of the direct object entity is indefinite, because “when a given … [entity] is referred to, no giving can be involved” (Allerton, 1978:29). However, when there is no act of giving involved, as is the case with verbs such as open, teach and answer in Pattern F.IV, a prepositionless construction is unlikely.

From the results of his questionnaire, Allerton (1978) concludes that the acceptability of the prepositionless pattern is a multifaceted phenomenon, depending on the “total semantic configuration”
and that “there is something like a scale or cline of ‘indirect-objectness’ which gains in strength the more a clear act of giving is seen to be involved” (30).

3.3. Fellbaum’s (2005) Re-examination Using the WWW as a Corpus

Fellbaum (2005) re-examines the semantic constraints on the benefactive DOC posited in the literature and argues “for the need to substitute or augment constructed data with web data to avoid theoretical biases and capture the full range of rule-governed linguistic behaviour” (209).

By looking into naturally occurring language data, Fellbaum (2005) questions to what extent it is required for the theme in the DOC to be transferred into the possession of the beneficiary. Contrary to what is assumed by the proposed intended reception constraint, Fellbaum’s (2005) results indicate that “the benefits in different verb classes conform to the notion of possession to varying degrees” (222). Consider the following examples from Fellbaum (2005:221-223):

a) Hurry, get me my red shirt.
b) And try to find me some aspirin while you’re at it.

c) In 1818-1819, Benjamin Henry Latrobe built the couple a house, which came to be known as Decatur House, next to Lafayette.
d) She read the recipes and cooked her husband some Spam.

e) Henn Parn with his dancing partner performed us the professional ballroom dances.
f) Morgane donned wooden clogs and danced us a dance.

g) Honey, can you iron me a shirt?
h) You’re a good boy Joe. Now het busy and wash me some dishes.

i) God said to Abraham: Kill me a son.

j) Baby open me your door.

The notion of possession is very straightforward with get and find in (a-b), since both verbs belong to the semantic class of obtainment and therefore inherently denote a change of possession (Fellbaum, 2005). Fellbaum (2005) uses the label “future possession verbs” to refer to situations of obtainment and selection in which the DOC denotes “a resultant possession for the beneficiary” (221). With get (a), for instance, the action of the agent leads to the beneficiary’s possession of my red shirt. Similarly, with find (b), it is only after the agent has found some aspirin, that the beneficiary comes to possess that obtained entity.

Just like obtained entities, the products of creation events are easily transferred into someone’s sphere of possession (Fellbaum, 2005). The verbs build and cook (c-d), thus adhere strictly to the intended reception constraint. Furthermore, it is with created entities as such, that the transfer is deemed beneficial, since “a creation usually requires an effort, and efforts tend to be undertaken only when
they are associated with a benefit” (Fellbaum, 2005:218). As such, with build (c), Benjamin’s effort of building a house leads to the couple’s possession of that house. Also with cook (d), it is clear that the woman is making an effort by reading the recipes in order to succeed in cooking some Spam. The beneficiary participant, her husband, then receives a home-cooked meal and as such, is able to enjoy those efforts.

With verbs of performance, however, the notion of possession becomes stretched to a certain degree, as is the case with perform and dance (e-f). Performances resemble creations or, as Fellbaum (2005) claims, are “re-creations of a work of art such as a composition, a poem or a song” (220). The performed or re-created entity, in other words, is of an immaterial nature, while the created entity, on the other hand, is of a physical nature (Fellbaum, 2005). The notion of possession is therefore not as straightforward and is only adequate under a broader interpretation. In this view, the beneficiary is interpreted as the audience of the performance and similarly, the audience’s perception as the beneficiary’s possession (Fellbaum, 2005). With perform (e), for instance, the beneficiary’s possession is in fact the audience’s perception of Henn Parn and his partner’s performance of the professional ballroom dances. Also with dance (f), it is not the actual dance which becomes the beneficiary’s possession; rather it is the beneficiary’s experience of watching a dance.

With the preparation events denoted in iron and wash (g-h), the notion of possession is extended even further (Fellbaum, 2005). Because the theme is already in possession of the beneficiary, there is no straightforward transfer of possession possible. Only under the interpretation that the beneficiary is getting his/her property back, the preparation event is able to construe a transfer of possession, or better “re-possession” (Fellbaum, 2005:223). With iron (g), for instance, a shirt already belongs to the beneficiary. However, as a result of the desired act, i.e. the ironing, the beneficiary can be interpreted as re-possessing the theme. The same holds for wash (h), where some dishes are re-transferred into the possession of the beneficiary; and as a result of the washing event, those dishes are now clean.

In addition to the cases listed above, it is also possible for the DOC to accommodate certain symbolic actions performed for the benefit of someone else (Fellbaum, 2005). In contrast to the situations of obtainment and creation in which the notion of possession is encoded very straightforwardly, and to the situations of performance and preparation in which the notion of possession is extended somewhat further to include re-creation and re-possession; there is no possession at all in the symbolic actions encoded by the verbs kill and open (i-j). Fellbaum (2005) indicates that in those cases, the exact nature of the benefaction is specific to the context. To be more specific, with kill (i), for instance, God’s command to kill a son is to be interpreted as a symbolic gesture in which the agent is asked to display his devotion towards the beneficiary. God, in other words, will not end up receiving the son; rather,
the son is killed to demonstrate the faith of the agent in question. Along similar lines, the situation denoted by open \( j \) is of a more symbolic nature, i.e. the opening of the door refers to romantic connection between two people. That is to say, the beneficiary does not end up in the possession of your door; rather, it is implied that the opening of the door demonstrates the love and willingness of the agent towards the beneficiary.

From the above mentioned examples, it becomes clear that the previously formulated intended reception constraint does not strictly hold for all speakers of English. Moreover, it is observed that people extend and violate the restriction regularly, which demonstrates “the softness of the semantic constraint” (Fellbaum, 2005:233). As such, by showing that the proposed intended reception constraint is “soft and subject to frequent violation” (209), Fellbaum (2005) not only enhances “the possibility of a constraint with fuzzy edges” (209), but also argues that web data can and should serve as evidence.


In an alternative semantic account, Takami (2003) argues that the “generally held assumptions made about the benefactive double object construction are difficult to maintain” (119). Such research previously argued that in order for the DOC paraphrasable as \([V + NP + for + NP]\) to be acceptable, “the double object form must be cognitively compatible with causation of change of possession” (Takami, 2003:199). In other words, as a necessary condition, only verbs denoting prospective possession are considered to be compatible with the double object form. Additionally, it has been argued that as a sufficient condition, these verbs need to belong to the semantic classes of obtainment and creation.

Takami (2003) counters the above claims and argues that in certain cases, simple action verbs are able to denote prospective possession; and additionally, that there are double object clauses where no change of possession is established. As such, Takami (2003) questions the validity of the posited intended reception constraint and proposes an alternative semantic constraint on the acceptability of the construction:

The benefactive double object construction is acceptable to the extent that it is clearly shown that an action the subject performs is intended for the benefit of the indirect object referent, and that the latter receives some benefit from the action. (213)

This means that in order to be appropriately used, the DOC “must show that the action the subject performs is intended for the benefit of the indirect object referent” (Takami, 2003:213). To arrive at this hypothesis, Takami (2003) examines the acceptability of multiple benefactive double object

---

13 This refers to the biblic story “The Binding of Isaac” (Genesis 22) in which God commands Abraham to offer his sons, Isaac, as a sacrifice. When Isaac is bound to the altar, Abraham is stopped by an angel of God who reveals to him that he passed the test and proved how much he fears God. (Source: Wikipedia)
clauses in English and classifies them into three different types, based on whether they adhere to the previously made claims or not. Consider the following examples from Takami (2003:210-211):

a) John bought me a ring.
b) John killed Mary a centipede for her collection.

c) John’s going to dig me some holes for the new little trees.
d) Good lord, it’s hot in here. Open me a window, would you John?

e) All you have to do to gain my confidence is rob me a couple of banks.
f) Sam promised to move/crush his lover a mountain.

The examples (a-b) are instances of Takami’s (2003) first type, which he labels the “POSSESSIVE TYPE” (210). The semantic requirements for this type are in line with the generally held assumptions: “a (prospective) possessive relationship is established between the indirect and direct object referents” (Takami, 2003:210); the transfer of possession, then, is deemed beneficial for the recipient. With buy (a), by virtue of belonging to the semantic class of verbs of obtaining, the verb itself is responsible for creating the possessive relation between the beneficiary and a ring (Takami, 2003). With kill (b) on the other hand, the possessive relationship is not created by the verb alone, since kill does not belong to the above mentioned semantic classes. In this case, the adverbial phrase for her collection makes it possible to interpret the event denoted by kill as one of prospective possession with Mary as the recipient of a centipede (Takami, 2003). Takami (2003) concludes that “it is far from enough to look at the meaning of the verb alone, and that it is necessary to consider the meaning of the whole sentence (or discourse), including the verb” (204).

A second type of benefactive situations allowed in the DOC, is what Takami (2003) labels as the “BENEFICIAL TYPE” (210). In this type, “the subject referent performs an action for the benefit of the indirect object referent” (Takami, 2001:210). Unlike the first, there is no possessive relationship being established and neither do the verbs in these examples belong to the semantic classes of obtainment and creation. With dig (c), for example, the indirect object referent cannot be interpreted as the possessor of some holes which John digs. It is clear, however, that the indirect object referent benefits from the action carried out by John (Takami, 2003). Also in (d) with open, it is obvious that one cannot possess a window. Rather, this sentence means “Open a window for my benefit” (Takami, 2003:206).

The third and last type Takami (2003) distinguishes, is the “DERRING-DO TYPE” (211) and is considered to be a subtype of the second. Similar to the beneficial type, the verbs rob, move and crush are neither verbs of obtainment or creation, nor is there a possessive relationship established between the direct object and the indirect object. With rob (e), the beneficiary will not end up possessing a couple of banks banks, nor will Sam’s lover in (f) with move/crush become the possessor of a mountain. However, it is clear that the indirect object referent gains benefit from the actions carried
out by the agents. Moreover, as Takami (2003) states, the beneficiaries in these sentences are interpreted as a “witness observing an heroic act performed by the subject referent” (207). As such, (e) can be paraphrased as “Show me whether you can rob me a couple of banks” (Takami, 2003: 207), for example when a Mafia boss wants to test a potential new member. Also (f) can be paraphrased as “Sam promised to show his lover that he can move/crush a mountain” (Takami, 2003:207), i.e. a symbolic act in which Sam proves the strength and depth of his love for the other.

By looking at the different kinds of relations in which agents, direct object referents and indirect object referents can engage, Takami (2003) is able to distinguish three different types of benefactive DOC’s. Moreover, he subsumes the first and third type under the second, since both the possessive and the derring-do type express a notion of benefaction, either with an additional change of possession or with the beneficiary as witness. Accordingly, he argues that the “the term ‘benefactive’ double object construction has actually hit the mark” and that “the acceptability of the benefactive double object construction is primarily controlled by the Semantic Constraint” (Takami, 2003:215).
Chapter 4. Summary Part I

The benefactive DOC in English, i.e. where there is a beneficiary rather than a recipient as third participant, is shown to be subject to particular restrictions. Traditionally, these restrictions have been formulated in terms of the intended reception constraint, which posits that the beneficiary has to be involved as the intended recipient of the theme. This means that, unlike its prepositional counterpart with for, the DOC is largely restricted to situations in which something is made accessible to the beneficiary through obtainment or creation.

This is incorporated in the semantic network model proposed by Goldberg (1995), where verbs belonging to the classes of obtainment and creation are said to instantiate a subsense involving “intended, instead of … actual transfer” (37). Thus, in construction grammar terms, the benefactive DOC is considered a semantic extension from the central sense “successful transfer” (Goldberg, 1995:39), relating causation to intended causation. Based on the idea that “metaphor extends the use of the ditransitive” (Goldberg, 1995:149), she proposes that ditransitives which involve no possession at all, can be seen as involving metaphorical possession in which beneficial actions are seen as transferred objects, and as such, puts forward the intended reception constraint as one with clear boundaries. This becomes difficult to sustain, since it predicts that the DOC accommodates all kinds of benefactive events and cannot exclude deputative uses (Takami, 2003).

Goldberg’s (1995) claim is nuanced by Colleman and De Clerck (2011), who develop their hypothesis of “semantic specialization” (185) by looking further into some of the extended uses from a variational perspective. Since the possibilities of the DOC are observed to be much wider in Late Modern English, they conclude that the intended reception constraint is “a relatively recent phenomenon” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:196). Simultaneously, they acknowledge that some of those older uses may have been preserved in the present-day language. As such, Colleman and De Clerck (2011) move away from the metaphor-based claim and recognize the possibility of other kinds of benefactive ditransitives as relicts from earlier phases of the language.

Similarly, recent research has shown that the intended reception constraint is often extended and violated, and by consequence, that the possibilities of the DOC are not uniform across varieties. In a preliminary questionnaire study, Allerton (1978) examines the acceptability of benefactive double object clauses in British English and concludes that they “exhibit no clear boundary between acceptable and unacceptable but a whole range of degrees from fully unacceptable to fully acceptable” (23). Based on the mixed judgements, Allerton (1978) argues that the more clear an act of giving is involved, the more acceptable the construction is judged. Accordingly, he discriminates between ultimate recipient, eventual recipient, owner and deputor, of which only the first three occur.
prepositionless. Whether or not the event can be construed as one of reception, is argued to depend on the total semantic configuration.

Also in Fellbaum (2005), the intended reception constraint is put forward as one with “fuzzy edges” (209). On the basis of data gathered from the web, Fellbaum (2005) shows that such clauses with mixed judgements indeed occur in everyday language use, and argues that with different verb classes, the benefit conforms “to the notion of possession to varying degrees” (223). In addition, she concludes that the constraint is subject to a degree of intralingual variation, not only due to the inherent fuzziness of the constraint, but also due to the fact that some speakers adhere more strictly to it than others.

Takami (2003) takes this one step further and proposes an alternative semantic constraint in which the notion of possession cannot account for the acceptability of the construction. Based on the different relations in which participants in the benefactive DOC can engage, Takami (2003) distinguishes a possessive subtype, a derring-do subtype and a beneficial subtype. Then, by positing that the beneficial subtype is the general type under which the two other types can be subsumed, he presents the semantics of that type as the defining feature of the benefactive DOC. That is, the actions of the subject have to be “intended for the benefit of the indirect object referent, and the latter receives some benefit from the action” (Takami, 2003:213). However, the fact that there are different types of benefaction accommodated by the DOC, does not rule out the importance of transfer of possession. Takami’s (2003) proposal thus becomes problematic when it is acknowledged that the possessive type is by far the most frequent type of benefactive DOC.

Within the SFL approach, the idea of an intended reception constraint becomes less central, and the focus shifts towards the function of the beneficiary role in the process. The notion of possession, on the other hand, becomes foregrounded when Fawcett (1987) re-interprets ditransitive processes as caused attributive possession, in which the indirect object functions as an affected-carrier. Davidse (1996a,b), then, further correlates caused having and possession by interpreting the dative alternation as caused identifying possession. In addition to a new interpretation of experiential ditransitivity, Davidse (1998) also argues for research into the interpersonal dimension of ditransitive clauses. By proposing that the subject functions as an “explicit instantiator of the situation type expressed in the residue of the clause” (Davidse, 1998:161), she lays bare an additional level of organization in which subject and objects interact as syntactic roles.

With this in mind, the next section in this paper will aim to establish the extent to which the benefactive DOC is constrained in the two major national varieties of English and, additionally, whether this can be interpreted in terms of the intended reception constraint, or not. To do so, the analysis will make use of the terminology encountered in the literature, of which figure 1 provides a schematized overview.
Since Kittilä’s (2005) RECIPIENT BENEFICIARY label covers the same meaning posited by the intended reception constraint, this paper considers it most appropriate in situations where “the nature of benefaction is such that the beneficiary ultimately receives something by instigation of the agent” (Colleman, 2010b:222). Song’s (2007) notion of engager beneficiary, in which the beneficiary “does not need to be a genuine recipient for being encoded as a recipient-benefactive” (Kittilä & Zúñiga, 2010:14), will be subsumed under the notion of recipient beneficiary. This notion will, in other words, cover both beneficiaries which are straightforward recipients and beneficiaries which engage with the theme in some way or another. Van Valin and Lapolla (1997) make a distinction similar to Kittilä (2005), however, somewhat more fine-grained. By differentiating between plain benefactives and deputative benefactives, they provide a useful means in defining some of the older uses observed by Colleman and De Clerck (2011). Therefore, when there is no transfer of possession, this paper will refer to PLAIN BENEFACATION and DEPUTATIVE BENEFACATION to refer to situations where the benefaction simply consists in pleasing the beneficiary and where it consists in carrying out an act instead of the beneficiary, respectively. Other typologies of benefaction such as Smith’s (2010) provide important insights into the nature of benefaction, but, terminologically speaking, do not allow further subcategorization. That is, while the classification between agentive and event benefactive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Capitalized Label</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Valin &amp; Lapolla (1997)</td>
<td>+ transfer</td>
<td>benefactor recipient</td>
<td>PLAIN BENEFICIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittilä (2005)</td>
<td>+ transfer</td>
<td>RECIPIENT BENEFICIARY</td>
<td>pure beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song (2007)</td>
<td>+ transfer</td>
<td>engager beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliday (1967)</td>
<td>+ transfer</td>
<td>client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett (1987)</td>
<td>+ affected-carrier</td>
<td>client</td>
<td>pleasee replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takami (2003)</td>
<td>+ transfer</td>
<td>possessive beneficial</td>
<td>derring-do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Overview recipient and beneficiary subtypes, related to the notion of transfer
(capitalized labels are selected for further analysis)
constructions can be relevant for a better understanding of the dynamics of the situation, it does not contribute to defining the nature of benefaction per se.

Within the SFL literature, the focus is less on nature of benefaction and more on the particular role of the beneficiary in the process; that is, whether it can be regarded as a participant or as a circumstance. From this point of view, the beneficiary role was first conceived as a general role comprising both “the one that goods are given to [and] … the one that services are done for” (Halliday, 1967:237), labelled recipient and client, respectively. Whether these roles function as a participant or as a circumstance, according to Halliday (1967) depends on how they are represented in the process, i.e. without or with preposition. Fawcett (1987) reformulates this in terms of an affected-carrier instead of recipient, who is always a participant, and three distinct beneficiary roles, which are always circumstantial. Some of them, however, can be realized in a DOC to invoke the semantics of a giving situation. In a system network he represents the realization of the three circumstantial roles of client, pleasee and replacement as a choice between different options, determined by the process type with which they occur. Fawcett’s (1987) classification corresponds, in other words, to the the notions of recipient beneficiary, plain beneficiary and deputative beneficiary. However, as the analysis focuses on the different kinds of benefactive events which the DOC can encode, the latter are more representative for present purposes.

While Takami’s alternative semantic constraint may not account for the intended reception constraint, his distinction between subtypes of benefactive DOCs is nevertheless useful when examining the construction’s semantic range, since all three are observed to occur in the double object form. The possessive type clearly corresponds to an event of recipient benefaction, i.e. where there is “a (prospective) possessive relationship established between the indirect and direct object referents” (Takami, 2003:210). The derring-do subtype, i.e. where the beneficiary is “a witness observing the heroic act performed by the subject referent” (Takami, 2003:207), denotes a situation of plain benefaction. The beneficial type, then, which Takami (2003) considered to be the most general one, is interpreted in the present paper as an extension form the possessive type. In other words, where there is no straightforward possession, but rather “something previously unavailable to the beneficiary … [which is now] made available as a result of the desired act” (Colleman, 2010b:224). Thus, as recipient beneficiaries, the possessive and beneficial subtype are both considered to be in accordance with the intended reception constraint, however to a different extent. That is, while the possessive type adheres very strictly to the constraint, the beneficial type extends the constraint to include less prototypical transfer scenes. As plain beneficiary, on the other hand, the derring-do subtype violates the constraint to encode benefaction without transfer. In what follows, the different subtypes of benefaction will be analysed accordingly.
PART II – Corpus Research

Chapter 1. Aim and Methodology

On the basis of data from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and the British National Corpus, this research attempts to map and compare the semantic ranges of the benefactive DOC in the two major national varieties of English. As such, the aim is to examine the extent to which the construction is constrained in American vs. British English. English is the standard language of about 215 million native speakers in the USA and about 58 million native speakers in the UK. However, since the two speaker communities are also separate political entities, the American variety of standard English is characterized by a number of linguistic differences from the British standard and vice versa. This section therefore investigates whether the semantic possibilities and lexical scope of the construction in the two varieties differ from one another, or not.

In order to test the distribution of the benefactive DOC in American and British English, this study selected a set of 31 test verbs from different semantic classes based on how these verbs are treated in the literature (see chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion). Then, to assess the occurrence of these verbs as benefactive ditransitives in the two national varieties, two corpora were used, representing various modes and registers of naturally occurring American and British English:

- the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), developed by Mark Davies (2008) at the Brigham Young University, with 450 million words from 1990-2012, equally divided among spoken, fiction, popular magazines, newspapers and academic texts;
- the British National Corpus (BNC), also developed by Mark Davies (2004) at the Brigham Young University, with 100 million words from 1980-1993, representing various genres such as spoken, fiction, popular magazines, newspapers and academic texts.

Step one was to determine for each verb the total number of occurrences. Since both corpora are annotated for lemma information, this task was relatively simple. Using the in-built tool of the corpora, each verb was lemmatized as a verb in order to strip away all inflectional morphology and as such, be able to retrieve all verbal forms without having to enter them individually. Thus, instead of entering all forms of the verb *buy* (*buy*, *buys*, *buying*, *bought*) for instance, the verb was lemmatized as *[buy].[v*]*, which gave a total of 114,593 attestations in COCA and 24,741 in BNC.

The second step, then, was to extract from all those occurrences, only the verbs in ditransitive syntax. However, since COCA and BNC are not tagged for syntactic function, it was not possible to

enter for example, [Subject] [Verb] [IndirectObject] [DirectObject] as a query and automatically retrieve all double object clauses. As an alternative, a combined set of lexical strings was used, following the method proposed by Colleman and De Clerck (2011). For their strategy, Colleman and De Clerck (2011) were “inspired by the canonical word order of the DOC in which the indirect object NP immediately precedes the direct object NP and by the well-known fact that double object clauses typically combine a pronominal recipient with a lexical NP theme” (189). As such, this study queried for all strings of a personal, reflexive and reciprocal pronoun (excluding it and itself), immediately followed by either a definite or indefinite article, a possessive determiner or an indefinite pronoun. For the verb buy, for instance, this resulted in the following three queries: [buy].[v*] [p*] [at*] for an article, [buy].[v*] [p*] [d*] for a possessive determiner, and [buy].[v*] [p*] [pn1*] for an indefinite pronoun.

The results of these automatic queries had to be manually filtered in order to identify only those instances where the verb encodes a three-participant event. Thus, the third step was to discard all unwanted sentences. Consider the following examples as illustrations of ambiguous cases where either the first or the second argument did not function as a participant in the process:

a) Well, I’m going to buy me some beer. (COCA)
b) I’m going to come back, and I’m going to buy me this house. (COCA)
c) I’m going to build me a little house. (COCA)
d) I said, “Yes, Sarge,” and went to kill me some giants. (COCA)
e) I’m gonna go kill me a Chinaman. (COCA)
f) Boys, let’s go clean us a furnace. (COCA)
g) I want to paint them another color. (COCA)

The examples in (a-f) are illustrations of the PERSONAL DATIVE or the so-called “SOUTHERN DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION” (Webelhuth & Dannenberg, 2006:31) which is typical of southern vernacular varieties of American English. According to Conroy’s (2007) definition, the personal dative “refers to a construction in which a pronoun is used in an object position, marked with accusative case, to be coreferential with its antecedent” (2). Such constructions typically invite self-benefactive understandings, but in contrast to what the term from Webelhuth and Dannenberg (2006) implies, do not involve a double object. With the verbs buy, build, kill and clean (a-f), the object is, in fact, no genuine object, but “rather serves to underscore or intensify the agentivity of the subject referent” (Colleman, 2010:227). Similar to Horn (2008), this study classified personal datives as “NON-ARGUMENT DATIVES” (169) and therefore, excluded them from the analysis. However, the fact that those instances only occurred in the COCA database, confirms that this is a feature of dialectal American English and serves as an “illustration that in certain varieties of English, the double object pattern covers a wider region in semantic space” (Colleman, 2010:227).
The construction in (g) with *paint* is what Halliday (2014) calls “TRANSFORMATIVE” and is different from the DOC with *paint*, which is considered to be “CREATIVE” (232). The difference between those two types of material processes, lies in the fact that the outcome of the latter is the coming into existence of the theme, i.e. the created object. The outcome of the former, on the other hand, is “the change of some aspect of an already existing … [theme]” (Halliday, 2014:232). In a transformative clause such as in (i), the direct object *them*, is supplemented with an attribute *another color*, “specifying the resultant state” (Halliday, 2014:232). This is different from, for instance, the creative clause “*I want to paint them another painting*”, where the first object *them* is the beneficiary, and the second object *another painting* is the creative outcome of the event.

After discarding all unwanted sentences, exactly 6.603 benefactive constructions remained for close reading. For the present aim – i.e. examining the extent to which the construction is constrained in American vs. British English – this database should suffice. However, it is important to acknowledge that this procedure does not guarantee the retrieval of all benefactive double object clauses. First of all, it is possible for the indirect object to take the form of a lexical NP rather than a pronoun. Second, double object clauses with non-canonical word order will not be retrieved.
Chapter 2. Constructing a Data Set

The following eight verb classes are discerned on the basis of Levin (1993) and the online verb lexicon, Verb Net\textsuperscript{15} (VN). As a verb of obtainment, \textit{buy} represents group 1. Verbs belonging to the class of creation and transformation are subdivided into \textit{build} verbs in group 2, \textit{create} verbs in group 3, \textit{perform} verbs in group 4 and \textit{prepare} verbs in group 5. Group 6, then, is somewhat more diverse and comprises four verbs in which the semantics are determined by the context. Group 7 accounts for a handful verbs of destruction. At last, group 8 is represented by the verb \textit{hold}. Since the verbs have been grouped together on the basis of their meaning, the classification is fairly self-explanatory.

2.1. Group 1: \textit{buy}

Group 1 comprises verbs of obtaining (Levin, 1993) in which someone comes into the possession of a pre-existing concrete or abstract entity. With the verb \textit{buy}, i.e. acquire or obtain by purchase (VN), the transfer of possession or “plan-to-give” (Allerton, 1978:27) is built into the meaning of the verb. Therefore, it is expected that ditransitive \textit{buy} will accommodate to the intended reception constraint and that the benefactive DOC will occur relatively frequent in both American and British English.

This choice is motivated by previous research in which the benefactive DOC with \textit{buy} is regarded as unproblematic. Allerton (1978) for instance, indicates that the meaning of the indirect object referent with ditransitive \textit{buy} is very similar to more prototypical transfer verbs such as \textit{bring} and \textit{take}. In the case of the former, however, the giving is more indirect, which makes the indirect object the ultimate instead of the immediate recipient (Allerton, 1978). Through this analogy, Allerton (1978) concludes that \textit{buy} and other verbs belonging to this pattern consistently permit the prepositionless construction. On the basis of data gathered from the web, Fellbaum (2005) was able to confirm that verbs “describing a resultant possession for the beneficiary, participate in the alternation” (221). As such, \textit{buy} and other “future possession verbs” (Fellbaum, 2005:222) are put forward as clear cases where the benefaction conforms to the intended reception constraint. As the main focus of this research lies on the extent to which the constraint is extended and violated, it seemed unnecessary to include other verb types belonging to the class of obtainment.

2.2. Group 2: \textit{build, bake, cook, knit}

Verbs in group 2 describe the creation of a new entity through the transformation of raw material. The created product is, in other words, brought into existence as result of the act. In combination with the DOC, it is possible for such verbs to denote a transfer of possession, i.e. describing a situation in which something is made available through the creation of that entity. Since the creation of such a

\textsuperscript{15} Created by Palmer and Kipper-Schuler (2006), at the university of Colorado, Verb Net (VN) is the largest on-line verb lexicon for English, organized into different verb classes extending Levin’s (1993) classification.
product usually requires an effort on behalf of the agent, and since efforts are usually carried out with the intention to benefit (Fellbaum, 2005), it expected that *build* verbs generally allow the benefactive DOC in both varieties. The created entity is then interpreted as the beneficiary’s possession, which adheres to the posited intended reception constraint. On the basis of the existing literature, the verbs *build, bake, cook* and *knit* were selected as most frequent members of this particular class. Consider the following examples:16

a) *The professor built me a house.* (Kittilä, 2005:275)

b) *The dentist baked me a cake.* (Kittilä, 2005:275)

c) *Could you cook me a meal?* (Allerton, 1978:25)

d) *My wife knitted me a nice sweater.* (Colleman, 2010:222)

Kittilä (2005) presents the DOC with *build* (a) and *bake* (b) as prototypical instances of recipient beneficiary, since it “comprises both reception and (substitutive) benefaction” (275). Regarding (b), the reception lies in the fact that a cake is transferred into the domain of possession of the beneficiary. The (substitutive) benefaction, then, consists in being replaced by the subject as agent of the denoted act. This dual nature, Kittilä (2005) further explains, can also be regarded in terms of two sub-events: the baking scene has to be completed before the eventual transfer scene can take place.

Very similar to ditransitive *bake* (b) is the DOC with *cook* (c) in which a cooking creation takes place. Both describe what is deemed by Colleman and De Vogelaer (2003) and Colleman (2009b;2010) as a somewhat more conventionalised situation of food preparation and provision. That is, even in highly restricted varieties such as Dutch, the benefactive DOC seems to accommodate verbs by which an entity is made available for consumption. Kittilä (2005) similarly comments on the nature of the theme and the context of the situation. Since the theme is such that it can be transferred and used for further purposes, i.e. it is expected that a cake and a meal will be eaten, the recipient-beneficiary reading is pragmatically plausible. This is corroborated by the results presented by Allerton (1978), in which the DOC with *cook* (c) is judged acceptable by 99% of the informants.

Also the DOC with *knit* (d) counts as an example of how the benefactive DOC in English accommodates events of recipient benefaction, since the agent’s knitting action is aimed as a subsequent transfer of a nice sweater, i.e. the created entity which is made available to the beneficiary and, simultaneously, is brought into existence through the denoted act. As the beneficiary was not yet in the possession of the sweater prior to the knitting, his/her domain of influence thus increases as a result of the event.

---

16 For each sentence, the main verb, indirect object and theme are identified using different styles of underlining. The same conventions are used for the analysis in chapter 3.
The examples (a-d) illustrate how the verbs in question conform to the intended reception constraint and, along similar lines, many other build verbs can be attested in the literature. On the basis of the semantics of the entire class, other alike verbs are expected to behave the same and therefore not included in the research.

2.3. Group 3: create, dig, mint design, produce, construct

The verbs in group 3 are comparable to those in group 2, since both presuppose the coming into existence of a created entity as the result of a procedural activity (VN). In many other respects, however, the two groups are highly dissimilar. Levin (1993) for instance, distinguished create verbs from build verbs in that the former does not entail a transformation of raw material. Additionally, it has been pointed out that verbs of creation are more obscure with respect to the benefactive DOC. On the basis of the existing literature, the verbs dig, mint, design, create, produce and construct were selected. Consider the following examples:

a) *Sue constructed/designed us a house. (Pinker, 1989:54)
b) It feels as though someone had designed me a custom dress. (Fellbaum, 2005:212)
c) Is there someone who could construct me a set of replicas? (Fellbaum, 2005:224)

d) Anyone who can create me some copies on other formats... (Fellbaum, 2005:222)

e) She produced me two gorgeous sons. (Fellbaum, 2005:224)

f) Could you dig me a hole? (Allerton, 1978:25)
g) John’s going to dig me some holes for the new little trees. (Takami, 2003:210)

Of the semantic group of create verbs, only dig, mint and design are included by Levin (1993) as alternating verbs in the benefactive DOC. Pinker’s (1989) data is even more strict and considers not only construct, but also design (a) ungrammatical. This constraint, known as the “Latinate constraint” (Fellbaum, 2005:223-225; De Clerck & Colleman, 2009), is formulated in morphological terms and restricts verbs from Latinate origin such as create, produce and construct. There are however, more recent investigations suggesting otherwise. Fellbaum (2005) for instance, counters the proposed constraint with evidence gathered from the web; hence, the attestations of the verb design (b), construct (c), create (d) and produce (e). Along similar lines, De Clerck and Colleman (2009) ask for a more nuanced understanding by indicating that some varieties adhere more strictly to the Latinate constraint than others. From a diachronic perspective, then, they argue that in earlier phases of the language, there must have been a greater flexibility towards verbs of creation in general (De Clerck & Colleman, 2009).

17 See, the material/product alternation (Levin, 1993:56-57)
While Allerton’s (1978) results are in line with the more traditional assumptions (the DOC with \textit{dig (f)} was judged acceptable by 98\% of the informants), the discussion is further complicated by Takami (2003). By proposing an alternative semantic constraint, the DOC with \textit{dig (g)} is licenced as a rather general “beneficial type” (210). This means the beneficiary is not necessarily the possessor of \textit{some holes}. Rather, what is received are the \textit{new little trees} (Takami, 2003).

The category of \textit{create} verbs is, in other words, expected to display a certain amount of intralingual variation. To sum up, the verbs \textit{design, create, construct and produce} are selected on the basis of their morphological features; that is, as verbs from Latinate origin they are excluded from the DOC, at least in some varieties. The verb \textit{dig}, then, is expected to display variation with regard to the intended reception constraint, since it is not always deemed necessary that the beneficiary is also the prospective possessor of the theme. Finally, while \textit{mint} is presented in the literature as a verb without complications, there are no cited examples confirming this.

2.4. Group 4: \textit{perform, play, sing, paint, recite}

The fourth group of test verbs comprises verbs of performance, i.e. “re-creations of a work of art such as a composition, a poem, or a song” (Fellbaum, 2005:220). Performances thus resemble the creations in group 2 and 3, since a created entity is brought into existence as result of the denoted act. However, because the creation is not always a physical entity, the transfer of possession becomes somewhat less transparent. Often, the beneficiary takes on the role of an experiencer (Fellbaum, 2005; Colleman, 2009b), which causes the intended reception constraint to extend in order to include metaphorical possession. On the basis of the existing literature, the verbs \textit{perform, play, sing, recite} and \textit{paint} were selected for further investigation. Consider the following examples:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{a) … I played them some tunes.} (Fellbaum, 2005:220)
  \item \textit{b) She sang them a song.} (Fellbaum, 2005:225)
  \item \textit{c) Could you paint me a picture?} (Allerton, 1978:25)
  \item \textit{d) Could you paint me a room?} (Allerton, 1978:25)
  \item \textit{e) …A group of students performed us sketches about their school.} (Fellbaum, 2005:222)
  \item \textit{f) Recite us your last poem.} (Fellbaum, 2005:225)
\end{itemize}

The verbs \textit{play (a) and sing (b)} are treated as relatively straightforward examples in which the benefactive DOC accommodates performance verbs (Levin, 1993). This is somewhat unexpected, since there is no prototypical transfer of possession. Rather, the beneficiary is construed as a metaphorical recipient, with perception as some kind of possession (Colleman, 2010a; Fellbaum, 2005). The transfer is much more prototypical with \textit{paint (c,d)}, since the created entity is of a concrete
nature. The nature of that entity may still vary and either be something easily transferrable, i.e. a picture (c), or something which is not, i.e. a room (d). As such, Allerton’s (1978) test results, i.e. 96% vs. 57% respectively, confirm that the degree of acceptability depends on a number of interacting factors.

The benefactive DOC with perform (e) and recite (f) is attested in actual language use, as indicated by Fellbaum’s (2005) web examples. However, since those verbs are of Latinate origin, they are not included in the more traditional accounts (Levin, 1993; Goldberg, 1995).

From the above mentioned examples it becomes clear that verbs of performance exhibit a certain amount of variation. In contrast with paint, where the transfer of a physical artwork is fairly straightforward, the intended reception constraint is extended with the verbs play and sing in order to include metaphorical recipient beneficiaries. With respect to perform and recite, the benefactive DOC is expected to occur more in some varieties than others, whether or not the Latinate constraint is adhered to.

2.5. Group 5: prepare, pour, iron, wash, clean, clear

Group 5 includes another subclass of creation and transformation verbs; that is, verbs of preparation, i.e. “where an agent acts on an entity such that this entity is prepared for use or consumption” (Fellbaum, 2005). Since the nature of the theme is such that it can be transferred and used for a particular purpose, the DOC with preparation is relatively unambiguous. This becomes more complicated when the theme in question is already owned by the indirect object (Allerton, 1978; Fellbaum, 2005; Colleman, 2010). In those situations, the intended reception constraint is expected to be stretched to include “re-possession” (Fellbaum, 2005:223). From the existing literature, the verbs prepare, pour, iron, wash, clean and clear were selected. Consider the following examples:

a) Tom Mullins Web Design Studio prepares you a bid. (Fellbaum, 2005:229)

b) Could you pour me a cup of coffee? (Allerton, 1978:25)
c) ...watching as he was poured a drink. (Fellbaum, 2005:217)

d) Could you iron me these shirts? (Allerton, 1978:25)
e) Honey, can you iron me a shirt? (Fellbaum, 2005:220)

f) Could you wash me some socks? (Allerton, 1978:25)
g) Could you wash me the dishes? (Allerton, 1978:25)
h) I asked Mom to wash me some clothes (Fellbaum, 2005:220)
i) Could you clean me some flowerpots? (Allerton, 1978:25)

---

18 Fellbaum (2005) also points out how in some cases, the beneficiary can be realized as the subject of the sentence. That is, even though it is not a core argument, “numerous examples of passivised beneficiaries” (Fellbaum, 2005:217) are attested, however, more in British than in American varieties of English.
j) Could you clean me these shoes? (Allerton, 1978:25)
k) Can you clean me the windows? (Allerton, 1978:25)
m) Only if you clean me some room on this desk to work, right? (Fellbaum, 2005:219)

n) I cleared him a place to sleep on the floor. (Langacker, 1991:360)

The verb prepare (a) denotes a situation in which an entity is equipped in advance for some use (VN). In the benefactive DOC it is therefore implied that the recipient beneficiary will use the prepared bid for a particular purpose. This purpose is often linked to the context of food preparation as is the case with pour (b,c). According to Allerton’s study (1978), pour (b) is judged acceptable by 100% of the informants. Similarly, Fellbaum (2005) confirms the use of pour (c) in the benefactive DOC in actual language use. This is not unexpected, since the nature of the theme implies that the beneficiary will end up drinking a cup of coffee or a drink.

Ditransitive iron (d) receives mixed judgement in Allerton’s (1978) questionnaire, i.e. acceptable in 76% of the cases. Examples from the web illustrate that iron (e) indeed occurs in everyday language use. The intended reception constraint is, in other words, stretched to include a broader interpretation of the transfer of possession sense, i.e. the beneficiary “is getting back his property in a better condition” (Allerton, 1978:28). Similarly, the DOC with wash (f,g) displays some variation depending on whether or not the theme can be interpreted as previously unavailable to the beneficiary; hence the judgements scores of 92% vs. 54%, respectively. The same holds for clean (i-l), with respective scores of 76%, 57%, 47% and 40%.

The DOC with clear (n) illustrates another ambiguity. That is, while clear in isolation does not denote creation or obtainment, the total semantic configuration can nevertheless be interpreted as one. In this context, the clearing act results in the beneficiary having “that place at his disposal for a particular purpose” (Colleman, 2010:223).

Thus, also with respect to verbs of preparation “the intended reception constraint comes with a certain amount of inherent fuzziness” (Colleman, 2010:224). While the DOCs with prepare and pour counts as more straightforward examples of recipient benefaction, the verbs iron, wash, clean and clear display more ambiguity. Taken overall, the construal of the benefactive DOC is expected to depend on the total semantic configuration.

2.6. Group 6: peel, open, hit, kill

Apart from the verbs of obtainment and creation, there is another subset of verbs participating in the benefactive DOC. The exact nature of those verbs, however, is less clearly definable and is particular to the context. Green (1974), for instance, signals that such acts are “intended to be symbolic of the subject’s devotion to the indirect object referent” (95). As it is not suggested that the beneficiary will
also comes to possess the theme, the intended reception constraint is expected to be violated to include plain benefaction. On the basis of the existing literature, the verbs *peel, open, hit* and *kill* were selected. Consider the following examples:

a) *I’ll peel you an orange.* (Colleman, 2010:225)

b) *Baby open me your door.* (Fellbaum, 2005:221)

c) *Babe Ruth hit his team and fans another home run.* (Takami, 2003:212)

d) *God said to Abraham: Kill me a son.* (Fellbaum, 2005:221)

It has been argued that the verb *peel* (a) can have a demonstrative interpretation in which nothing new is made available to the beneficiary (Kay in Colleman, 2010:225). Similarly, with *open* (b), the beneficiary does not come to possess *your door*. The same holds for *hit* (c), where it is clear that *his team and fans* will not end up possessing *another home run*. What is more, all those acts are carried out with the intention to please the beneficiary, “who is meant to witness the act” (Colleman, 2010:226). The idea of a heroic act or “act of derring-do” (Takami, 2003:213) is also present in ditransitive *kill* (d), where Abraham performs a noteworthy act in order to show his devotion to God.

The symbolic acts in the examples above represent clear violations of the intended reception constraint. Since the nature of the benefaction is specific to the context, it’s reasonable to assume that there is a certain degree of intralingual variation. Moreover, the DOC with *peel, open, hit* and *kill* is expected to be “subject to wide dialectal variation” (Colleman, 2010:226). For the derring-do use in particular, it has been argued to be “typical of colloquial varieties of American English” (Colleman, 2010:226).

### 2.7. Group 7: *destroy, ruin, burn, crush*

Group 7 includes verbs that belong to the semantic class of destruction and alike, which, in contrast to verbs of creation and transformation, damage an entity irreparably or cause the undoing of that entity. Throughout this particular semantic contrast, such verbs have been argued to display a certain amount of ambiguity when used in the DOC. That is, when used in a particular context, it is possible for verbs of destruction to entail a benefit (Fellbaum, 2005). Additionally, the DOC also accommodates certain events of malefaction, but this has not yet been investigated systematically. On the basis of the existing literature, the verbs *destroy, ruin, burn* and *crush* were selected. Consider the following examples:

a) *Herons or other wild fowl shall destroy them their nest or eggs.* (Fellbaum, 2005:219)

b) *The white missionary is trying to ruin them their way of life.* (Fellbaum, 2005:220)
c)  ...kick the crap outta saint nick and burn him some pagans. (Fellbaum, 2005:219)

d)  Sam promised to move/crush his lover a mountain. (Green, 1974:96)

While the DOC with destroy (a) and ruin (b) is clearly carried out at the expense of the indirect object referent, this is not the case with burn (c) and crush (d). In the former, the DOC occurs with “events that have undesirable consequences” (Fellbaum, 2005:213) for the maleficiary. The opposite holds for burn (c), where the act is symbolic for the subject’s devotion to the beneficiary. Similarly, with crush (d), the act of demolishing a mountain is not literal, but figurative, and is meant to make an impression on the beneficiary.

Both the malefactive uses with destroy and ruin, and the benefactive uses with burn and crush illustrate that the semantic possibilities of the DOC are not uniform across all varieties. Since the nature of the effect depends strongly on the broader context, the use of destruction verbs in the DOC is expected to display a lot of variation. Whether or not such malefactive uses violate the intended reception constraint, has not yet been systematically investigated.

2.8. Group 8: hold

In order to investigate whether the benefactive DOC accommodates events of deputative benefaction, the present analysis included the verb hold. It has been argued unanimously, that the present-day English DOC does not accept uses where the benefaction solely consists in the substitution of the beneficiary as the agent of the denoted act. However, since this particular use has been reported to be frequent in earlier phases of the language, it is not entirely impossible to assume that such uses have been preserved in certain present-day varieties. Therefore, on the basis of the existing literature, the verb hold was selected for further investigation. Consider the following example:

a)  ... and the young Benedictine holding him the torch as he wrote,...  
   (Sterne, 1967; in Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:195)

In the above mentioned example with hold (a), it is clear that Benedictine is holding the torch instead of the beneficiary, i.e. so that the beneficiary does not have to hold it himself and is able to write something down instead (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011).

As the benefit with hold clearly does not entail that the beneficiary comes to possess “an object which is created or obtained for his/her sake” (Colleman & De Clerck, 2011:195), the DOC is expected to violate the intended reception constraint. Such uses would confirm the semantic specialization hypothesis of Colleman and De Clerck (2011) and serve as evidence that in some varieties, older uses have been preserved.
Chapter 3. Analysis and Results

This chapter presents the analysis and the results of the data retrieved from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and the British National Corpus. For each of the 31 test verbs, the observed ditransitives are turfed and compared to the total number of occurrences. Each double object clause is then further analysed and categorized according to the particular type of benefaction it denotes. As such, by testing the distribution of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English, this chapter aims to establish which verbs adhere more strictly to the intended reception constraint and how this differs in the two major national varieties of English.

The results for each group of test verbs from the two corpora are merged in table 1 to table 8, which shows that the numbers of observed ditransitives are very small. Each table lists the total number of occurrences and the number of ditransitives found in the COCA and the BNC database. Additionally, in order to visualise the semantic possibilities of the ditransitive in the two varieties, detailed results for each verb in both American and British English are presented in figure 2.a to 32.a, and figure 2.b to 32.b, respectively.\(^\text{19}\)

3.1. Group 1: buy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA</th>
<th></th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>114,593</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>24,741</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1. COCA

buy

Ditransitive buy is attested 3.018 times in the COCA database and in 3.012 of those instances, the DOC straightforwardly encodes an event of recipient benefaction. In such cases, the DOC implies that “the argument designated by the first object comes to receive the argument by the second object”

\(^\text{19}\) For a complete overview of the results, see tables 10 and 11 in appendix A.
In other words, the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The following examples thus adhere to the intended reception constraint:

1) ...I finally went out and bought them all awards and gave them awards. (SPOK)
2) ...and he would buy me this and do that for me. (ACAD)
3) He also bought himself some jewelry. (SPOK)
4) My father, when I was born, just bought me some milk, ... (SPOK)
5) “Here, buy yourself some real food.” (FIC)
6) Will you buy me some beer for a Friday night? (FIC)
7) “Can I buy you another beer?” (FIC)
8) John Kanzius may have the option of a bone marrow transplant that could buy him more time. (SPOK)
9) ...he was the king who was going to die, but Isaiah the prophet bought him some extra years by turning the sun dial back! (FIC)
10) Basically, Ballmer has bought himself some time. (MAG)
11) First of all, Kim just bought me some time. (SPOK)
12) Money can’t buy you this experience. (SPOK)
13) Money will buy you any dream you want. (FIC)
14) In short, our wealth can buy us more than new hospitals. (MAG)
15) Having cash on hand will save everyone time and buy you some good karma. (MAG)
16) Celine Arseneaux, out to buy herself some action. (FIC)
17) He bought himself some peace by pretending obedience to his father. (ACAD)
18) Buy yourself some good karma. (FIC)

The first examples (1-2) juxtapose the semantic roles of the recipient and the recipient beneficiary, and of the recipient beneficiary and the plain beneficiary, respectively. In (1), for instance, buy and give are used in highly similar prepositionless constructions where the same theme is transferred into the possession of the same indirect object referent. The difference lies in the way in which the indirect object referent is conceptualised; that is, first as recipient beneficiary with buy, then as prototypical recipient with give. This illustrates that the notion of possession is part of the semantic frame of buy and that it is present in the definition of the recipient-beneficiary role. The fact that the buying event precedes the giving event in the sentence, on the other hand, indicates that the giving in buy is of a more indirect nature. As such, it is possible for the speaker to highlight the transfer of possession sense by reformulating the buying event in terms of a giving event. Example (2) confronts a recipient-beneficiary with a plain-beneficiary reading. While both the verbs buy and do can easily add a beneficiary argument as a PP adjunct with for, only buy permits the DOC. The possibility of the dative shift with buy rules out the “replaced agent” (Fellbaum, 2005:214) reading and simultaneously enhances the notion of possession.

Similar, in (3-7) there is a relatively straightforward transfer of possession in which the beneficiary is also involved as the prospective possessor of the theme. What is more, the DOC with buy often denotes a prototypical material transfer, as is the case in (3), where some jewelry is transferred into the possession of the beneficiary. The same transfer situation is described in (4-7), where the beneficiary
comes to possess some milk, some real food, some beer and another beer. In this particular context of food preparation and provision, it is implied that the transferred theme will be enjoyed as a meal or as a drink. In other words, subsequent to the buying event, the theme is transferred into the beneficiary’s sphere of control so that it can be used for further purposes.

The notion of possession is somewhat more stretched in examples (8-16), where an abstract possessive relationship is established between the agent, the theme and the beneficiary. In (8-11) it is clear that the beneficiary cannot literally end up receiving more time, some extra years, or some time. On the other hand, it is implied that something was previously unavailable to the beneficiary and now, as a result of the actions of the agent, this is no longer the case. In (9), for instance, the king who was going to die is running out of time to live. However, by turning the sun dial back, the prophet is able to help the king and, by this, buy him some extra years. Time, in other words, is now available to the beneficiary, who is therefore construed as the possessor of the theme. Also in examples (12-15), the notion of possession is less transparent. This can be attributed to the fact that an inanimate entity is construed as the agent of the buying event. However, when “the process of obtaining involves a transfer of money […] this sum is understood to be sufficient to allow the transition to take place” (Levin, 1993:83). As such, money, our wealth and having cash on hand are interpreted as some kind of animate agent, capable of buying something for the beneficiary. Consequently, the beneficiary comes to possess the obtained entities this experience, any dream you want, more than new hospitals and some good karma as a result of the buying event. Additionally, examples (10,16-18) show that the beneficiary can be construed as the agent him/herself, instead of some other person. In other words, in the DOC with buy, it is possible for the beneficiary to be co-referential with the agent instigating the transfer. In (16), for instance, Celine Arseneaux is both the one who carries out the buying event and the one benefiting from that event by receiving some action. An event of self-benefaction as such, illustrates the unrestricted nature of the benefactive DOC in English.

In two other double object clauses, however, the DOC does not imply a transfer of possession. In the following examples the intended reception constraint is violated to encode plain benefaction, i.e. a situation where the benefaction simply consists in pleasing, entertaining or amusing the indirect object referent:

19) I’ll buy you the moon baby. (NEWS)
20) …and buy her the moon and the stars. (FIC)

The exact nature of the symbolic actions in (19-20) is more difficult to define and is specific to the context. In both (19-20), the act of buying does not involve an actual obtained entity that is transferred to the domain of possession of the beneficiary. With example (20) in particular, the beneficiary cannot be interpreted as the prospective possessor of the moon and the stars. Along similar lines, the agent does not literally buy the theme in question. Moreover, the act of buying the moon and the stars is
interpreted as symbolic of the agent’s devotion to the beneficiary. It implies that the agent shows the strength of his/her love for the beneficiary. The nature of the benefaction thus consists in pleasing the beneficiary by performing a noteworthy act.

In another four instances of the DOC, the verb buy encodes an event of malefaction rather than benefaction, i.e. the effect bestowed upon the indirect object referent is undesirable. In the following examples the agent has no intention to please the indirect object referent:

21) “Can I have some fat?” or “Dad, can you buy me some diabetes?” (NEWS)
22) Don’t buy yourself this fight, Mr President. (SPOK)
23) Now, tell me she didn’t buy herself some cancer on that day. (FIC)
24) ...and it has only bought us more debt. (NEWS)

The ironic comment in (21) is clearly intended to refer to the adversative effect when the dad in question would buy unhealthy kinds of food for the child. It is implied that through the act of buying unhealthy things, you actually give your child diabetes. As such, some diabetes, is construed as an obtained entity with negative consequences for the possessor, who is therefore a maleficiary rather than a beneficiary. The other examples similarly refer to a situation with undesirable consequences. In (22) for instance, the actions of the president could possibly lead to a lot opposition and as such, the president would buy himself this fight. Since such a situation is not desirable in politics, the participant is adversely affected by the events.

3.1.2. BNC

buy

![Diagram of buy in British English]

Figure 2.b. Detailed results for buy in British English

Ditransitive buy is attested 798 times in the BNC database and in all but one, those cases encode an event of recipient benefaction. That is to say, in accordance with the intended reception constraint, the beneficiary in the following examples is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

25) ...so I bought us some chocolate éclairs(SPOK)
26) So I bought myself a bike,... (SPOK)
27) Shane’s bought himself another car. (SPOK)
28) ...why don’t you buy it then, buy yourself some records... (SPOK)
29) So Ashen spent eight quid of his money in order to buy himself an alibi. (FIC)
There, a little money will buy you a good deal of swank. (MISC)
...but money buys us a lot of friends. (FIC)
Money buys you certain things, but it can’t buy you the simple pleasures in life (MAG)
...altitude or power, it buys you a very useful commodity – time. (MISC)
It might buy you the time you need. (FIC)
Try and get that now (pause) buy yourself some time. (SPOK)
…it’s only a temporary measure to buy yourself some time... (SPOK)

The notion of possession is straightforwardly encoded in (25-29), where the beneficiary is construed as the prospective possessor of a material theme. In a prototypical transfer scene as such, the obtained entity is transferred into the domain of possession of the beneficiary, who is therefore able to make use of the results. This is the case in the context of food provision and preparation as in (25), where the buying event results in the beneficiary’s possession of some chocolate éclairs. Also in (26-29), the buying of a bike, another car, some records and an alibi leads to the beneficiary’s possession of those obtained entities.

This is less prominent in (30-37), where the denoted transfer is of a more abstract nature. In examples (30-31), there is no animate agent intentionally carrying out the buying event. Nevertheless, the beneficiary can be interpreted as the one to whom something previously unavailable is now made available. That is to say, the commodity money is construed as the agent of the buying event, which results in the beneficiary’s possession of the obtained entities in question. Similarly, in examples (32-37), there is no straightforward notion of possession. This can be attributed to the fact that the transferred theme is not something that can be possessed in the literal sense of the word. To be more specific, the beneficiary cannot possess the simple pleasures in life or some time as in (32-33), for instance. On the other hand, it is implied that something previously unavailable to the beneficiary is now made available. For example, in (33), the Americans have offered the beneficiary refugee, which leads to the beneficiary’s possession of some time. Additionally, examples (26-29,36-37) show that the situation can be construed as an event of self-benefaction, i.e. where the agent and the beneficiary refer to the same person. In (36-37) for instance, the agent is both the one carrying out the buying event as the one benefiting from that act by receiving some time. This can be attributed to the unrestricted nature of the benefactive DOC in English.

In only one other DOC, the verb buy denotes an event of malefaction rather than a beneficial one. This means that, in the example below, the event affects the indirect object participant adversely:

If you buy that horse you’ll be buying yourself a packet ful o’ trouble. (NON-ACAD)

In this example (38), the action of the agent is considered to have an adversative effect on the indirect object participant, who is therefore a maleficiary rather than a beneficiary. As such, the act of buying that horse would have a negative effect on the maleficiary, i.e. it will cause a lot of trouble.
3.2. Group 2: build, bake, cook, knit

Table 2. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>BNC total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>111,649</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>22,417</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bake</td>
<td>15,180</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>33,142</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knit</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1. COCA

build

Figure 3.a. Detailed results for build in American English

Ditransitive build is attested 414 times in the COCA database and 411 of those instances, the DOC straightforwardly encodes an event of recipient benefaction. In such cases, the DOC implies that the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The following examples thus follow the intended reception constraint:

39) Mom and Dad built her that tree house when she was seven years old. (FIC)
40) Harry sent him over to build me some shelves. (FIC)
41) His job is to build them those really nice houses. (MAG)
42) Well, I became a landlord when my son-in-law built me a bird house as a gift. (NEWS)
43) Maybe he found shelter or built himself some shield against the heat. (FIC)

44) ...visit www.mindware.com. BUILD ME A CITY WORTH LIVING IN (MAG)
45) We had to build ourselves another identity,... (FIC)

The examples in (39-43) are very straightforward instances of recipient benefaction where an agent is building something with the intention of giving that entity to the beneficiary. Once built, that tree house, some shelves, those really nice houses, a bird-house and some shield against the heat enter the domain of possession of the beneficiary. In other words, after the building event carried out by the agent, the indirect object referent will be able to use that entity for particular purposes. In (39), for instance, the girl is now able to play in the tree house that her parents built for her.

In (44-45) the notion of possession is somewhat less straightforward, since one cannot possess a city, nor is it possible to actually build another identity. However, in (44) combination with the phrase
worth living in, it is possible to interpret the denoted event as one of prospective possession. That is, the beneficiary will be able to make some kind of use of the results of the action, i.e. he/she will have a more comfortable life in this improved city. Also in (45), this can be interpreted as something previously unavailable which is now made available to the beneficiary, i.e. a new identity or a new life. Additionally, as (45) illustrates, it is possible to accommodate an event of self-benefaction in the DOC with build. Also in (43), the beneficiary is co-referential with the agent of the denoted event, i.e. the agent built something for him/herself to use and benefit from. To be more specific, the agent built some shield for himself, therefore that entity enters his sphere of control and as a result, he is able to gain direct benefit from it, i.e. protection against the heat.

In three other double object clauses, there is no implied transfer of possession. As such, the following examples violate the intended reception constraint to include an event of plain benefaction:

46) Let us now honor the patron of our city, the goddess Athena. Let us build her a magnificent temple. (FIC)
47) “I will build thee a statue in snow, my Lord,” (MAG)
48) They have builded him an altar in the evening dews and damps. (SPOK)

In examples (46-48) the exact nature of the benefaction is hard to define. However, it is clear that the building act is carried out with the intention of pleasing the beneficiary. What is more, the building of a magnificent temple, a statue in snow and an altar are to some extent demonstrative acts, symbolic of the agent’s devotion to the beneficiary. There is no implied transfer of possession and the beneficiary cannot be interpreted as the one receiving those entities, since, often, he/she is someone who has already passed away. In (46) for instance, the goddess Athena does not refer to a specific person on earth, but to a divine spirit and the patron of our city. Thus, by building her a temple, the agents attempt to honour Athena as a patron and demonstrate the respect they have for her.

\[\text{bake}\]

![Diagram]

Figure 4.a. Detailed results for bake in American English

Ditransitive bake is attested 50 times in the COCA database and in all but one, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of

---

20 Colleman and De Clerck (2011) analyse this as “intended honoree” (196).
the product of the baking event. As such, the following examples adhere to the intended reception constraint:

49) My mother was home, baking me a cake. (FIC)
50) “Hi, Mommy, can you bake me some cupcakes for school?” (FIC)
51) I’d like to bake him a cake for valentine. (MAG)
52) The carefully arranged rows of muffins and cheese rolls she had baked herself that morning... (FIC)
53) ...borrow their oven to bake herself a birthday cake. (NEWS)
54) Launched in 2004, Bake Me A Wish!, ... (MAG)

The notion of possession is fairly straightforward, since the events in (49-53) describe a situation where the agent carries out a baking act with the intention of giving those baked entities to the indirect object referent. That is to say, the beneficiary functions as the prospective possessor of a cake, some cupcakes, the carefully arranged rows of muffins and cheese rolls and a birthday cake. As such, it is possible to construe the events in (49-53) as denoting two subevents, i.e. a baking event in which the theme is baked by the agent, and a subsequent transfer event in which the theme is transferred into the possession of the beneficiary. Additionally, it is also possible to construe a baking scene as an event of self-benefaction in which the agent is also the beneficiary. In (53), for instance, the agent is baking a birthday cake with the intention of giving it to herself. As such, she is both the one carrying out the baking act as the one who receives the cake and is able to enjoy it.

In (54), the notion of possession is less transparent and this can be attributed to the fact that the theme is an abstract entity. The baking of A Wish cannot be interpreted literally, but only as a metaphor for giving someone the opportunity to make his/her dream come true. Therefore, the beneficiary is the one who receives the possibility of making a wish. In other words, through the actions of the agent, something previously unavailable to the beneficiary is now made available.

In one other instance, on the other hand, the verb bake does not imply that the beneficiary will end up receiving the theme. In this case, the nature of benefaction consists in pleasing or entertaining the beneficiary. As such, the following violates the intended reception constrain to accommodate an event of plain benefaction:

55) Bake me a cake as fast as you can. (SPOK)

In example (55), the beneficiary is not the one who comes to possess the theme, but rather the one witnessing the act carried out by the agent. In combination with the phrase as fast as you can, it is clear that the agent is trying to show how fast he/she is able to bake a cake. In other words, by baking a cake as fast as possible, the agent is hoping to impress and please the beneficiary. This could take place in the context of a competition where the contestants have to show their baking skills in order to
proceed to the next round. Within this demonstrative interpretation, it is less relevant whether the cake will eventually be transferred to the possession of the beneficiary.

*cook*

![Figure 5](image)

**Figure 5.a. Detailed results for *cook* in American English**

Ditransitive *cook* is attested 94 times in the COCA database and all those occurrences encode an event of *recipient benefaction*. In other words, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The following examples thus adhere strictly to the intended reception constraint:

56) *Jack and his wife would* *cook us* *all* *lasagne* *every night.* (FIC)
57) “I’m *cooking us some nice lunch.*” (FIC)
58) *Tonight, for his birthday, she would* *cook him a great feast.* (FIC)
59) *Cook him something great.* (SPOK)
60) *Would you cook me something to eat?* (SPOK)
61) *She let her two golden retrievers play in the yard, cooked herself some eggs, poured herself a cup of coffee.* (MAG)
62) *I cooked myself a TV dinner.* (FIC)

In all the examples (56-62), the beneficiary is involved as the prospective possessor of the theme, which is cooked by the agent. In (56) for instance, the agents *Jack and his wife* carry out a cooking event, with the intention of giving the cooked entity to the indirect object referent. As such, *lasagne* is transferred into the domain of possession of the beneficiary, who is now able to make use of the result of the cooking event, i.e. eat the lasagne. This is fairly obvious, since the nature of the theme implies that it will be eaten. Similarly, in (61) it is expected that the beneficiary is going to eat *some eggs*, once they are cooked. Additionally, examples (61-62) show that is possible for the agent and the beneficiary to be co-referential, i.e. the benefit is not intended for some other person, but for the agent him/herself. In such an event of self-benefaction, the agent is both the one who cooks *a TV dinner* and the one who is able to benefit from that event by receiving a meal.
Ditransitive \textit{knit} is attested 16 times in the COCA database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of \textit{recipient benefaction}, i.e. where the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the examples below are in line with the intended reception constraint:

63) \textit{Can you knit me a jersey or can you not, that’s what I’m askin’}. (FIC)
64) \textit{I spent three months knitting you a pair of bed-socks}. (FIC)
65) \textit{My son, aged 10, asked me to knit him a sweater}. (MAG)
66) \textit{Knit yourselves several metres of tubing to match your projected garment}. (MAG)
67) \textit{Many years ago I knitted myself a sleeveless jumper in mercerised cotton}. (MAG)
68) \textit{I knitted myself a dress…} (MISC)

In (63-68), there is an obvious transfer of possession scene where the beneficiary can be interpreted as the prospective possessor of the theme. This means that the agent is involved in a productive knitting event and that the beneficiary will end up receiving the theme, once it is made. In (63-65) for instance, the indirect object referent receives either a \textit{jersey}, a \textit{pair of bed-socks} or a \textit{sweater}, and benefits from the fact that he/she does not need to carry out the knitting him/herself. This is not the case in (66-68), since the agent and the beneficiary are co-referential. In such an event of self-benefaction the agent carries out the knitting event with the intention of giving the theme to him/herself. In (58) for example, the agent is knitting \textit{a dress} for herself to wear and benefit from.

\subsection*{3.2.2. BNC}

\textit{build}
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Ditransitive build is attested 76 times in the BNC database and in all but one, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefaction. In accordance with the intended reception constraint, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme in the following:

69) The government would save so much money in the long run if they built us all homes instead of putting us up in this dump;... (FIC)
70) Pete’s brother-in-law built him a massive speaker cabinet...(FIC)
71) Ten thousand pounds will build you the highest column in the world... (NEWS)
72) ...he employed Hugh May q.v. to build him a house... (FIC)
73) “Here, build yourself some good foundations and a stout wall or two.” (FIC)

In (69-73) there is a transfer of possession in which the beneficiary is construed as the prospective possessor of the theme, i.e. the entity which is built. In other words, the agent performs an act of building something with the intention of giving that entity to the beneficiary. As such, in (69-70), the government and Pete’s brother-in-law are agents who built homes and a massive speaker cabinet, with the intention of giving those entities to the beneficiary after the building event is completed. This interpretation is fairly transparent, since the nature of the themes in question allows it to be transferred from one domain of possession to another. Example (72) further highlights the notion of possession by construing the agent as being employed by the beneficiary.21 That is to say, the beneficiary is this context is considered to be a customer who temporarily employs the agent Hugh May to build him a house. As such, by virtue of being a customer, the beneficiary is necessarily the prospective possessor of the product being made, i.e. the product for which he pays. Additionally, the possibility of (73) indicates that the DOC with build can be construed as an event of self-benefaction. To be more specific, the agent who builds some good foundations and a stout wall or two is also the beneficiary who is able to make use of the results of that building event.

In one other DOC, the nature of the benefaction consists in pleasing the beneficiary. By accommodating an event of plain benefaction, the following thus violates the intended reception constraint:

74) ...it is talking of building him a memorial. (MAG)

The nature of benefaction in (74) is somewhat more ambiguous, since the indirect object referent cannot be interpreted as a possessor of a memorial. Neither is it possible for a theme as such to be transferred from one domain of possession to another. What is more, the building act is symbolic for the agent’s devotion to the beneficiary. In other words, by building someone a memorial, the agent attempts to honour and remember someone who has passed away. Even though the beneficiary is no longer among the living, he is nevertheless construed as capable of witnessing the symbolic act performed by the agent.

21 See the employment constraint proposed by Green (in Fellbaum, 2005:229)
bake

Ditransitive *bake* is attested only once in the BNC database and in accordance with the intended reception constraint, the example below encodes an event of **recipient benefaction**, i.e. where the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

75) *...I ordered cook to bake you an extra large one all for yourself.* (FIC)

The DOC in (75) denotes prospective possession of the theme by the indirect object referent and, as such, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme. That is to say, the indirect object referent will receive *an extra large one* and will be able to use that for further purposes, i.e. to eat it all by him/herself. The benefit thus consists in being able to make use of the results of the baking event as well as not having to partake in the baking event him/herself. Furthermore, the context of (75) in particular serves as evidence for Green’s (1974) proposal that the benefactive construction is more acceptable as a command: the cook is ordered to bake something for the indirect object referent.

cook

Ditransitive *cook* is attested 53 times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC denotes an event of **recipient benefaction**. Thus, conform to the intended reception constraint, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme in the following:

76) *She would cook them all a good breakfast...* (FIC)
77) *Geoff cooked him a pheasant.* (SPOK)
78) *Can you cook me a bonefish?* (FIC)
79) *...before we cooked them a typical English dinner...* (MISC)
80) *...he cooked her something to eat and he feeds her...* (SPOK)
81) *Then I shall cook you something delicious.* (FIC)
82) *I’m going to cook myself some lunch.* (FIC)
The notion of possession is very straightforward in (76-83), where a good breakfast, a pheasant, a bonefish, a typical English dinner, something to eat, something delicious, some lunch and some fresh green and root vegetables are transferred into the domain of possession of the indirect object referent. As such, without having to carry out the cooking event him/herself, the beneficiary is still able to make use of the result of the event, i.e. he/she will be able to enjoy a meal. Additionally, the possibility of (82-83) indicates that the DOC with cook can also be construed as an event of self-benefaction. That is to say, the beneficiary of the cooking event can be anybody, even the agent him/herself. As such, in (82) for instance, the agent is both the one who is doing the cooking and the one who will eventually be able to have some lunch.

\[ \text{knit} \]

Ditransitive knit is attested 16 times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction. In accordance with the intended reception constraint, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient in the following:

84) For Christmas she might knit him a sweater... (FIC)
85) You know how Mama knitted him the hose and muffler for Christmas? (FIC)
86) ...and so she took it upon herself to knit him something synthetic: (NEWS)

Examples (84-86) are very straightforward instances of how the DOC with knit denotes prospective possession of the theme by the indirect object referent. To be more specific, the indirect object referent will receive either a sweater, a hose and muffler and something synthetic once the agent has finished knitting those objects. Furthermore, the broader context of examples (84-85) highlights that the event can be regarded as involving two subevents. Because the agent intends to give the sweater or the hose and muffler as a Christmas present, the knitting necessarily precedes the transfer event. Additionally, the possibility of (86) indicates that with knit, the DOC can be construed as an event of self-benefaction. So, in a knitting event, the agent and the beneficiary can refer to the same person, i.e. the one who is knitting is also the one who receiving something synthetic.
3.3. Group 3: *create, dig, mint, design, produce, construct*

Table 3. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>BNC total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>create</td>
<td>140,223</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,091</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dig</td>
<td>15,927</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mint</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>52,591</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,451</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produce</td>
<td>83,608</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,594</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construct</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1. COCA

*create*

Ditransitive *create* is attested four times in the COCA database and in only one of those cases, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefaction. As such, the following example is the only instance of *create* which follows the intended reception constraint:

87) *figure out what exercises went with what and create themselves a work-out.* (ACAD)

In example (87) the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme and is able to make use of the result of the creation event. However, the theme in (87) cannot be interpreted as an entity transferred from one domain of possession to another. Rather, the notion of possession consists in having the created entity at one’s disposal for a particular purpose and for a certain amount of time. This means that the beneficiary will not actually receive a *work-out* in the literal sense of the words, but rather that the beneficiary will be able to participate in a few exercises. Additionally, the beneficiary and the agent are co-referential, i.e. the one creating a work-out is also the one benefitting from it. The DOC with *create* (87) is, in other words, construed as an event of self-benefaction.

The other three occurrences of *create* encode an event with an adversative effect on the indirect object referent. As such, the following examples are considered to be events of malefaction:

88) Hugh, 8th Lord Sommerville, a man with an’ unruly humour which *created him many troubles.* (MAG)
89) *She was start to create me a lot of problems.* (SPOK)
90) It would cost Texas $85,000 to create him a prison cell. (SPOK)

Examples (88-89) clearly have a negative outcome, since the denoted event creates many troubles and a lot of problems for the indirect object referent, who is therefore a maleficiary. Put differently, the actions of an agent result in difficulties on the side of the the maleficiary. The event in (90) is somewhat less straightforward because the creation of a prison cell is indicated to cost Texas $85,000. Therefore, the creation of the cell is not only affecting the maleficiary, but also the agent who will have to spend a lot of money. In addition, it is debatable whether the prison cell would actually by adversative or not, especially since the cost of the cell indicates an effort on behalf of the agent.

dig

Figure 8.a. Detailed results for dig in American English

Ditransitive dig is attested 41 times in the COCA database and in only 15 of those cases, the DOC adheres to the intended reception constraint by encoding an event of recipient benefaction. In the following examples, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

91) He dug her an estakhr behind the house, ... (FIC)
92) Knowing these folks, though, most likely they’d just dig themselves a fourth subbasement floor and keep on trucking. (FIC)
93) ...in the dry earth, he was able to dig himself a burrow, where he slept during the high heat of the day... (FIC)
94) ...before settling down in Denny’s district and digging herself this excellent den, (FIC)
95) “I dug you a fine grave, old boy,” I said. (FIC)
96) I won’t be able to dig her a grave; the ground is frozen hard as granite. (FIC)
97) Dig me a path tae the Underworld! (FIC)

The notion of possession is fairly straightforward in (91-94), since the indirect object referent will end up receiving something which is dug out by the agent. To be more specific, the agent in (91) will dig an estakhr behind the beneficiary’s house. As such, the beneficiary will be able to make use of the result of the digging event in that she will have a swimming pool at her disposal. Similarly, in (92-94) a fourth subbasement floor, a burrow and this excellent den are transferred into the possession of the beneficiary when the digging act is completed. Additionally, in (92-94) the beneficiary is construed as the agent him/herself instead of referring to some other person. In an event of self-benefaction as in
(93) for instance, the one carrying out the digging event is also the one benefitting from it, i.e. by receiving a burrow in which he can sleep during the high heat of the day.

The notion of possession is somewhat more stretched in (95-96) because the beneficiary does not refer to a person who is alive and able to experience the positive effects. In other words, when the beneficiary is deceased, he/she is not capable of benefiting from the results in a direct manner. However, as instances (95-96) indicate, people apparently do perform actions for the benefit of deceased or not-yet-born beneficiaries. In (92) for example, the digging of a grave is regarded as beneficial in the context of one last gesture for a deceased loved-one. As such, the beneficiary can be interpreted as the one who benefits from the events by receiving a fine grave.

The exact nature of the benefaction in (97) is somewhat more ambiguous, since there is no straightforward possessive relationship between the direct object and indirect object referent. To be more specific, the digging of a path cannot lead to the possession of that path or, in other words, a path cannot be transferred from one domain of possession to another. The only possible interpretation is that the beneficiary will be able to walk the path once it it finished and, as such, that the beneficiary is capable of engaging with the theme without being a genuine recipient. Something previously unavailable to the beneficiary is made available after the digging act, which can therefore be interpreted as involving a subsequent transfer of possession.

However, in 26 of the 41 double object clauses, the DOC with dig encodes an event with undesirable consequences for the indirect object referent. The following examples are to be interpreted as events of malefaction:

98) And now they have dug themselves such a hole, that it's not going to work. (SPOK)
99) ...but it's not going to go away because we've dug ourselves a deep hole. (SPOK)
100) Just be careful not to dig yourself a bigger hole than you started with. (NEWS)
101) But Mel Gibson sure has dug himself a deep hole. (MAG)
102) Consumers just keep digging themselves a bigger, deeper hole. (NEWS)
103) ...that Mr. Bush has dug himself a hole that he can’t get out of. (SPOK)
104) So what’s this nonsense about digging yourself a grave? (FIC)
105) The Democrats have been digging themselves a political grave... (NEWS)

In (98-103) it is very clear that the act of digging a hole does not entail a benefit for the indirect object referent, who is therefore interpreted as a maleficiary. In (101) for example, Mel Gibson has dug himself a deep hole, which refers to a situation where this man experiences problems that are very difficult to resolve. Interestingly enough, all these malefactive situations with the verb dig seem to

---

22 For more info on the constraints on the semantics of the beneficiary, see Fellbaum (2005:226-229)
23 Song (2010) would categorize this as engager-beneficiary. The present expresses the same idea, but does not distinguish between genuine recipient beneficiaries and engager-beneficiaries, i.e. the latter is simply interpreted as an extension of the former.
constitute events of self-benefaction. Thus, in a situation where one is adversely affected by the digging of a hole, it is often the maleficiary him/herself who is responsible.

Examples (104-105) are interesting because the digging of a grave is interpreted as having negative consequences for the indirect object referent. In contrast with (95-96) where the digging of a grave is considered to be beneficial, the same situation is now adversely affecting the indirect object referent. This difference in meaning could be attributed to the fact that in (104-105), the indirect object referents are still alive and, therefore, would not benefit from a grave. Especially in (105), it is clear that the digging of a political grave is not literal, but refers to a difficult situation where a politician has made a mistake from which it is not easy to recover. Similar to the previous examples, these are events of self-benefaction, highlighting the fact that the one responsible for the difficulties, is also the one experiencing those difficulties.

\[ mint \]

\[ \text{Figure 9.a. Detailed results for } mint \text{ in American English} \]

Ditransitive \( mint \) is not attested in the COCA database.

\[ design \]

\[ \text{Figure 10.a. Detailed results for } design \text{ in American English} \]

Ditransitive \( design \) is attested eleven times in the COCA database and in all those instances, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction. For the following examples this means that, in accordance with the intended reception constraint, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

106) \( I \text{ would appreciate it if you would } design \text{ me a dog house} \ldots \) (FIC)
107) \( "I'\text{ll } design \text{ you a wardrobe,}" \text{ he said, and he got a pencil and began.} \) (FIC)
108) \( \text{But you get somebody like Step Fletcher to } design \text{ you some real software} \ldots \) (FIC)
109) Tony, an architect, designed us a little home on stilts... (NEWS)
110) ...as a design scientist, I would design them a bridge... (MAG)
111) Animators at Industrial Light and Magic designed him a limb... (SPOK)
112) When he asked Maybeck to design him a house a year after that disaster (ACAD)

The indirect object referent in (106-113) is clearly involved as the prospective possessor of the theme. In (106-107) for instance, the beneficiary comes to possess a dog house and a wardrobe, once those entities are designed. Furthermore, in the DOC with design it is not only implied that the theme will be designed, but also that the design becomes reality, i.e. that the designed objects will come into existence. The beneficiary, then, is able to make use of the result of the designing event in that he/she is now in the possession of the design of a dog house or a wardrobe and can make further concrete plans for the realization of that design. The examples in (108-113) encode a similar situation of prospective possession of the theme by the beneficiary. In addition, these examples also denote a very specific relationship between the agent in a designing event and the beneficiary in the subsequent transfer event. That is to say, by virtue of being a designer, the agent is employed by the beneficiary to design him/her a particular object, e.g. Step Fletcher and Tony, an architect in (108-109) are hired by the beneficiary. The beneficiary is, in other words, the customer and therefore the eventual owner of the product of the designing event.

produce

Ditransitive produce is attested only once in the COCA database and, by encoding an event of recipient benefaction, the DOC remains true to the intended reception constraint. As such, in the following example the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

113) ...they’re likely to demand somebody to produce them a good or a service. (SPOK)

The notion of possession is very straightforward in (113) since the beneficiary is interpreted as the prospective possessor of a good or a service produced by the agent. The produced entity is, in other words, transferred from one domain of possession to another. As such, the benefit consists in being able to make use of the result of the producing event, i.e. having a good or a service at your disposal, as well as not having to partake in that particular event yourself.
Ditransitive *construct* is attested two times in the COCA database and in both cases, the DOC encodes an event of **recipient benefaction**. Because the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme in the following examples are in accordance with the intended reception constraint:

114) *I will merely construct us a snow cave, in which we will be nice and comfey (MAG)*

115) *...to construct herself a structure out of the heap of building materials. (FIC)*

The notion of possession in (114-115) consists in the beneficiary’s possession of the theme, once it is constructed. In (114) for example, the benefaction consists in the indirect object referent being capable of making use of the result of the construction event. To be more specific, because the agent constructs a snow cave, the beneficiary will end up having shelter and will be nice and comfey. A similar situation is denoted in (115), where the beneficiary will end up having a structure out of the heap of building materials at her disposal. Additionally, the agent and the beneficiary are referring to the same person, which makes this an event of self-benefaction. That is to say, in (115) the one who is constructing a structure, is also the one for whom the structure is intended.

3.3.2. BNC

Ditransitive *create* is not attested in the BNC database.
Ditransitive *dig* is attested five times in the BNC database but in only two of the five attestations, the DOC adheres to the intended reception constraint by encoding an event of **recipient benefaction**. In the following examples, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

116) *My husband spent the evening before digging her a grave.* (MAG)

117) *…so that to get out of the pump, we had to dig ourselves a path.* (FIC)

In (116), the notion of possession is not completely transparent, since the indirect object referent is not alive and therefore not able to make use of the result of the action carried out by the agent. However, as example (116) indicates, people apparently do perform actions for the benefit of deceased beneficiaries. Especially the act of digging a grave for a loved-one can be regarded as beneficial and, in this context, the grave can be interpreted as the beneficiary’s possession.

The exact nature of the benefaction in (117) is even more ambiguous, because there is no straightforward possessive relationship between the direct object and indirect object referent. To be more specific, the digging of a path cannot lead to the possession of that path or, in other words, a path cannot be transferred from one domain of possession to another. It is possible, however, to interpret the beneficiary as being able to engage with the theme, i.e. being able to walk the path. As such, without having to be a genuine recipient, the beneficiary in (117) is constructed as the one to whom something previously unavailable is now made available, through digging. Additionally, the fact that agent and beneficiary in (117) are co-referential, indicates that with *dig*, the DOC can be construed as an event of self-benefaction.

In three of the five double object clauses, on the other hand, the DOC encodes an event of **malefaction** rather than benefaction. In the following, the indirect object referent is adversely affected by the events:

118) *We’ve dug ourselves a pretty big hole and it’s getting dark down there.* (NEWS)

119) *Royle refused, so City and Swales, having dug themselves a large hole, returned to Kendall and agreed to his terms.* (NEWS)

120) *Are they not digging themselves a grave?* (MISC)
In (118-119) it is clear that the act of digging a hole does not entail a benefit for the indirect object referent, who is therefore interpreted as a maleficiary rather than a beneficiary. In (119), the fact that City and Swales dug themselves a large hole, leaves them no other possibility than to return and agree to the terms of Kendall. The context of this situation thus highlights the negative effect an action as such may have on the indirect object referent, i.e. it immobilises the maleficiary. Additionally, examples (118-119) show that with dig, the beneficiary and the agent can refer to the same person. That is to say, in an event of self-benefaction, the one experiencing the negative effect of the event is also the one responsible for the digging.

Example (120) illustrates how the total semantic configuration is important in defining the nature of the effect bestowed upon the indirect object referent. While digging a grave was interpreted as being beneficial in (116), the opposite holds for (120). This difference in meaning can be attributed to the fact that in (120) the indirect object referents are alive and thus would not benefit from a grave. Additionally, (120) shows that the participant who is affected by the digging of a grave, is also the one who is carrying out the digging. In such an event of self-benefaction, the DOC with dig, in other words, codes the agent and the beneficiary as co-referential.

**mint**

Ditransitive mint is not attested in the BNC database.

**design**

Ditransitive design is not attested in the BNC database.
Ditransitive *produce* is attested only once in the BNC database and, in accordance with the intended reception constraint, the DOC encodes an event of **recipient benefaction**. This means that in the following example, the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

121) “I can produce you a great paper,” he drawled. (MISC)

In (121), the notion of possession is fairly straightforward, since the indirect object referent is also the prospective possessor of a great paper, once it is produced. As such, the beneficiary will be able to make use of the result of the producing event, for example by submitting the paper in his/her own name and by receiving a positive evaluation. From a slightly different perspective, this situation can also be interpreted as an act of performance in which the beneficiary acts as the experiencer. This would imply that the beneficiary is able to read and enjoy the paper, but in contrast with the other interpretation, would not actually possess the paper. Thus, however strong the notion of possession is present in this particular event, depends on the broader context of the expression.

Ditransitive *construct* is attested only once in the BNC database and, conform to the intended reception constraint, the DOC encodes an event of **recipient benefaction**. In the following, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme:

122) To keep herself from sleep...She constructed herself a bed so excruciatingly painful that although she was very generous, she never placed herself upon it without trembling and shuddering. (MISC)
The transfer of possession is unambiguous in (122), where the indirect object referent can be interpreted as the prospective possessor of a bed, once it is constructed. In other words, the beneficiary has the bed at her disposal for a particular purpose. The nature of this purpose, on the other hand, is somewhat more ambiguous in that it consists in not being able to sleep: instead of making the bed as comfortable as possible, the bed is constructed with the intention of being excruciatingly painful. However, within this particular context, the beneficiary wants to keep herself from sleep. As such, the situation of having an excruciatingly painful bed at one’s disposal is to be interpreted as being beneficial. Additionally, this is an event of self-benefaction in which the agent and the beneficiary are co-referential.

3.4. Group 4: perform, play, sing, paint, recite

Table 4. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>BNC total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perform</td>
<td>47,624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>214,912</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>36,482</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>47,468</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint</td>
<td>26,546</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recite</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1. COCA

perform

Figure 13.a. Detailed results for perform in American English

Ditransitive perform is not attested in the COCA database.

play

Figure 14.a. Detailed results for play in American English
Ditransitive *play* is attested 220 times in the COCA database and in 214 of those cases, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme, however, only metaphorically. In the DOC with the verb *play*, the transferred entity is of a more abstract nature and, as such, the double object clause is considered to encode non-prototypical transfer. Therefore, the following examples extend the intended reception constraint to include metaphorical recipients:

123)  *He played me some music...* (SPOK)
124)  *We’re going to play you that tape and much more, coming up.* (SPOK)
125)  *I played her a tape of his voice.* (FIC)
126)  *I want to play you what Richard Heene had to say about the balloon.* (SPOK)
127)  *Katherine, I want to play you one last thing.* (SPOK)

All the examples in (123-127) involve a non-prototypical transfer of possession where the beneficiary does not end up possessing the theme, but rather is to be interpreted as the addressee of the playing event. In (123) for instance, there is an event in which the agent plays some music for the indirect object referent, who is therefore the experiencer of that event. The beneficiary is thus involved as the metaphorical recipient of the music. Also in (124-127), it is the beneficiary’s perception of that tape and much more, a tape of his voice, what Richard Heene had to say about the balloon and one last thing, which constitutes a kind of possession.

In two of the 220 double object clauses, on the other hand, the intended reception constraint is violated to include events of plain benefaction. As such, there is no transfer of possession implied in the DOC in the following examples:

128)  *You know scales? # Yessuh. Some. # Well, play me a B-flat scale on there, up two octaves and back.* (FIC)
129)  *Now play me a C chord.* (FIC)

There is a clear demonstrative interpretation involved in (128-129), i.e. the agent is asked to demonstrate his/her musical skills by playing a B-flat scale or a C chord. As such, there is nothing made available for the beneficiary nor is there a concrete transfer of possession. Rather, the beneficiary is considered to be the witness of some kind of noteworthy act performed by the agent. Situations as such can be paraphrased as “Show me that you can play...”.

In another four cases, the DOC with *play* encodes an event of malefaction rather than benefaction. In the examples below, the indirect object referent is adversely affected by the events:

130)  ‘*You would not play me such a scurvy turn.*’ (FIC)
131)  ‘*Fitz, are you playing me a joke, because it’s a damned poor one.*’ (FIC)
132)  *She grew almost happy to think how her memory had played her a trick.* (FIC)
133)  *Madame she played you a terrible trick.* (FIC)
The playing events in (130-133) clearly have undesirable consequences for the indirect object referent. The situation in (130-133) is to be interpreted as one of deceit, i.e. where the playing of a scurvy turn, a joke, and a trick on someone results in that particular person being deceived. In (133) for instance, the fact that her memory plays her a trick, refers to a situation in which the affected person incorrectly believes something has happened in the past and, consequently, is confused in the present.

\[ \textit{sing} \]

![Figure 15](image)

Ditransitive \textit{sing} is attested 119 times in the COCA database database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of \textbf{recipient benefaction} in which the beneficiary is metaphorically involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The DOC with the verb \textit{sing}, does not encode a prototypical transfer, because the theme is a non-physical entity. Therefore, the following examples extend the intended reception constraint to include metaphorical recipients:

134) \textit{He sang me some songs and took off.} (SPOK)  
135) \textit{...but from now on, I’m not singing them another note.} (FIC)  
136) \textit{I had to rock her to sleep and sing her some lullabies.} (SPOK)  
137) \textit{Maybe I sing him a lullaby my mama sang to me when I was a little girl.} (FIC)  
138) \textit{I tuck Christopher in under the blanket I knitted him, sing him a lullaby.} (FIC)  
139) \textit{Get out there and sing me a song, Dance me a dance.} (SPOK)  
140) \textit{I would play you, sing you one last song, if I could.} (FIC)  
141) \textit{...a planet where the plants sing her a welcome.} (FIC)  
142) \textit{...that no one would ever come to greet and sing you a safe journey...} (FIC)

The beneficiary in (134-142) is to be interpreted as the experiencer of the singing event carried out by the agent. In (136) for instance, the agent is the one singing some lullabies and the beneficiary is the metaphorical recipient of those lullabies. In this particular situation, it is clear that the indirect object referent benefits from the singing event, i.e. singing some lullabies soothes the beneficiary and makes it easier to fall asleep. In (141-142) on the other hand, the metaphorical dimension is even more apparent, because the theme is not only something which has to be experienced or perceived, but also something conveying a particular message. Through the medium of song, the beneficiary in (141-142) receives a welcome, i.e. the message that she is welcome, or a save journey, i.e. the wish to have a safe journey.
Ditransitive *paint* is attested 24 times in the COCA database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of **recipient benefaction** in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. Therefore, the following examples adhere to the intended reception constraint:

143) “He **painted us a picture.**” (FIC)
144) *He desires to paint you the dreamiest, shadiest, quietest, most enchanting bit of romantic landscape* (FIC)
145) *We commissioned Trotter to **paint us a fake.*** (SPOK)

There is a fairly transparent notion of possession in (143-145), since the indirect object referent is involved as the prospective possessor of the theme, once it is painted. In other words, the agent who carries out the painting event, does so with the intention of giving the painted entity to the beneficiary. The beneficiary in (143) for example, is the one who comes to possess a picture painted by the agent. However, this can also be interpreted in the context of describing a particular situation to some other person. While there is no literal transfer in this sense, the notion of possession nevertheless holds, i.e. what is transferred is a mental picture rather than a physical one. In the context of a physical painting then, the benefit consists in receiving what is painted as well as not having to partake in the painting event oneself. In (145) for instance, the beneficiary commissions Trotter, who is therefore the painter, to paint a fake. In the context where such a painting is commissioned, the beneficiary’s possession of a fake is considered to be beneficial.

*recite*
Ditransitive *recite* is attested only once in the COCA database and encodes an event of **recipient benefaction** in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme, however, only metaphorically. In the DOC with the verb *recite*, the transferred entity is a non-physical entity. In this non-prototypical transfer, the following extends the intended reception constraint to include metaphorical recipients:

146) “Recite me some of your poetry,” I suggested, hoping to cheer him up. (FIC)

It is not possible to interpret the beneficiary in (146) as the possessor of *some of your poetry*. In an event as such, the beneficiary behaves more like an experiencer for whom the poetry is recited. Therefore, it is not the theme itself, but the beneficiary’s perception of the reciting that constitutes a kind of possession.

3.4.2. BNC

*perform*

Figure 13.b. Detailed results for *perform* in British English

Ditransitive *perform* is not attested in the BNC database.

*play*

Figure 14.b. Detailed results for *play* in British English

Ditransitive *play* is attested 28 times in the BNC database and in 26 of those cases, the DOC encodes an event of **recipient benefaction** in which the beneficiary is metaphorically involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The DOC with the verb *play*, thus encodes a non-prototypical transfer of a non-physical entity. Therefore, the following examples extend the intended reception constraint to include metaphorical recipients:
In (147-151) there is no prototypical transfer of possession involved, i.e. there is no concrete entity transferred into the possession of the beneficiary, nor is there anything made available for a particular purpose. Moreover, as the experiencer of the playing event, the beneficiary is involved as the metaphorical recipient of the theme. As the audience of a tune or the Nirvana album they’ve never heard in (149-150) for instance, the beneficiary is the addressee of the playing event. As such, it is the perception of the beneficiary which constitutes a kind of possession.

In another two cases, the DOC with play encodes an event of malefaction rather than benefaction. In the following, the indirect object referent is adversely affected by the events:

152) “To play us such a trick: # After we’ve brought you so far,... (NON-ACAD)
153) ...we – played him a dirty trick,.... (SPOK)

The playing event in (152-153) has an undesirable consequence for the indirect object referent. In (152) for instance, it is clear that the maleficiary is negatively affected by the actions of the agent. That is to say, by playing such a trick, the agent deludes those who have helped him before. A similar situation is denoted in (153), where the adjective preceding the theme further highlights the nature of the event, i.e. it is not just a trick, but a dirty trick.

sing

Ditransitive sing is attested eleven times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme, however, only metaphorically. That is to say, the DOC with sing does not encode a prototypical transfer, because the theme is a non-physical entity. Therefore, the following examples extend the intended reception constraint to include metaphorical recipients:

154) Mr. Billy Bayswater will now sing you a song. (FIC)
155) I’ll sing you a song. (FIC)
156) I’ll sing you a song, mates. (FIC)
157) So long as they sing me that sheet melody... (FIC)
158) ...you only had to sing him a snatch of any symphony or concerto... (MISC)

In (154-158), the indirect object referent is the metaphorical recipient of the theme, i.e. that which is sang by the agent. As such, the beneficiary is to be interpreted as the experiencer of the singing event and similarly, it is the audience’s perception which constitutes some kind of possession. In (154) for instance, Mr. Billy Bayswater is the one who is singing a song and the beneficiary is the metaphorical recipient of that particular song. Also in (155-158), the beneficiary is construed as the experiencer of a song, that sheet melody and a snatch of any symphony or concerto.

Figure 16.b. Detailed results for paint in British English

Ditransitive *paint* is attested four times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. Therefore, the following examples are in accordance with the intended reception constraint:

159) Paint *us* a picture yeah? (SPOK)
160) “I could paint you an exact copy,” I said gently... (FIC)
161) Does anyone know of a signwriter who could paint *me* a decent menu board for my catering trailer? (MISC)
162) I’m gon na sit right down and paint *myself* an abstract... (MISC)

The examples in (159-162) describe a situation where a picture, an exact copy, a decent menu board and an abstract are transferred into the domain of possession of the beneficiary, once those object are painted. This means that there are two subevents taking place, i.e. a painting event and a transfer event. As the prospective possessor of the theme, the beneficiary is only involved in the latter. Additionally, (162) shows that the beneficiary can be anybody, also the agent him/herself. In a self-benefactive painting event as such, the agent is both the one who paints an abstract as the one whom is intended to receive that entity.
Ditransitive *recite* is not attested in the BNC database.

3.5. Group 5: *prepare, pour, iron, wash, clean, clear*

Table 5. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA</th>
<th></th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>56.342</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.185</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour</td>
<td>22.374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash</td>
<td>18.721</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>21.715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>21.922</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.094</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1. COCA

*prepare*

Ditransitive *prepare* is attested 24 times in the COCA database and in all those instances, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the examples below conform to the intended reception constraint:

163) “May I prepare you some tea?” (FIC)
164) She prepared him a fresh pot of coffee… (FIC)
165) She prepared him a surprise dinner… (FIC)
166) “Would you mind waiting while I prepare her something?” (FIC)
167) He wants to prepare himself another sandwich... (FIC)
168) Hunger gnawed at her, and she moved quickly to prepare herself a meal (FIC)
The DOC in (163-168) describes an event in which an agent acts on an entity so that it is prepared for use or consumption. The indirect object referent in those situations, is the one for whom the prepared entity is made available. The notion of possession is, in other words, relatively straightforward, since the beneficiary is construed as the prospective possessor of the prepared theme. In (163-165) for instance, the agent prepares some tea, a fresh pot of coffee and a surprise dinner for the beneficiary, i.e. the one who receives the theme and is able to use it for further purposes. Additionally, as examples (167-168) show, the beneficiary in a preparing situation can be anybody, even the agent him/herself. In (167) for instance, the DOC with prepare denotes an event of self-benefaction in which the one who is preparing another sandwich, is also the one who receives that entity.

**pour**

Figure 19.a. Detailed results for pour in American English

Ditransitive pour is attested 1.235 times in the COCA database and in all those cases, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the examples below adhere to the intended reception constraint:

169) “Can I pour you a glass of wine?” (MAG)
170) “Can I pour you one, too?” (FIC)
171) He poured her some white wine before drawing away. (FIC)
172) Poor me, poor me, pour me another drink. (SPOK)
173) Worthington pours them each a cup of tea and then… (FIC)
174) Hook poured himself another cup of coffee and lit a cigarette. (FIC)
175) Barry sat and poured himself a cup. (FIC)
176) Kate poured herself more wine. (FIC)
177) Margot pours herself a glass of wine. (FIC)
178) He gets up to pour himself another bourbon. (FIC)

The notion of possession is very straightforward in (169-178) where the indirect object referent is construed as the one for whom some kind of liquid substance is poured. To be more specific, in (171-174) the agent pours some white wine, another drink, a cup of tea and another cup of coffee with the intention of transferring those entities into the possession of the beneficiary. The intended transfer is unambiguous in a context of food provision and preparation, since the theme is as such that it can be received and used for a particular purpose, i.e. it is implied that the beneficiary will drink it. Additionally, examples (174-178) illustrate that this situation can also be construed as an event of self-
benefaction. In (177) for instance, the agent and beneficiary are co-referential, which means that Margot is both the one who is pouring a glass of wine and the one who will drink that wine.

iron

Figure 20.a. Detailed results for iron in American English

Ditransitive iron is attested only once in the COCA database and encodes an event of recipient benefaction. However, due to the fact that the theme already belongs to the beneficiary prior to the ironing event, the intended reception constraint is extended to include a situation of re-possession in the example below:

179)  My woman always ironed me a new suit to wear. (FIC)

In (179), there is no intended transfer in the strict sense of the word, because the indirect object referent is already in the possession of the theme. To be more specific, a new suit already belonged to the beneficiary before the ironing event took place. On the other hand, as a result of the ironing event, something previously unavailable is now made available to the beneficiary. That is to say, the suit is now in a better condition, i.e. ironed and ready to wear instead of creased. As such, there is a transfer of possession under the broader interpretation that the beneficiary comes to re-possess the theme as a result of the ironing act carried out by the agent.

wash

Figure 21.a. Detailed results for wash in American English

Ditransitive wash is not attested in the COCA database.
**clean**

Ditransitive *clean* is not attested in the COCA database.

**clear**

Ditransitive *clear* is attested six times in the COCA database and in all those cases, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefaction in which the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the following adheres to the intended reception constraint:

180) *Try to clear us a path to the ship.* (FIC)
181) *Brian nodded politely but couldn’t go any farther without clearing himself a path first.* (FIC)
182) *…and so she cleared herself a path…* (FIC)
183) *“Go on, dog. Move’em out of here. Clear me a road.”* (NEWS)
184) *Other passengers start to clear them a wide berth…* (FIC)
185) *We had to clear ourselves a spot on which to sit.* (FIC)

In (180-185), the indirect object referent is construed as the prospective possessor of the theme, however not unambiguously. That is to say, the beneficiary cannot actually come to possess a *path* or *a road* (182-183). On the other hand, through the act of clearing, something previously unavailable to the beneficiary is now made available. To be more specific, in (180) for instance, as a result of the clearing act carried out by the agent, a *path to the ship* is made available to the beneficiary. This makes the beneficiary a possessor under the interpretation that they have a *path* at their disposal for a particular purpose, i.e. to board the ship. Similarly, in (185) the phrase *on which to sit* specifies how the beneficiary becomes the possessor of a *spot* as a result of the clearing act carried out by the agent.
3.5.2. BNC

*prepare*

Ditransitive *prepare* is attested ten times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC encodes an event of *recipient benefaction* in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the following examples conform to the intended reception constraint:

186) *In the kitchen his congaie began preparing him another drink…* (FIC)
187) *“Could you possibly prepare me a John Collins Mr Nelmes,”* (FIC)
188) *…chef usually prepares them something* (MISC)
189) *Visit your lady, and then I will prepare you some easement.* (FIC)
190) *The record company prepared her an exhaustive schedule which…* (MAG)
191) *God the Father prepared him a body…* (MISC)
192) *She dragged herself from the sofa and listlessly prepared herself some lunch,* (FIC)
193) *…while trying to prepare himself a hamburger,…* (MISC)

The notion of possession is relatively straightforward in (186-192), where the indirect object referent is construed as the prospective possessor of the theme, i.e. the one for whom the prepared entity is made available. In (186-187) for instance, the agent prepares *another drink* or *a John Collins* with the intention that the beneficiary receives that prepared entity and will be able to enjoy it. In such contexts, the theme of the event implies that it can be received and used for further purposes, i.e. it will be consumed by the beneficiary. However, other themes that do not belong to the context of food preparation and provision, such as *some easement, an exhaustive schedule* and *a body* as in (189-191), easily fit into the DOC with *prepare*. Additionally, as examples (191-192) indicate, this event can also be construed as one of self-benefaction, i.e. where the beneficiary and the agent are co-referential.

*pour*

Figure 18.b. Detailed results for *prepare* in British English

Figure 19.b. Detailed results for *pour* in British English
Ditransitive *pour* is attested 265 times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC denotes an event of *recipient benefaction* in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the following adheres to the intended reception constraint:

194) Can I *pour you* another cup of tea Ian? (SPOK)
195) Shall I *pour you* a cup of tea? (FIC)
196) She *poured me* a second cup of coffee. (FIC)
197) *Pour me* some Madeira and say a prayer yourself. (FIC)
198) “*Pour me* some Evian.” (FIC)
199) I *poured him* another glass. (MISC)
200) Alex *poured herself* another glass of wine and sipped it slowly,… (FIC)
201) He *poured himself* some wine and went over to the fire to drink it. (FIC)
202) He *poured himself* another amber liquid from a thick cut-glass decanter. (FIC)
203) He *poured himself* a double Scotch from the antique drinks cabinet. (FIC)
204) Laura told Ross now as he *poured himself* a cool drink. (FIC)
205) …by all means come and *pour yourself* one! (FIC)

In (194-205), the beneficiary is construed as the one for whom the theme is poured out. In other words, as the prospective possessor of a cup of tea, a second cup of coffee, some Madeira and some Evian, the beneficiary in (195-198) will end up receiving those entities by instigation of the agent. The intended transfer is straightforward, because the theme in those situations is as such that it can be received and used for a particular purpose, i.e. it is implied that the beneficiary will drink it.

Additionally, examples (200-205) show that in a context of food preparation and provision, it is possible for the beneficiary to be anybody, even the agent him/herself. As in (200) for instance, Alex is not only the one who pours another glass of wine, but also the one who “sipped it slowly”.

![Figure 20.b. Detailed results for iron in British English](image)

Ditransitive *iron* is attested only once in the BNC database and encodes an event of *recipient benefaction*. However, because the beneficiary is already in possession of the theme prior to the denoted event, the intended reception constraint is extended to include a situation of re-possession in the following:

206) …*got out your ironing board and your iron and ironed himself a hanky*. (SPOK)
The notion of possession is stretched considerably in (206), since the indirect object referent is already in possession of the theme. That is to say, a hanky cannot be transferred into the possession of the beneficiary, when the beneficiary is already the owner of that hanky. On the other hand, as a result of the ironing event, something previously unavailable to the beneficiary is now made available in the sense that the hanky is now in a better condition. As such, this situation denotes re-possession of the hanky, which is ironed and therefore made available to the beneficiary.

**wash**

![Diagram for wash](image1)

**Figure 21.b. Detailed results for wash in British English**

Ditransitive *wash* is not attested in the BNC database.

**clean**

![Diagram for clean](image2)

**Figure 22.b. Detailed results for clean in British English**

Ditransitive *clean* is not attested times in the BNC database.

**clear**

![Diagram for clear](image3)

**Figure 23.b. Detailed results for clear in British English**
Ditransitive *clear* is attested only once in the BNC database and denotes an event of **recipient benefaction** in which the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the example below is in accordance with the intended reception constraint:

207) *... to clear himself some political space.* (NON-ACAD)

The indirect object referent in (207) is involved as the prospective possessor of the theme, however under a broader interpretation of that notion. That is to say, the beneficiary cannot actually come to possess *some political space*, nor is it possible to transfer that entity from one domain of possession to another. On the other hand, through the act of clearing, something previously unavailable to the beneficiary is now made available, i.e. some room for political actions and debate. This makes the beneficiary a possessor under the interpretation that he has *some political space* at his disposal for a particular purpose. Additionally, this example shows that the beneficiary and the agent can be co-referential in such a context or, in other words, that the DOC with *clear* can be construed as an event of self-benefaction. This means that the agent carrying out the clearing act is also the one for whom the theme is now available.

3.6. Group 6: *peel, open, hit, kill*

Table 6. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA</th>
<th>BNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peel</td>
<td>8,484</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>127,308</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit</td>
<td>84,891</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>106,377</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.1. COCA

*peel*

Ditransitive *peel* is attested four times in the COCA database and in three of those instances, the DOC denotes an event of **recipient benefaction** in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the following examples adhere to the intended reception constraint:

![Figure 24.a. Detailed results for peel in American English](image-url)
208) Peel me an egg, would you, Mrs. Hayes? (FIC)
209) I peel her an apple... (NEWS)
210) ...offered to peel me an apple. (FIC)

The event in (208-210) describes a situation where the beneficiary will end up with the theme, i.e. the peeled product. In other words, as a result of action carried out by the agent, an egg or an apple is made available to the beneficiary. In (208) for instance, the indirect object referent will end up receiving an egg as the result of the peeling act carried out by Mrs. Hayes.

In one other case, the DOC with peel does not imply that the theme will be transferred into the possession of the beneficiary. Rather, the event is of a more symbolic nature, carried out with the intention to please or amuse the beneficiary. As such, the following example violates the intended reception constraint to accommodate an event of plain benefaction:

211) ‘Beulah, peel me a grape!’ (MAG)

In (211), there is no straightforward notion of possession, not even under a broad interpretation. In contrast to the peeling of an apple or an egg, the peeling of a grape cannot be interpreted as involving a subsequent transfer of possession. This is because a grape almost has no peel, and an action as such would be redundant. In (211) for instance, the agent, Beulah, is the servant of the beneficiary and the request to peel a grape serves only to highlight the superiority of the beneficiary as the mistress. In other words, when the servant peels the grape, she demonstrates her obedience towards her mistress. As such, the benefaction consists in pleasing and amusing the beneficiary, without a subsequent transfer of possession.

open

![Diagram]

Figure 25.a. Detailed results for open in American English

Ditransitive open is attested four times in the COCA database and in all those cases, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefactions because the theme is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The following examples thus conform to the intended reception constraint:

212) ...and open yourself a beer. (FIC)
213) Bailey opens himself a beer... (FIC)
214) He opened himself a beer... (MAG)
215) I will open us a gate. (FIC).

The notion of possession is relatively straightforward in (212-214), where the beneficiary is construed as the intended recipient of the theme, a beer. In this particular context, the opening of a beer leads to the beneficiary being able to drink that beer. As such, it is possible to interpret the denoted event as consisting of two subevents: one where an agent opens the beer, and a subsequent one where the opened bottle of beer is transferred into the possession of the indirect object referent. What is more, the agent and the beneficiary in (212-214) are co-referential and as such, the DOC with open denotes an event of self-benefaction. In (213) for instance, this means that Bailey is both the one who opens a beer as the one who will be able to drink the beer.

The exact nature of the benefaction is somewhat more ambiguous in (215) because it is difficult to construe the beneficiary as the prospective possessor of the theme, a gate. The outcome of this particular event is not that the indirect object referent comes to possess the gate, but rather that it is made available for a particular purpose. That is to say, through the act of opening a gate, the beneficiary is able to benefit from the result, i.e. gain access to what is behind the gate.

hit

Ditransitive hit is attested 17 times in the COCA database and in four of those cases, the DOC encodes an event of recipient benefaction. This means that the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme. The examples below thus adhere to the intended reception constraint:

216) He kept his big serve in his racket bag and hit her some soft lobs. (NEWS)
217) ... and hit him a few grounders. (NEWS)
218) I’ll hit you some (FIC)
219) I’ll hit you some (FIC)

Examples (216-219) describe a situation in which the beneficiary is also the prospective possessor of the theme. That is to say, through the act of hitting something, the indirect object referent ends up receiving the direct object. In (216) for instance, the agent hits some soft lobs and, as a result of that action, the beneficiary receives those soft lobs. Also in (217) the beneficiary is to be interpreted as the recipient of a few grounders. In all of the examples above, the hitting is not simply a means to an end, because then, the indirect object referent would function as more prototypical recipient. The fact that
the hitting event is construed as one where the agent carries out the act of hitting with the intention of pleasing the indirect object referent (e.g. in the context of a game), enhances the beneficiary reading.

In two other instances the verb *hit* does not imply a subsequent transfer of possession. In the following, the intended reception constraint is violated to encode *plain benefaction*, i.e. where the benefaction consists in pleasing or entertaining the indirect object referent:

220) “Sushi, *hit me a six*.” (FIC)
221) “...it’s all down again and I can’t *hit him a lick.*” (FIC)

The exact nature of the benefaction in (220-221) is more difficult to define and is specific to the context. In (220-221) the act of hitting does not lead to the beneficiary’s possession of the theme. What is more, the agent’s actions are to be interpreted as symbolic of the devotion to the beneficiary. In (220) for instance, it is clear that *a six* does not end up in the possession of the beneficiary. Rather, this takes place in a gambling context, where the desired act of hitting a six, would result in the beneficiary winning the game. As such, the benefaction consists in pleasing the beneficiary, who is construed as the witness of the hitting event carried out by the agent. Similarly, in (221) the beneficiary is the one who is pleased by the actions of the agent. By hitting *a lick*, it is implied that the agent gains a large profit in a short amount of time and, by doing so, is able to demonstrate his/her devotion to the beneficiary.

However, in the majority of the cases, the DOC with *hit* encodes an event of *malefaction* rather than benefaction. This means that in the following eleven examples, the indirect object referent is adversely affected by the events:

222) *I hit him a sharp one on his nose,*... (FIC)
223) “...and then they just start *hitting me one right after another*...” (SPOK)
224) *I almost told Cara I’d hit her one.* (NEWS)
225) “...he’d just *hit them one*” (SPOK)
226) Dat mean ole Harvey musta *hit her somethin’ awful, an in de face, too.* (FIC)
227) *Man, I hit him a good shot.* (NEWS)
228) “...and hit him a right uppercut,...” (FIC)
229) *We felt if we hit them a good, big whop, they’ll do something* (NEWS)
230) “...darabahu darban’ he hit him a hitting, that is, he hit him hard.” (ACAD)
231) “...hitting him a wicked two-handed blow just beneath the breastplate.” (FIC)
232) *Black Coda steps aside and hits him a terrible blow on the back.* (FIC)

It is clear that in (222-232) the agent has no intention to please the indirect object referent. To be more specific, when the agent hits the indirect object referent *one*, as in (222-225), this refers to a punch or a hit. As a verb of contact by impact (Levin, 1993), *hit* inherently denotes a situation where someone is adversely affected by the action carried out by the agent, i.e. the hitter. Example (230), where the agent hits the maleficiary *a hitting*, for example, illustrates how the theme is part of the semantic frame of the verb. The explanatory compound clause *that is, he hit him hard* further highlights the
impact of the effect bestowed upon the indirect object referent. Similarly, the adjectives preceding the theme in (231-232), i.e. a wicked two-handed blow and a terrible blow, serve to underscore the negative effect such an action may have on the maleficiary.

\[ \text{kill} \]

Figure 27.a. Detailed results for kill in American English

Ditransitive kill is attested nine times in the COCA database and in eight of those cases, the DOC denotes an event of **recipient benefaction**. Because the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme, the following examples adhere to the intended reception constraint:

233) ...he said, “Kill us some birds in the morning.” (FIC)
234) Go kill me some dinner. (FIC)
235) ‘Where’s Ike?’” # “Out yonda killing me a fat hen for super…” (FIC)
236) ...so I say we go kill ourselves some varmints. (FIC)
237) Thomas Becknell wrote, “I killed one a prairie dog…” (MAG)
238) ‘Do you need us to kill you any groundhogs?’” (MAG)
239) ‘Do you need us to kill you some snakes?” (MAG)
240) Then kill him one. (MAG)

In (233-240) it is clear that the theme of the killing event is such that it can be received and used for a particular purpose, which makes the beneficiary the prospective possessor of some birds in (233), for instance. What is more, the DOC with kill often constitutes a means of getting food. This is illustrated in (234) in particular, where the killing of an animal is referred to as killing some dinner. In a situation as such, it is implied that the theme will be eaten. With the killing of a fat hen (235) for example, this is made explicit through the phrase for super. The context of food provision, however, is not the only possible one, as illustrated in (236) where the killing of some varmints refers to the hunting of small mammals as a means of pest control rather than for food.\(^\text{24}\)

In one other instance, the DOC with kill encodes an event of **malefaction**. In the example below, the indirect object referent is adversely affected by the denoted event:

241) Jacob lay on the floor in a puddle of blood.... Father was shaking all over.
   “They killed us the Jacob!” Mother screamed at Leah and father… (FIC)

The indirect object referent in (241) denotes a person to whose disadvantage the action is performed. That is to say, the killing event has an undesirable consequence for the indirect object referent. The theme in (241) is, contrary to what is expected in the DOC, a human being, the Jacob. In this particular context, the agent carries out an act in which Jacob is killed. Consequently, Jacob’s family is disadvantageously affected and construed as a maleficiary. Throughout the use of a double object clause the focus of attention shifts from the one who is killed to those who lose their loved one.

3.6.2. BNC

peel

Ditransitive peel is attested three times in the BNC database and in only one case, the DOC denotes an event of recipient benefaction. That is to say, in accordance with the intended reception constraint, the beneficiary is involved as the intended recipient of the theme in the following:

242) Nunzia peeled herself an orange. (FIC)

Example (242) refers to a peeling action carried out by an agent, with an implied subsequent transfer of the theme to the indirect object referent. Put differently, the beneficiary is the prospective possessor of the peeled entity. In (242) for instance, an orange is made available to the beneficiary as the result of the peeling event, i.e. it is now ready for consumption. Additionally, this example shows that it is possible for the agent and the beneficiary to be co-referential. That is, in an event of self-benefaction, Nunzia is both the one who peels an orange as the one for whom that entity is made available.

In two other cases, however, the DOC with peel is of a more symbolic nature, carried out with the intention to please or amuse the beneficiary. Without a subsequent transfer of possession, the following examples violate the intended reception constraint to encode an event of plain benefaction:

243) Peel me a grape! (FIC)
244) Odalisque, peel me a grape! (FIC)

The events in (243-244) are intended for the benefit of the indirect object referent, without implying that the indirect object referent is also the prospective possessor of the theme. There is, in other words, no transfer of possession subsequent to the peeling event. In contrast to the peeling of an orange, the
peeling of a grape is not useful, i.e. there is no thick peel that needs to be removed in order to be able to make use of the grape. The request is therefore not a literal one; the peeling of a grape is intended to be symbolic of the devotion of the agent to the beneficiary. Thus, in (243-244) the benefaction simply consists in pleasing the beneficiary, who is meant to witness the peeling act or see its results.

open

Figure 25.b. Detailed results for open in British English

Ditransitive open is attested only once in the BNC database and encodes an event of recipient benefaction. This means that the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme in the example below, which is therefore considered to follow the intended reception constraint:

245) I opened us each a beer... (FIC)

There is a straightforward transfer of possession in (245), since the act of opening a beer for someone leads to the subsequent possession of that beer. The beneficiary is, in other words, able to enjoy the results of the opening event, i.e. when the beer is open, it is ready for consumption. As such, it is possible to interpret the denoted event as consisting of two subevents: one where an agent opens a beer, and a subsequent one where the opened bottle of beer is transferred into the possession of the indirect object referent.

hit

Figure 26.b. Detailed results for hit in British English

Ditransitive hit is attested three times in the BNC database and in all those cases, the DOC denotes an event of malefaction instead of benefaction. The indirect object referent is negatively affected by the events described in the examples below:

246) ...that stonework would have hit us a nasty crack at the pace I was going. (FIC)
247) ...if she gave him any more of her canting preaching, he’d hit her one that she’d
The indirect object in (246-248) is adversely affected by the denoted event. It is clear that the one who receives a nasty crack, one that she’d remember or a glancing blow through an act of hitting, is not a beneficiary, but rather a maleficiary. The agent, then, obviously has no intention to please the indirect object referent. On the contrary, the act is carried out with the intention to hurt and cause suffering on behalf of the maleficiary. This is inherent to the meaning of hit as a verb of contact by impact (Levin, 1993). It is possible, however, that the agent is construed as an inanimate force and therefore lacking intentionality. This is illustrated in (248), where the maleficiary is negatively affected in a bus crash.

**kill**
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Figure 27.b. Detailed results for *kill* in British English

Ditransitive *kill* is attested only once in the BNC database and encodes an event of **plain benefaction** in which the benefaction consists in pleasing or amusing the beneficiary. As there is no implied notion of possession, the following violates the intended reception constraint:

\[ 249 \) Nonetheless cries of “*Kill them the Communists*” have been heard on the fringes of the Leipzig demonstrations... (1989, NEWS) \]

It is clear that in (249) the beneficiary is not involved as the intended recipient of the theme. To be more specific, the indirect object referent will not end up receiving the Communists after the killing event, nor is it implied that the Communists will be used for a specific purpose. What is more, the killing act is to be interpreted as a demonstrative gesture, symbolic for the agent’s devotion to the beneficiary. As protesters of the new communist leader, the agents in (249) attempt to silence the new regime by reinforcing their own political beliefs. In this particular context, the agent thus performs a noteworthy act to impress the beneficiary, who witnesses the act and is pleased by the results.
3.7. Group 7: *destroy, ruin, burn, crush*

Table 7. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>BNC total</th>
<th>DOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>destroy</td>
<td>29.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.903</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruin</td>
<td>7.192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.192</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>30.436</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.985</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crush</td>
<td>6.994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.1. COCA

*destroy*

Ditransitive *destroy* is attested only once in the COCA database and encodes an event of **malefaction**. The indirect object referent is adversely affected by the events described below:

250) ...he should not allow the Tchi mission to **destroy** him any more impact than a light spring rain. *(FIC)*

The indirect object referent in (250) is negatively affected by the destroying event carried out by the agent. As such, the indirect object referent is construed as a maleficiary, i.e. the one to whose disadvantage the action is performed. In this particular context, the agent attempts to destroy the impact that the maleficiary has as a writer. It is implied that the agent has succeeded in the past and that the maleficiary has been suffering the consequences.

*ruin*

Ditransitive *ruin* is not attested in the COCA database.
Ditransitive *burn* is attested six times in the COCA database and in all those instances, the DOC denotes an event of **recipient benefaction** in which the beneficiary is also involved as the intended recipient of the theme. As such, the following examples are in accordance with the intended reception constraint:

251) *...he burned me some CDs of weird music.* (FIC)
252) *I burned you a new CD.* (SPOK)
253) *I would be happy to burn you a great compilation CD...* (NEWS)
254) *I had to ask her twice to burn me a second copy...* (FIC)
255) *When he asked Brad, 16, to burn him a CD...* (MAG)
256) *“We have burned you the chicken”* (ACAD)

The notion of possession is straightforward in (251-255) where the beneficiary is also the prospective possessor of the relatively similar themes: *some CDs of weird music, a new CD, a great compilation CD, a second copy, a CD*. As such, the burning event refers to writing a particular content on a CD, DVD or other drive with recording capabilities. In this context, the benefaction consists in the creation of the DC and implies its subsequent transfer into the possession of the beneficiary. Similarly, in (256) the beneficiary is construed as the prospective possessor of *the chicken*. In this case, the burning event refers to a particular style of cooking and, once the chicken is ready, it will be transferred into the possession of the beneficiary. What is more, when the verb *burn* is used in the context of food preparation as in (256), it is required that the beneficiary likes his/her food being burned and, additionally, that the agent is aware of these preferences. Only then, the action can be interpreted as intended for the benefit of the indirect object referent.

*crush*
Ditransitive crush is attested only once in the COCA database and encodes an event of malefaction. In the example below, the indirect object referent is negatively affected by the denoted event:

257) One time, this jack roller crushed me one walking out of a bar – you could call it a sucker punch. (MAG)

In (258) the act of crushing one does not entail a benefit for the indirect object referent. In this context, the act of crushing refers to hitting someone without warning, which is made explicit by the reference to a sucker punch. As a change of state verb (Levin, 1993), it is inherent to the meaning of crush that something is altered for the worse. As such, similar to the examples with hit in (222-232) and (245-248), the action is not carried out with the intention to please.

3.7.2. BNC

destroy

![Diagram for destroy]

Figure 28.b. Detailed results for destroy in British English

Ditransitive destroy is not attested in the BNC database.

ruin

![Diagram for ruin]

Figure 29.b. Detailed results for ruin in British English

Ditransitive ruin is attested only once in the BNC database and encodes an event of malefaction. In the following example, the indirect object referent is the one to whose disadvantage the action is performed:

258) He's done his best to ruin us these three hours at the ale-house in Mountsorrel, I'll be bound. (FIC)
In (259) the indirect object referent is construed as the one who is negatively affected by the denoted event. To be more specific, by ruining *these three hours* for the maleficiary, the agent prevents the maleficiary from enjoying the time spent *at the ale-house in Mountsorrel*. As such, the actions of the agent can be interpreted as causing some kind of loss on behalf of the maleficiary.

*burn*

![Figure 30.b](image)

Figure 30.b. Detailed results for *burn* in British English

Ditransitive *burn* is not attested in the BNC database.

*crush*

![Figure 31.b](image)

Figure 31.b. Detailed results for *crush* in British English

Ditransitive *crush* is not attested in the BNC database.
3.8. Group 8: *hold*

Table 8. Total number of occurrences and observed ditransitives for group 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA total</th>
<th>COCA DOC</th>
<th>BNC total</th>
<th>BNC DOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hold</em></td>
<td>201.150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.634</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.1. COCA

**hold**

Figure 32.a. Detailed results for *hold* in American English

Ditransitive *hold* is not attested in the COCA database.

3.8.2. BNC

**hold**

Figure 32.b. Detailed results for *hold* in British English

Ditransitive *hold* is not attested in the BNC database.
Chapter 4. Discussion

This chapter aims to account for the observed differences in the attested frequencies between the COCA and BNC database. Additionally, through the semantic map method, as developed by Haspelmath (2003) among others, it tries to map and compare the semantic ranges of the construction under investigation. A major question that will be addressed is whether the intended reception constraint is more strictly adhered to in one variety of English than the other.

4.1. The Benefactive Potential of the DOC in American vs. British English

In the previous chapter, the results of a corpus investigation into the use of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English were presented. By looking into the distribution of the construction in the two major national varieties of English, the analysis aimed to examine the extent to which the DOC can be used to encode different subtypes of benefaction and, accordingly, distinguished between recipient benefaction, plain benefaction and malefaction. Table 9 summarizes the overall frequencies of attested structures in both corpora.25

Table 9. Overall frequency of attested structures in COCA vs. BNC26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>PB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COCA</td>
<td>1.672.926 (100%)</td>
<td>1.665.715 (99,681%)</td>
<td>5.323 (0,319%)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.272</td>
<td>5.261</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNC</td>
<td>325.121 (100%)</td>
<td>323.841 (99,606%)</td>
<td>1.280 (0,394%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table merges the raw frequencies and, between brackets, the normalized frequencies of the attested structures for all the verbs together. Then, for each subcategory, the relative frequencies are calculated by dividing the number of attested structures by the the encompassing category’s number of occurrences. This is organized as follows. The category ‘total’ encompasses the subcategories ‘other’ and ‘DOC’. As such, the relative frequencies of ‘other’ and ‘DOC’ are calculated by dividing the number of attested structures of those subcategories by the total number of occurrences of the surrounding category ‘total’. Similarly, the subcategories ‘M’ and ‘B’ have as their subtotal the number of attested structures of category ‘DOC’, and subcategories ‘RB’, ‘PB’ and ‘DB’ have as their subtotal the number of attested structures of category ‘B’.

Taken overall, the data analysis shows that the majority of the structural realizations of the 31 test verbs fall under the category ‘other’, while the numbers of observed ditransitives are very small. That is, the ditransitive pattern is observed in a mere 0,319% in American English and in 0,394% of the total number of attested structures in British English. In general, the frequencies are too small to allow meaningful statistical analysis and, consequently, it was difficult to assess the results from a quantitative perspective. A first attempt to re-divide the test verbs according to their compatibility with the DOC, proved to be less relevant than for instance, in Colleman’s (2009b) investigation into the distribution of the benefactive ditransitive in Belgian vs. Netherlandic Dutch. Unlike the results

25 For a complete overview of the results, see table 10 and 11 in Appendix A, where for each corpus the results of the 31 test verbs are presented in alphabetical order.
26 The results are categorized according to the total number of occurrences (total), number of structures other than the DOC (other), number of ditransitives (DOC), number of malefactive ditransitives (M), number of benefactive ditransitives (B), instance of recipient benefaction (RB), instances of plain benefaction (PB), and instances of deputative benefaction (DB).
obtained by Colleman (2009b), the present reveals no systematic quantitative difference between the different subtypes of ditransitives in American vs. British English. That is, only a handful of verbs display a fair number of ditransitive examples, i.e. the verbs pour and buy, respectively in 5,519% and 2,63% of the American ditransitives and in 7,686% and 3,228% of the British ditransitives; and the verb cook in 1,488% of the ditransitives in British English only (see tables 10 and 11 in Appendix A).

These findings are in accordance with Stefanowitsch and Gries’s (2003) collocal structural analysis, i.e. “a family of three methods for determining the direction and the strength of the association between a given construction and the words that occur in one or more of its slots” (Wulff et al., 2007:268). Thus, by extending collocational analysis to the concept of constructions, they compiled a list of “significant collexemes” (Stefanowitsch & Gries, 2003:229) for the ditransitive in English, which includes buy and cook as two of the 30 strongest collocates. By assigning the 21st place to buy and the 27th place to cook, Stefanowitsch and Gries’s (2003) results confirm the observed compatibility of those two verbs in the present analysis.

The predisposition of the verb pour is not entirely unexpected either. In Colleman (2009b) for instance, it is acknowledged that pour is one of the few verbs “which can still be used ditransitively in the [Dutch] standard language according to the norm” (199). The benefactive ditransitive in Dutch is, in other words, heavily constrained and limited to pour and a few other verbs related to food preparation and provision. In another, more geographically oriented study, Colleman and De Vogelaer (2002) present pour as the most popular verb occurring in the Dutch DOC. The results of their questionnaire assign to pour the highest score, i.e. it was judged acceptable in the dialect of 68,60% of the informants. Semantically speaking, they categorize pour as belonging to a class of verbs describing a situation in which object b becomes available and, simultaneously, is brought into existence through the denoted act. Additionally, it belongs to the somewhat more conventional context of food provision and preparation; a situation to which the benefactive DOC seem very responsive. Colleman (2009b) ascribes this to what he calls the “degree of contiguity between the preparatory act and the actual transfer” (206). That is to say, with the verb pour the first subevent, i.e. in which the theme is created, and the second subevent, i.e. in which the theme is transferred, seem to coincide. As such, the fact that in the DOC with pour “the overall event could just as well be construed as a single act of giving” (Colleman, 2009b:206), supports the present findings in which pour is significantly the most attested ditransitive verb, in both American and British English.

A number of additional observations can be made. First, even though the total number of ditransitives is small in both American and British English, the proportion of ditransitives to other occurrences is nevertheless somewhat larger in the British variety, i.e. 0,319% vs. 0,394%. Compared to all uses other than the DOC, the selected set of test verbs are, in other words, used in a ditransitive construction somewhat more often in British English than in American English. The results are less
straightforward, however, when other kinds of frequency are taken into consideration.⁷ For each verb, for instance, it is possible to calculate the token frequency, or how often it occurs within the DOC (see table 12 in Appendix B). Barðdal (2008) explains how token frequency refers “the total occurrences of either one or all the types of a construction in a text or corpus” (27). Consider for example the verb buy with a token frequency of 56,78% and 62,3% in American vs. British English, respectively. As Barðdal (2008) further indicates, token frequency contributes to productivity since it “makes individual lexical items more entrenched and thus more suitable as models for analogical extensions” (34). Put differently, the benefactive subsense associated with buy is well entrenched compared to some other verbs where the benefactive subsense is of a more peripheral nature, e.g., clear with a token frequency of 0,11% and 0,08% in American vs. British English.

Second, as the ditransitive in American English clearly accommodates more different types of verbs than British English, the type frequency is higher in the former (see table 13 in Appendix B). Barðdal (2008) defines type frequency as that which is made up by “all the predicates which can instantiate the ditransitive construction” (27). As such, with a total of 25 different verbs, the American English DOC outperforms the 20 different verbs accommodated by the DOC in British English. More than with token frequency, the type frequency of a construction is considered to play a crucial role in the construction’s productivity (Barðdal, 2008). That is to say, “the more verbs that can occur in a construction, the more types are associated with it and the higher its type frequency is” (Barðdal, 2008:29). Especially when those types are semantically divers, this allows the construction to be extended to new lexical verbs and therefore, be productive. Following Barðdal (2008), syntactic productivity is, in other words, “the function of a construction’s type frequency and semantic coherence … [with] an inverse correlation between the two” (34). As the benefactive DOC in American English accommodates a wider range of verbs, the construction is considered to be more general and schematically more entrenched, and therefore also more productive than in British English.

All of this suggests that in certain varieties of English, the semantic scope of the benefactive DOC is somewhat wider than in others. Since the semantic range is not uniform, the construction in question is shown to be subject to a certain degree of intralingual variation. That is, “at least for some speakers of contemporary English, the double object construction can encode other subtypes of benefactive events than just recipient-benefaction” (Colleman, 2010:226).

---

⁷ For more results regarding the frequency of attested structures, see table 12 and 13 in Appendix B.
4.2. A Semantic Map of the Benefactive DOC in American vs. British English

A useful way to capture intralingual variation within the ditransitive domain is provided by the semantic map method, as developed by Haspelmath (2003), among others. Haspelmath (2003) defines a semantic map as “a geometrical representation of functions in ‘conceptual/semantic space’ that are linked by connecting lines and thus constitute a network” (213). The principles behind the organization are based on a “contiguity requirement” (Malchukov et al., 2007:45), i.e. different functions expressed by the same marker are represented adjacent to each other in a contiguous space. On the basis of cross-linguistic comparison, such spatial arrangements aim to be universal.

For present purposes, the construction map designed by Malchukov et al. (2007:51) is taken as a starting point. This map inherits the layout of the more traditional role map (Malchukov et al., 2007:46), which is in turn derived from Haspelmath’s (2003:213) map for the dative domain. By broadening its scope to include other more general links, the role map focuses on the basic connections of the recipient and related functions, including goal, patient, malefactive source and beneficiary. Then, in order to capture “the distribution of particular encoding strategies across different verb types” (Malchukov et al., 2007:51), the construction map integrates a number of verbs that are attested in different ditransitive constructions. Additionally, in the context of the benefactive DOC in English, the construction map proposed by Malchukov et al. (2007) is complemented with Zúñiga’s (2009:9) map of typical dative functions, which includes engager beneficiary28, plain beneficiary and deputative beneficiary. By integrating this particular semantic configuration of the beneficiary subtypes within the more general construction map, it was possible to sketch a semantic map of the benefactive ditransitive in English.

The present map is designed to compare the semantic ranges of the benefactive DOC in present-day American and British English, and is based on its occurrence in the two corpora. Attention will be paid to the “gradient benefactive extension” (Malchukov et al., 2007:49), i.e. the continuum linking recipients and beneficiaries which, additionally, extends further into the domain of (external) possession and, eventually, is linked to the malefactive source function. As with other continua, it is possible to zoom in on more fine-grained functions, since, with respect to American and British English, there are different beneficiary subtypes to be recognized. What is more, as there are a number of clear cases in which the indirect object functions as a maleficiary, the present map discerns a number of additional maleficiary subtypes. In what follows, each verb will be arranged on the map according its particular semantic behaviour in the benefactive DOC.29

---

28 As has been put forward in part I, the present does not make the distinction between recipient beneficiary and engager beneficiary, but subsumes the latter under the former.
29 For more information on the integration of the verbs into the map, see tabel 14 in Appendix C, where all the verbs on the map are illustrated with a corpus example.
Figure 33: Semantic map of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English
4.2.1. Benefaction vs. Malefaction

Since prototypical transfer is deemed beneficial for the recipient, “a benefactive elaboration is a natural way to extend the basic ‘give’ structure” (Newman, 2005:162). The beneficiary subtype adjacent to the more central recipient function is the **recipient beneficiary** (RB on the map), i.e. where the beneficiary is also involved as the prospective possessor of the theme. The difference, however, lies in the fact that the transfer of possession with *give* verbs can be conceptualised as caused motion (Malchukov et al., 2007). The notions of direction and successful transfer are bleached when an RB is involved.

As an exception, (i.) **RB-pour** is semantically more similar to *give*-verbs than other preparation verbs participating in the benefactive DOC. Since the overall event is often “construed as a single act of giving” (Colleman, 2009b:206), **RB-pour** is placed closer to the recipient end of the RB category. Also (ii.) **RB-buy** is located relatively close to the recipient, since, as a verb of obtainment, it is implied in the meaning of the verb that someone’s “sphere of influence grows because a new object is added to it” (Dabrowska, 1997:29).

With verbs of creation, however, the reference to the RB is not encoded in the semantics of the verb, resulting in a somewhat lower position on the map. Because (iii.) **RB-build/construct/produce/dig**(1) denote a similar act in which an object is made available and simultaneously comes to exist, they are grouped together. In all those cases, the DOC denotes an event in which the RB is involved as the prospective possessor of a created entity. Then, moving horizontally, the nature of the transferred entity becomes somewhat less concrete in (iv.) **RB-design**, where the design of a wardrobe (107) does not result in its existence, but rather in a future plan to create that object. The nature of the transfer becomes more abstract in (v.) **RB-dig,(2)/clear/open**(1), where the RB cannot really come to possess a path (97), some space (207) or a gate (215). Rather, through the creative act, something is made available to the RB, who is therefore able to engage with the theme without having to be a genuine recipient. Also with (vi.) **RB-create**, the concrete nature of the transfer is bleached. Moreover, as the result of the creation of a work-out (87), the RB is a participant rather than a recipient. This explains the position closer towards the experiencer domain, in which plain benefaction is located.

As a fifth and last group of creation verbs, (vii.) **RB-knit/paint/burn**(1) are placed somewhat further down the vertical axe. While the effected object is of a material nature; hence the leftward position, the reference to the RB is faded out. That is, it is possible for those events to be interpreted as being carried out for the sake of the act itself, i.e. you knit a sweater (84) simply because you like to knit, you paint a picture (143) because you like to paint, or you burn a CD (251) because you like making music. This is not the case with the other creation verbs where, in the majority, such a verb invokes a future user. Similarly, performance verbs (viii.) **RB-sing/play/recite** are felicitous without an implied user. Therefore, they are located on the same horizontal level. The transfer in a performance is,
however, of a more abstract nature than with RB-knit/paint/burn, since the former merely performs or “re-creates” (Fellbaum, 2005:220) a work of art. The RB is therefore not a recipient in the literal sense, but rather metaphorically, i.e. as the spectator of the performance in which the RB’s perception is interpreted as transferred possession. As there is nothing made available in the literal sense, RB-sing/play/recite is located at the uttermost right of the RB category, closer to the experiencer domain.

With preparation verbs, the reference to the RB is even less salient. However, what is implicated in (ix.) RB-cook/bake/burn, is a future use of the prepared object, which then, in turn, entails a future user (Dabrowska, 1997). That is, by preparing an object for future use, the RB can be interpreted as the one who will be able to benefit from the results. The RB is, in other words, even more indirectly affected than in a creation or performance event; hence the lower position. However, in contrast to other verbs of preparation, the theme in RB-cook/bake/burn can also be regarded as a created entity, i.e. food is created from raw ingredients. Due to this particular ambiguity, RB-cook/bake/burn is positioned in between verbs of creation and verbs of preparation.

Then, as a more straightforward member of preparation, (x.) RB-prepare/peel/open is placed immediately under the previous group, since an already existing item is not created, but merely prepared for consumption. However, even though the theme is not effected in the strict sense of the word, the use of the DOC nevertheless implies that prior to the event, the RB did not have that entity in his/her possession. Moving more to the left, on the other hand, the transfer sense is somewhat more enhanced in (xi.) RB-kill, since it not only refers to the context of food preparation, but also to how that food is obtained, i.e. the killing constitutes a “means of getting food” (Kittilä, 2005:292). As such, the position of RB-kill is parallel to that of RB-buy.

At the bottom of the vertical axe, the RB is the least directly involved as prospective possessor in (xii.) RB-iron, since in a transformation verb, the RB is already in the possession of the theme. Neither does the theme come into existence as a result of the ironing. It is possible, however, to interpret a new suit (179) as something which is made available to the RB through ironing.

As the last type within the domain of the RB, (xiii.) RB-hit is positioned close to the allative domain because the situation can be conceptualised as one of caused motion. Even in a benefactive subsense, the notion of transfer and the directionality of the movement remain present to some extent. That is, the RB of some soft lobs (216), is not only construed as the person benefiting from the event, i.e. by receiving the theme, but also as the goal of that event, i.e. the place to which the theme moves. Therefore, as the transfer becomes more concrete and more targeted, RB-hit is placed at the utter left and close to the goal function.

As indicated by Malchukov et al. (2007), it is possible for the benefactive extension to be further extended to the domain of deputative benefaction. As with other continua, this extension is
gradient and includes an intermediate subtype involving a plain beneficiary (PB on the map). Moving away from the centre of the map, this role shifts from transfer of possession to no transfer at all. This was already indicated by the horizontal gradualness of the RB types denoting abstract or metaphorical transfer and is now completed in the PB domain.

This is manifested in (xiv.) \textit{PB-buy/play/hit\textsubscript{1}}, where the act of baking \textit{a cake as fast as you can} (55), playing \textit{a C-chord} (129) and hitting \textit{a six} (220), does not necessarily imply that the PB will end up receiving those entities. What is more, the PB primarily functions as the spectator of those events; hence the notion of experienter in the domain of the PB. Similarly, for (xv.) \textit{PB-build}, the building of \textit{a memorial} (74) is not carried out with the intention of transferring it to someone, but with the intention of honouring the PB. Additionally, with \textit{RB-build}, the PB is less likely construed as the spectator of the event, since he/she is probably dead. Therefore, \textit{RB-build} is placed below \textit{PB-buy/play/hit\textsubscript{1}}, where the act is carried out with the intention to prove oneself rather than to honour someone else.

Moving further downwards, the denoted event becomes less factual in (xvi.) \textit{PB-peel}, where the request to peel \textit{a grape} (244) serves only to highlight the superiority of the PB. This is even more so in (xvii) \textit{PB-kill}, where the killing of \textit{the Communists} (249) is meant to by symbolic for the subject’s devotion to the PB. Additionally, moving more to the right, \textit{PB-peel} and \textit{PB-kill} denote a situation in which there is a concrete entity as theme, but this entity is not acted upon in the literal sense, i.e. \textit{a grape} is not really peeled, \textit{the Communists} are not really killed. This is in contrast with \textit{PB-buy/play/hit\textsubscript{1}} and \textit{RB-build}, where the theme is brought into existence.

At the end of the vertical cline within the PB domain, the symbolic nature enhances even more. In (xiii.) \textit{PB-buy}, the buying of \textit{the moon} (19) is symbolic for the agent’s love for the PB. Similarly, with (xix.) \textit{PB-hit\textsubscript{2}}, the hitting of \textit{a lick} (221) stresses the agent’s dedication for the PB. Additionally, \textit{PB-buy} and \textit{PB-hit\textsubscript{2}} move further horizontally, indicating that with such abstract and figurative themes, the event becomes less factual.

Since there are no types located in the domain of the deputative beneficiary, the semantic map confirms that the benefactive DOC in English does not accommodate the deputative subtype (Colleman, 2010). The benefactive extension is therefore restricted to recipient beneficiaries and plain beneficiaries. This confirms what is posited in the literature regarding the intended reception constraint, i.e. a constraint with fuzzy edges, subject to frequent extension and violation. This is represented on the map by the red lines. First, the solid line marks the extension from recipient to RB and covers all types that adhere relatively straightforward to the constraint, including all verb types located left from the RB category, from point 0 to point 2. Second, the dotted line illustrates that even within the RB category, there are ambiguities and less straightforward cases which cause the intended reception constraint to extend, i.e. all types located right from the RB category, from point 2
to point 3. Finally, there are instances in which the beneficiary is not involved as the prospective possessor, resulting in a violation of the constraint, i.e. all types located outside the RB category (from point 3 to 4, and further).

On the other hand, the map portrays another kind of extension; that is, from beneficiary to maleficiary. It is indicated by Newman (1996:116) that the two roles are to be regarded as “instantiations of the experiencer category, rather than as evidence for a meaning changing into its opposite” (Newman, 1997:117). Nevertheless, as they sometimes participate in the same construction, the present map considers the two notions semantically related (Fellbaum, 2005). The exact nature of this relationship, on the other hand, remains to be established on the basis of cross-linguistic evidence; hence the dotted lines in black. Nevertheless, the map indicates that for each beneficiary subtype, there is a possible maleficiary subtype as its counterpart. By placing the maleficiary subtypes somewhat behind the beneficiary ones, the present semantic map merely attempts to visualize the similarity between the notions attested in the corpora, without claiming to be universal.

The fact that prototypical transfer of possession is deemed beneficial, does not rule out the possibility of a transfer with an adversative effect for the indirect participant. As such, the present map distinguishes a recipient maleficiary subsense (RM in the map) instantiated by (xx.) RM-buy/create, in which the nature of the transferred theme is responsible for the malefactive nature of the reception, e.g., buying some cancer (23), creating a lot of problems (89). The RM is, in other words, the semantic counterpart of the RB: where the latter is the one who is intended to benefit from a transfer, the former is intended to be disadvantaged by it. Similarly, in (xxi.) RM-hit/crush, the consequences of reception are adversative. That is, the RM in the hitting of a right uppercut (228) or in the crushing of one, i.e. a sucker punch (257) is clearly disadvantageously affected. In addition to the nature of the theme, the semantics of the verb are responsible for instantiating the malefactive sub-sense in RM-hit/crush, i.e. verbs denoting a situation of contact by impact and bodily harm (Levin, 1993). Because the malefactive subsense is inherent to the meaning of the verb, RM-hit/crush is located somewhat further into the malefactive domain.

A second malefactive semantic extension is that of the plain maleficiary (PM in the map), where the notion of transfer is bleached similar to its beneficial counterpart, however, with an agent who acts at the expense of the PM rather than with the intention to please. The total semantic configuration is responsible for the malefactive nature in the more or less fixed ditransitive expressions with (xxii.) PM-dig/play. That is, under appropriate circumstances, digging a deep hole (99) and playing a terrible trick (133) are clearly carried out at the expense of the PM. Moving somewhat deeper into the malefactive domain, the adversative effect is even stronger in (xxiv.) EP-

---

30 This division is inspired by Quint (2010), who distinguishes between beneficiary and maleficiary subtypes in Koalib. The labels used in this paper are somewhat different, as they were meant to mirror the terminology used for the beneficiary subtypes.
kill/destroy/ruin. As verbs of killing and destruction (Levin, 1993), there’s an inherent malefactive subsense of causing death and undoing. Therefore, EP-kill/destroy/ruin is positioned parallel to RM-hit/crush, and in opposition with the other two malefactive subtypes where the adversative effect depends more strongly on the contextual interpretation.

4.2.2. American English vs. British English

The present map not only captures the semantic range covered by the benefactive DOC, but also allows comparison between the construction in different varieties. It provides, in other words, a useful way to simultaneously map and compare the scope of the construction in American vs. British English. The colour distinctions, i.e. purple for American and yellow for British English, highlight the verbs which occur in one variety but not in the other. As such, the map represents what has already been assessed; that is, the benefactive DOC is more productive in American than in British English. Because the possibilities are wider for the DOC in American English, this variety is more likely to attract new types. Consider for instance the use of ditransitive burn, i.e. either in the context of a cooking creation as in RB-burn(1), or in the context of an artistic creation as in RB-burn(2). Both instantiate a subsense that matches the semantic criteria of the construction and, since the American DOC is more general than the British DOC, the chances of such a match are higher in the former than in the latter.

To sum up, American English and British English are shown to draw the line at different places with regard to the lexical possibilities of the benefactive DOC. This observed regional variation also entails that the American DOC is more flexible towards the intended reception constraint; not only with respect to abstract and metaphorical transfers, but also regarding compatibility with plain benefaction and different kinds of malefactive events. By instantiating more different types, the American construction thus allows the constraint to be extended and violated more frequently than in British English.
Conclusion

This paper looked into the use of the benefactive DOC in American vs. British English and, more specifically, into the nature of benefaction accommodated by the construction in question. As such, the present aimed to account for the degree of intra-lingual variation reported in the existing linguistic literature. Therefore, on the basis of data gathered from the Corpus of Contemporary American English and the British National Corpus, an in-depth corpus investigation was conducted, examining the occurrence of the benefactive DOC with respect to a set of 31 test verbs. Central to this investigation was the question whether the intended reception constraint is more strictly adhered to in American vs. British English. This constraint has been posited in the literature as central in determining the acceptability of the benefactive use of the DOC in English. On the other hand, it has been acknowledged that the constraint is soft and therefore frequently extended and violated. To be able to examine the extent to which the constraint is effective in the two major national varieties of English, this study accounted for the distribution of the DOC in terms of the notion of possession. This means that for each verb attested in the DOC, the different uses were categorized according to the nature of the benefaction. Then, a semantic map was designed to visualize the effect of the intended reception constraint on the use of the benefactive DOC. By mapping and comparing the semantic ranges of the construction in American and British varieties of English, it was possible to determine which variety is more flexible with regard to the posited constraint.

Taken overall, the results indicate that American English and British English draw the line at different places with respect to the lexical possibilities of the benefactive DOC. The fact that the type frequency is higher in American than in British English, entails that the American DOC is somewhat more productive and therefore more likely to attract new types. Consider for instance the use of create, a creation verb traditionally excluded from the benefactive DOC but nevertheless attested in the benefactive construction in American English. Also with respect to verb types belonging to other semantic classes, the American DOC is shown to be more open. The verb burn, for instance, is used in the American DOC and adapts to the overall meaning of the construction; that is, in terms of a creation event through burning, i.e. either in the context of an artistic product or in terms of food preparation.

Not only does the DOC in American English instantiate more different types, this variety is also shown to be more flexible with regard to the intended reception constraint. Again, this follows from the fact that the verb types in the American DOC are more heterogeneous. Small categories, on the other hand, can only be extended within their limited semantic range (Barðdal, 2008). On the semantic map, this is illustrated by the fact that in American English, there are more types located towards the end of the ditransitive-benefactive cline. The constraint is, in other words, more frequently extended to include abstract and metaphorical transfers (within the RB category, moving further horizontally), or transfers whereby the reference to the RB becomes less direct (within the RB category, moving further...
downwards). Also regarding the construction’s compatibility with plain benefaction and different kinds of malefactive events, the American DOC is clearly more tolerant than the British DOC. In addition to the reported extension, the intended reception constraint is, in other words, also more often exposed to violation in American than in British English.

Be that as it may, the observed differences between the DOC in American vs. British English remain very small. Not to mention that with respect to the different kinds of benefaction and malefaction, the construction covers a relatively similar semantic range, as can be seen on the semantic map. That is, similar to the DOC in American English, the construction in British English extends the intended reception constraint to include abstract and metaphorical transfers or transfers whereby the reference to the RB becomes less direct and, occasionally, violates the intended reception constraint to include plain benefaction and particular kinds of malefaction. However, almost always to a lesser extent than in American English. There are two exceptions: the use of ditransitive ruin to denote an event of plain malefaction, and the use of ditransitive kill to denote an event of plain benefaction. A concrete answer to the question why these verbs do not occur in the DOC in American English, remains to be established on the basis of additional research into the use of verbs destruction, which, in contrast to verbs of creation, cause the undoing of an entity.

In conclusion, the benefactive DOC in English can be regarded as a rather open and general construction, even more so in American than in British English. This means that, in principle, any verb of obtainment and creation can be combined productively into the DOC and, additionally, that verbs belonging to other semantic classes can be extended into the semantics of the construction. What is more, under the appropriate conditions, it is possible for the construction to encode another kind of benefaction and, sometimes, even malefaction. The extent to which these conditions are considered to be appropriate, however, depends strongly on the interpretation of the user and is therefore an important source of intra-lingual variation. The notion of possession determines, in other words, the use of the DOC to encode benefaction only to some extent. Along similar lines, the intended reception constraint cannot always account for the observed variation. Whether or not a particular situation can be construed as one of intended reception is, in other words, “a matter of degree rather than kind” (Colleman, 2010:240). The results of this research thereby confirm what has been assessed by Allerton (1978), Fellbaum (2005), Colleman (2010) among others; that is, there is “a cline from fully acceptable to fully unacceptable benefactive uses, with different speakers drawing the line at different cut-off points” (Colleman, 2010:240).

All things considered, there are a few issues which need to be taken into consideration for further research on the benefactive DOC. First, apart from the variation between American and British varieties of English, it has not yet been established whether the observed variation “follows regional lines” (Colleman, 2009b:196; 2010:226). Thus, while this study asserts that there are differences
between the use of the construction in the two major national varieties of English, it remains to be investigated to what extent the benefactive DOC is judged to be acceptable across the different dialectal regions of the two language communities. A geographically oriented questionnaire study, for instance, could contribute to a better understanding of the observed language-internal variation. Second, apart from the fact that the DOC occasionally accommodates verbs of destruction, this study does not further account for the relation between events of malefaction and the notion of possession. Additional research into the nature of the constraint could benefit from including more verbs that can instantiate a malefactive subsense and from taking into account the way in which they relate to the central transfer of possession sense. Only then, it is possible to accurately distinguish the different kinds of malefaction and finalize their position on the semantic map. What is more, on the basis of additional (cross-)linguistic evidence, the present semantic map actually invites such falsification, revision and optimization.
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### Appendix A

Table 10 merges the results for American English based on the occurrences of the 31 test verbs in COCA, and list alphabetically the detailed results presented figure 2.a to 32.a in the analysis.

Table 10. Frequency of attested structures for each verb in COCA, categorized according to the total number of occurrences (total), number of structures other than the DOC (other), number of ditransitives (DOC), number of malefactive ditransitives (M), number of benefactive ditransitives (B), instance of recipient benefaction (RB), instances of plain benefaction (PB), and instances of deputative benefaction (DB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>DB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bake</td>
<td>15.180</td>
<td>15.130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.67%)</td>
<td>(99.67%)</td>
<td>(0.32%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(98%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>111.649</td>
<td>111.235</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.62%)</td>
<td>(99.62%)</td>
<td>(0.37%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(99.27%)</td>
<td>(0.73%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>30.436</td>
<td>30.429</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.98%)</td>
<td>(99.98%)</td>
<td>(0.01%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>114.593</td>
<td>111.575</td>
<td>3.018</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.014</td>
<td>3.012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(97.36%)</td>
<td>(99.62%)</td>
<td>(2.63%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(99.87%)</td>
<td>(99.94%)</td>
<td>(0.73%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>21.715</td>
<td>21.715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>21.922</td>
<td>21.916</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(0.02%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construct</td>
<td>16.274</td>
<td>16.272</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.98%)</td>
<td>(99.98%)</td>
<td>(0.01%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>33.142</td>
<td>33.048</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.71%)</td>
<td>(99.71%)</td>
<td>(0.28%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create</td>
<td>140.223</td>
<td>140.219</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(0.03%)</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crush</td>
<td>6.994</td>
<td>6.993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(0.01%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>52.591</td>
<td>52.580</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(0.02%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroy</td>
<td>29.445</td>
<td>29.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(0.01%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dig</td>
<td>15.927</td>
<td>15.886</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.74%)</td>
<td>(99.74%)</td>
<td>(2.57%)</td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit</td>
<td>84.891</td>
<td>84.874</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.98%)</td>
<td>(99.98%)</td>
<td>(0.02%)</td>
<td>(64%)</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>(66%)</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hold</td>
<td>201.150</td>
<td>201.150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.93%)</td>
<td>(99.93%)</td>
<td>(0.06%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>106.377</td>
<td>106.368</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.92%)</td>
<td>(99.92%)</td>
<td>(0.08%)</td>
<td>(11.11%)</td>
<td>(88.89%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knit</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>2.335</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.31%)</td>
<td>(99.31%)</td>
<td>(0.68%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mint</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>127.308</td>
<td>127.304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(99.97%)</td>
<td>(0.03%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint</td>
<td>26.546</td>
<td>26.522</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.91%)</td>
<td>(99.91%)</td>
<td>(0.09%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peel</td>
<td>8.484</td>
<td>8.480</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.95%)</td>
<td>(99.95%)</td>
<td>(0.047%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Raw freq</td>
<td>Normalized freq</td>
<td>Other freq</td>
<td>DOC freq</td>
<td>RB freq</td>
<td>PB freq</td>
<td>DB freq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform</td>
<td>47,624</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>214,912</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour</td>
<td>22,374</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>56,342</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produce</td>
<td>83,608</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recite</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruin</td>
<td>7,192</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>47,468</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash</td>
<td>18,721</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total structures in COCA</td>
<td>1,671,038</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>5,323</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>5,261</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 10 merges the raw frequencies and, between brackets, the normalized frequencies of the attested structures for each verb. For each subcategory, the relative frequencies are calculated by dividing the number of attested structures by the total number of occurrences of the encompassing category. This is organized as follows. The category ‘total’ encompasses the subcategories ‘other’ and ‘DOC’. As such, the relative frequencies of ‘other’ and ‘DOC’ are calculated by dividing the number of attested structures of those subcategories by the total number of occurrences of the surrounding category ‘total’. Similarly, the subcategories ‘M’ and ‘B’ have as their subtotal the number of attested structures of category ‘DOC’, and subcategories ‘RB’, ‘PB’ and ‘DB’ have as their subtotal the number of attested structures of category ‘B’.
Table 11 merges the results for British English based on the occurrences of the 31 test verbs in BNC, and list alphabetically the detailed results presented figure 2.b to 32.b in the analysis.

Table 11. Frequency of attested structures for each verb in BNC, categorized according to the total number of occurrences (total), number of structures other than the DOC (other), number of ditransitives (DOC), number of malefactive ditransitives (M), number of benefactive ditransitives (B), instance of recipient benefaction (RB), instances of plain benefaction (PB), and instances of deputative benefaction (DB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>DB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bake</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>22,417</td>
<td>22,341</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>24,741</td>
<td>23,943</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construct</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create</td>
<td>21,091</td>
<td>21,091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crush</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>11,451</td>
<td>11,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroy</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dig</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit</td>
<td>10,092</td>
<td>10,089</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hold</td>
<td>45,634</td>
<td>45,634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>14,243</td>
<td>14,242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knit</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mint</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>23,287</td>
<td>23,286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peel</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>36,482</td>
<td>36,454</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw frequency</td>
<td>normalised frequency</td>
<td>relative frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>15.185 (100%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.175 (99.934%)</td>
<td>10 (0.066%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>produce</td>
<td>29.594 (100%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.593 (99.997%)</td>
<td>1 (0.003%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recite</td>
<td>452 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>452 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rain</td>
<td>7.192 (100%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.191 (99.986%)</td>
<td>1 (0.014%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>5.764 (100%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.763 (99.809%)</td>
<td>11 (0.191%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wash</td>
<td>4.583 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.583 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total structures in BNC</td>
<td>325.121 (100%)</td>
<td>1.280 (0.79%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>323.841 (99.606%)</td>
<td>1.270 (0.9921%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.267 (99.76%)</td>
<td>0 (0.24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 11 merges the raw frequencies and, between brackets, the normalized frequencies of the attested structures for each verb. For each subcategory, the relative frequencies are calculated by dividing the number of attested structures by the encompassing category's number of occurrences. This is organized as follows. The category 'total' encompasses the subcategories 'other' and 'DOC'. As such, the relative frequencies of 'other' and 'DOC' are calculated by dividing the number of attested structures of those subcategories by the total number of occurrences of the surrounding category 'total'. Similarly, the subcategories 'M' and 'B' have as their subtotal the number of attested structures of category 'DOC', and subcategories 'RB', 'PB' and 'DB' have as their subtotal the number of attested structures of category 'B'.
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Table 12 lists the token frequency of each type in COCA vs. BNC. The token frequency accounts for the number of occurrences of each individual type instantiated by the DOC.

Table 12. Token frequency of each type attested in the DOC in COCA vs. BNC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>COCA token frequency</th>
<th>BNC token frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5323</td>
<td>n=1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bake</td>
<td>0,94%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build</td>
<td>7,78%</td>
<td>5,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>0,11%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>56,7%</td>
<td>62,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>0,11%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construct</td>
<td>0,03%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
<td>1,77%</td>
<td>4,14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create</td>
<td>0,07%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crush</td>
<td>0,02%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>0,21%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroy</td>
<td>0,02%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dig</td>
<td>0,77%</td>
<td>0,39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit</td>
<td>0,32%</td>
<td>0,23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hold</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>0,02%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>0,17%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knit</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td>1,25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mint</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint</td>
<td>0,45%</td>
<td>0,31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peel</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
<td>0,23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>4,13%</td>
<td>2,19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour</td>
<td>23,23</td>
<td>20,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepare</td>
<td>0,45%</td>
<td>0,78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produce</td>
<td>0,02%</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recite</td>
<td>0,02%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0,08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing</td>
<td>2,24%</td>
<td>0,86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 lists the type frequency of the different kinds of benefactive subtype instantiated in COCA and BNC. The type frequency accounts for the different verb types that can be instantiated by a particular subtype in the DOC.

Table 13. Type of the different benefaction/malefaction subtypes in COCA vs. BNC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COCA (n = 25)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>BNC (n = 20)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>type frequency</td>
<td>token frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COCA (n = 5323)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BNC (n = 1280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Benefaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient B</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
<td>5.272 (99.04%)</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
<td>1.270 (99.22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain B</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>11 (0.21%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (0.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Malefaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient M</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>51 (0.96%)</td>
<td>51 (0.96%)</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain M</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (13.33%)</td>
<td>19 (0.36%)</td>
<td>19 (0.36%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

Table 14. Corpus examples complementing the semantic map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>corpus example (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-pour</td>
<td>Margot pours herself a glass of wine. (177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-buy</td>
<td>“Can I buy you another beer?” (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-build</td>
<td>His job is to build them those really nice houses. (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-construct</td>
<td>I will merely construct us a snow cave,... (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-produce</td>
<td>...to produce them a good or a service. (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-dig(1)</td>
<td>...he was able to dig himself a burrow,... (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-design</td>
<td>“I’ll design you a wardrobe” he said,... (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-dig(2)</td>
<td>Dig me a path tae the Underworld! (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-clear</td>
<td>...to clear himself some political space. (207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-open(1)</td>
<td>I will open us a gate. (215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-create</td>
<td>...and create themselves a work-out. (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-knit</td>
<td>For Christmas she might knit him a sweater. (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-paint</td>
<td>He painted us a picture. (143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-burn(1)</td>
<td>...he burned me some CDs of weird music. (251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-sing</td>
<td>Mr. Billy Bayswater will now sing you a song. (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-play</td>
<td>Play us a tune, Hoomey. (149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-recite</td>
<td>“Recite me some of your poetry,” I suggested,... (146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-cook</td>
<td>Can you cook me a bonefish? (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-bake</td>
<td>I’d like to bake him a cake for valentine. (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-burn(2)</td>
<td>“We have burned you the chicken.” (256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-prepare</td>
<td>She prepared him a fresh pot of coffee,... (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-peel</td>
<td>Peel me an egg, would you, Mrs. Hayes? (208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-open(2)</td>
<td>Bailey opens himself a beer... (213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xi.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-kill</td>
<td>Go kill me some dinner. (234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xii.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-iron</td>
<td>My woman always ironed me a new suit to wear. (179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiii.)</td>
<td><strong>RB</strong>-hit</td>
<td>...and hit her some softlobs. (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiv.)</td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-bake</td>
<td>Bake me a cake as fast as you can. (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-play</td>
<td>Now play me a C chord. (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-hit(1)</td>
<td>“Sushi, hit me a six” (220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xv.)</td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-build</td>
<td>...it is talking of building him a memorial. (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xvi.)</td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-peel</td>
<td>Odalisque, peel me a grape! (244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xvii.)</td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-kill</td>
<td>...cries of “Kill them the Communists”... (249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xviii.)</td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-buy</td>
<td>I’ll buy you the moon baby. (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xix.)</td>
<td><strong>PB</strong>-hit(2)</td>
<td>...it’s all down again and I can’t hit him a lick. (221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xx.)</td>
<td><strong>RM</strong>-buy</td>
<td>...tell me she didn’t buy herself some cancer on that day. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RM</strong>-create</td>
<td>She was to start to create me a lot of problems. (89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xxi.)</td>
<td><strong>RM</strong>-hit</td>
<td>...and hit him a right uppercut,... (228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RM</strong>-crush</td>
<td>this jack roller crushed me one... call it a sucker punch. (257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xxii.)</td>
<td><strong>PM</strong>-dig</td>
<td>...we’ve dug ourselves a deep hole. (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PM</strong>-play</td>
<td>Madame she played you a terrible trick. (133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xxiii.)</td>
<td><strong>PM</strong>-kill</td>
<td>“They killed us the Jacob” Mother screamed... (241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PM</strong>-destroy</td>
<td>...to destroy him any more impact than... (250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PM</strong>-ruin</td>
<td>...to ruin us these three hours at the ale-house... (258)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>