Typological remarks on "internal" beneficiaries and the benefactive-possessive convergence

Andrej Malchukov

1. Introduction[1]

Recent years have seen renewed interest in ditransitive constructions and in typological variation in the coding of recipients and beneficiaries (see, in particular, the contributions in MALCHUKOV, HASPELMATH & COMRIE 2010; ZÚÑIGA & KITTILÄ 2010, as well as other literature cited in the Introduction to this volume). One typologically interesting case, which has received some attention in the literature, concerns possessive marking of recipients and beneficiaries. As amply discussed in the typological literature, the convergence of benefactive and possessive constructions involves different patterns, including the following:[2]

1. the use of a dative/benefactive marker to mark external possession (PAYNE & BARSHI 1999); cf. German *Er hat mir den Arm gebrochen.* 'He broke my arm';
2. the extended use of benefactive/goal/purpose markers as adnominal modifiers (HEINE 1997); this use is common, albeit marginal, in European languages (cf. *the gym for schoolchildren*, Swedish *vännen till mig* 'a friend of mine; lit. a friend to me', etc.);
3. possessive marking of beneficiaries/recipients; this pattern is used to a limited extent in European languages (*He built my (= me) house*), but is frequent in some other languages, including Mayan (see CREISSELS 1979, CROFT 1985; LEHMANN et al. 2004).

In this paper, I am mostly concerned with the third case (called "indirect object lowering" by CROFT 1985), as opposed to the first ("possessor raising", in terms of CROFT) or second case. Yet, as we will see below, in some cases the second and third scenarios are difficult to distinguish.

In the most detailed typological study of this topic so far, LEHMANN et al. (2004) observe that a verbal argument, such as a recipient (R) or a beneficiary (B), can be represented either "directly" ("direct participation") as a verbal dependent (*I built him a house*), or indirectly ("indirect participation") as a nominal dependent (*I built his house*), or else may be doubly represented (*I built him his house*). A similar encoding of beneficiaries and possessors is to be expected (given that beneficiaries can be conceived of as prospective

possessors (P));[3] yet it is restricted to certain predicate types. Thus, when one extends this strategy from verbs of creation/production (e.g. *I built his house = I built him a house)* to transfer verbs (e.g. *I gave his money ≠ I gave him money)*, this leads to an unwelcome ambiguity and is therefore avoided.

In what follows, I will provide a brief cross-linguistic overview of different cases where recipients or beneficiaries receive possessive coding, with special attention paid to disambiguation strategies signalling benefactive interpretation.

2. Restricted use of internal recipient constructions: Vafsi and other Iranian languages

Many languages use possessive constructions to encode beneficiaries, yet in the absence of additional marking, this strategy is used restrictedly as it leads to ambiguity. This will be illustrated by the data from Iranian languages, which figure prominently in the present volume. Consider the case of Vafsi (STILO 2010), a Northwestern Iranian language, where the ditransitive construction either follows the double object pattern (neutral alignment) or is a construction with a prepositional recipient (indirective alignment). Yet another, typologically more remarkable, option is the encoding of a recipient through possessive (oblique) enclitics on the (direct) object (theme).

(1)   Vafsi (STILO 2010: 263)
       ketab=i   (æ)d-do-m.
       book=$2S_2$ DUR-give-$1S_1$
       'I'll give you a book.'

This construction is not restricted to recipients, but is also found with other beneficiaries, e.g. with verbs of creation/production:

(2)   Vafsi (STILO 2010: 261)
       æz   kot=i   æd-duz-om   veréwni=i
       me.DIR   coat=$2S_1$ DUR-sew-$1S_1$ OPB=$2S_2$
       'I'll sew you a coat / I'll sew a coat for you.'

This usage, however, is restricted to prospective possessors/beneficiaries; other classes of transitive verbs (e.g. verbs of destruction) only allow a possessive interpretation (3). Unlike some other languages discussed below, Vafsi does not employ any further disambiguation mechanisms to recover the benefactive meaning. This may be the reason why Vafsi is more restrictive in terms of verbs types found in the genitive-benefactive construction.

(3)   Vafsi (STILO 2010: 269)
       æz   bez=i   (æ)r-koš-om.
       I.DIR   goat=$2S_2$ DUR-kill-$1S_1$
       'I'll kill your goat.' ('*I'll kill you a goat', '*I'll kill a goat for you')

---

3   In the words of CROFT (1985:44), "the benefactor (indirect object) comes into possession of the direct object by virtue of the event described by the main verb; thus the possessive construction has generalized its use to include possessors-to-be."

A similar construction is found in Modern Persian (MAHOOTIAN 1997, cf. also HERKENRATH, this volume, on Kurmanji). Consider the following example, where the recipient is the oblique clitic on the object theme. The same clitics index patients on verbs and possessors on nouns.

(4)   Persian (MAHOOTIAN 1997:140)
       sæmm=eš   dad-æm
       poison=3SG   give.PST-1SG
       'I gave him poison.'

Moreover, this pattern is also attested in Old Persian (5).

(5)   Old Persian (HAIG 2008: 48 citing KENT 1953)
       aita=maiy   Auramazdā   dadātuv
       this=1SG.GEN   Ahuramazdā   may.give
       'May Ahuramazda give this to me.'

Yet, in Old Persian the situation is not restricted to clitics, rather it represents a general convergence of the two cases: genitive and dative. Specialists agree that in Old Persian, the genitive took over the function of the old dative (Agnes KORN, p.c.; HAIG 2008: 45).

3. Disambiguation through head marking of nouns: designative forms in Tungusic and Samoyedic

Tungusic languages may encode the beneficiary/recipient either by the dative case or by means of a special designative construction, see the examples from the North-Tungusic language Even in (6) and (7), respectively, which both translate as 'The old man gave a sledge to the child.'

       Even (MALCHUKOV & NEDJALKOV 2010: 327)
(6)   *etiken   kunga-du   turki-w   bön*
       old.man   child-DAT   sledge-ACC   give.NFUT.3SG
(7)   *etiken   kunga   turki-ga-n   bön*
       old.man   child   sledge-DES-3SG.POS   give.NFUT.3SG
       'The old man gave a sledge to the child.'

The dative construction (6) is unremarkable; the theme appears in the accusative and the recipient in the dative. In the designative construction (7), the theme takes the designative case *-ga-* while the recipient is encoded as a possessor within the object NP, and is correspondingly cross-referenced by the possessive agreement on the nominal head. In Even (as in most other Tungusic languages and in Altaic in general), nominal possessor constructions are head-marked:[4]

(8)   *kunga   turki-n*
       child   sledge-3SG.POS
       'the child's sledge'

Nominal possessors do not have any special genitive/possessive marking. However, pronominal possessors (in the 1st and 2nd person) have a possessive form distinct from the nominative:

(9) *min   turki-w*
     my   sledge-1SG.POS
     'my sledge'

The same possessive forms of pronouns are also used in the designative construction:

(10) *etiken   min   turki-ga-w*   *bön*
      old man   my   sledge-DES-1SG.POS   give.NFUT.3SG
      'The old man gave a sledge to me.'

The marking of the beneficiary is thus identical to possessive constructions with both head marking and dependent marking (where the latter is required). The only difference is the use of the designative case. If the head of the possessive NP is marked by the designative case DES, the formal possessor is obligatorily interpreted as a beneficiary/recipient. If DES is replaced by the accusative case, this interpretation is lost. Thus, (11) refers to a situation when the sledge currently belonging to the child is given to someone else.

(11) Even (MALCHUKOV & NEDJALKOV 2010: 328)
      etiken   kunga   turki-wa-n   *bön*
      old man   child   sledge-ACC-3SG.POS   give.NFUT.3SG
      'The old man gave the child's sledge.'

The designative construction is by no means restricted to transfer verbs with recipients. It is also regularly used for encoding prospective possessors-beneficiaries with verbs of creation:

(12) Even (MALCHUKOV & NEDJALKOV 2010: 328)
      etiken   min   turki-ga-w   *oo-n*
      old man   my   sledge-DES-1SG.POSS   make.NFUT.3SG
      'The old man made a sledge for me.'

There is some variation among Tungusic languages in form, distribution and function of designative suffixes (see KAZAMA 2010; MALCHUKOV & NEDJALKOV 2010). Yet in all of them, the possessor within the designative construction is unmistakably NP-internal; this is most obvious when it is pronominal and expressed by the possessive form of a pronoun (as in (10) above).

In (Northern) Samoyedic, we find a similar construction called destinative. In this construction, the recipient or beneficiary is likewise cross-referenced by the possessive marker on the theme, which additionally carries a destinative marker (CREISSELS & DANIEL 2006). The following examples illustrate the destinative construction for Nganasan:[5]

---

[5] Cf. also KHANINA & SHLUINSKY 2014 for a detailed discussion of the destinative construction in another Samoyedic language, Enets.

Nganasan (Michael DANIEL, p.c.; CREISSELS & DANIEL 2006)

(13) *ŋəmsu-ði-ne*   *tətu-ŋu-ruʔ*
      food-DEST-PL.1SG   give-IMP-2PL
      'Give us (some) food. Give us something to eat.'

(14) *xunsəə   ma-tə-m'i*   *mej-ku-ðəm*
      another house-DEST-1DU.ACC make-IMP-1SG.S
      'I am going to make another house for us two.'

Differently from the Tungusic languages, the destinative is not a case marker in Samoyedic[6] since it combines with noun inflection cumulatively expressing case and possession. Most commonly, the destinative marker is found before the accusative ending as in the examples above. Again differently from Tungusic, in Samoyedic, the destinative construction is the basic strategy, the alternative (al)lative construction being rare in Nganasan. The same is true of other Samoyedic languages (see KHANINA & SHLUINSKY 2014 on Enets). Yet, in spite of these differences, both Tungusic and Samoyedic show important similarities. In both families, the beneficiary/recipient is encoded NP-internally as a possessor, and the benefactive interpretation is recovered from the dedicated marker on the head (the possessed object/theme).

4. Disambiguation through head marking of verbs: Internal R in an applicative construction in Qiang and Manipuri

In Qiang (LAPOLLA & HUANG 2003), a Tibeto-Burman language of China, one possibility of encoding a recipient in a ditransitive construction is the genitive case (alternatively, allative marking can be used).

(15) Qiang (LAPOLLA & HUANG 2003: 148)
      sum   the:-tɕ   pi:-xsə-la   de-l.
      teacher he=GEN   pen-three-CL DIRECT-give
      'The teacher gave him three pens.'

The genitive marker is also found in various benefactive constructions:

(16) Qiang (LAPOLLA & HUANG 2003: 148)
      the: qatɕ   zə-p-sa
      s/he   me.GEN   DIRECT-buy-1SG
      'S/he bought it for me.'

The benefactive interpretation of the genitive is aided by the "secundative" pattern of ditransitive indexing/cross-referencing (in terms of HASPELMATH 2005; MALCHUKOV et al. 2010). Note that the suffixal object agreement cross-references the R argument in (16). The use of directional prefixes (as in (15) above) may serve the same disambiguating function. The genitive-marked beneficiary usually precedes the theme, following the regular

---

[6]   The destinative marker in Samoyedic has recently attracted a lot of attention in the specialist literature and led to a lively debate about the nature/status of this marker: it has been variously interpreted as a marker of prospective possession, nominal tense marker, and even as a nominal applicative (see KHANINA & SHLUINSKY 2014 for discussion and references).

possessive pattern just as the regular possessor precedes the possessed. Yet, as noted by (LAPOLLA & HUANG 2003: 85), the order of the beneficiary and theme can be changed, which suggests that the genitive-marked beneficiary can also be NP-external.

Also in Manipuri/Meithei (BHAT & NINGOMBA 1997), the beneficiary can be encoded by the genitive (recipients appear either in the locative-allative or in the accusative).

(17)   Manipuri (BHAT & NINGOMBA 1997: 131)
        əy-nə   məsi   Cawbə-gi   ləy-rəm-mi
        I-NOM   this   Chaoba-GEN   buy-COMPL-NFUT
        'I had bought this for Chaoba.'

Nevertheless, more commonly the genitive encoding of the recipient or beneficiary occurs in conjunction with benefactive marking of the verb, as in (18a). In the absence of such marking genitive marking alone (as in 18b) is less frequent than the pattern where genitive is augmented by the marker *-də-mək*, as in (18c).

(18)   Manipuri (BHAT & NINGOMBA 1997: 131)
        a.   *ma-nə   ey-gi*   *layrik   pa-bi*
             3SG-NOM   I-GEN   book   read-BEN
             'He read the book for me.'
        b.   *əy-nə   tombə-gi*   *yum   ləy*
             I-NOM   Tomba-GEN   house   bought
             'I bought Tomba's house.'
        c.   *əy-nə   tombə-gi-də-mək*   *yum   ləy*
             I-NOM   Tomba-GEN-LOC-FOC   house   bought
             'I bought a house for Tomba.'

Thus, in Manipuri, like in Qiang, additional mechanisms of disambiguation are at work. Internal recipients or beneficiaries are signalled through object agreement, benefactive-applicative or directional marking.

Similar strategies of disambiguation are found elsewhere. For example, in Totonac (MACKAY 1991: 337), the possessor of the object can be interpreted as beneficiary on the condition that the verb takes the applicative suffix *-ni-*. LEHMANN et al. (2004: 80) discuss a similar pattern in Korean and Tamil, where the beneficiary is encoded as a possessor when the verb combines with a benefactive auxiliary (based on the verb 'to give').

5. Disambiguation through word order: Oceanic and Australian languages

In a series of articles SONG (1998; 2005) argued that in a number of Oceanic languages, the possessive construction has been reanalyzed as a benefactive construction.[7] The source construction involves the use of one of the possessive classifiers in an alienable possession construction. The following example illustrates the possessive NP in the direct object position.

---

[7]   Cf. LICHTENBERK 2002, MARGETTS 2002.

(19)   Kusaiean (SONG 2005: 806, citing LEE 1975: 237)
        nga   mole-lah   rais   la-l   Sohn   ah
        1SG:SBJ   buy-ASP   rice   PCL-3SG:POSS   John   DET
        'I have bought John's rice.'

In an apparently similar example (20) the possessor is interpreted as a beneficiary.

(20)   Kusaiean (SONG 2005: 807)
        nga   mole-lah   rais   ah   la-l   Sohn
        1SG:SBJ   buy-ASP   rice   DET   PCL-3SG:POSS   John
        'I have bought rice for John.'

As explained by SONG, the change of interpretation correlates with word order. Note that the object NP boundary, signalled by the position of the determiner *ah*, is between the theme noun and the possessive classifier in (20), which indicates that the possessive classifier plus the following noun are a separate NP. Such extraposed possessive-marked NPs are interpreted in Kusaiean as prospective possessors or beneficiaries rather than actual possessors.

SONG further shows that languages are to various degrees advanced in the process of reanalysis of possessors as beneficiaries by way of "externalization". Some allow possessive beneficiaries in constructions other than those of prospective possession, or permit co-occurrence of two possessive-marked NPs in the possessive proper and in benefactive functions. A language with an advanced stage of reanalysis is Saliba (MARGETTS 2002; SONG 2005). Saliba also uses another strategy to encode a recipient through directional suffixes (hither = 'to me' and thither = 'to you'). These strategies can appear in combination, as in the following example:

(21)   Saliba (MARGETTS 2002: 629)
        yo-gu   medolo   se   le-ya-ma.
        CL1-1SG:P   medal   3PL   give-3SG:O-hither
        'They gave me a medal.'

MARGETTS (2002: 629) notes that these two strategies in combination allow disambiguating recipients from possessors. This explanation might hold also for some other Oceanic languages discussed by SONG. Note that semantically, externalization of a possessor is less felicitous than internalization of a beneficiary, as the dative marker is semantically richer (less ambiguous) than the genitive-possessive marker. Hence, it is conceivable that possessive coding of recipients and beneficiaries may lead to ambiguities, and such constructions will rely on extra disambiguation tools.

As argued by SONG (2005: 803ff.) and others, the convergence of possessors and beneficiaries in Oceanic is due to an extension of possessive marking to beneficiaries, not the other way round. An apparently similar pattern of convergence is found in Australian languages. More specifically, many Australian languages feature genitive-dative "syncretism", which is resolved through word order (BLAKE 1977). Thus, the "dative" can encode the possessor if used NP-internally (immediately preceding the head noun) in Diyari (AUSTIN 1981); cf. *wilha-ya wana-li* [woman-DAT digging_stick-ERG] 'with the woman's digging stick' for the genitive use and the benefactive use in (22):

(22)   Diyari (AUSTIN 1981: 143)
         nhulu   nganthi   mani-rna   wara-yi   kinthala-ya
         3SGNF.ERG   meat.ACC   get-PTCPL   Aux-PRS   dog-DAT
         'He got some meat for (his) dog.'

As reported by AUSTIN (1981: 147-148), the possessive use of the dative is more common with alienable possession. It is also found with inalienable possession, but in this function, juxtaposition is more frequent. Also in Warlpiri (LAUGHREN 2001; Mary LAUGHREN, p.c.), the possessive dative argument is strictly NP-internal (preceding the possessed) and cannot be dislocated (cf. the ungrammatical (23)').

(23)   Warlpiri (LAUGHREN 2001; Mary LAUGHREN, p.c.)
         karnta-ku   jaja-ngku   yunparnu
         woman-DAT   MM-ERG   sang
         'The woman's grandmother sang (it).'
(23)'   **Jaja-ngku karnta-ku yunparnu*

For Australian languages, however, it is less clear whether the possessive function is the primary function of this marker while the dative function is derivative and signalled by dislocation. Instead, one could argue that the dative function is primary (cf. BLAKE'S 1977: 38 proposal to regard the genitive as a special use of the dative in adnominal domain). On this account, this pattern of convergence is an instantiation of the "Goal Schema" for encoding possessors, in the terms of HEINE (1997). As noted by HEINE (1997: 186), the Goal Schema is more frequent in the domain of predicative possession (cf. French: *Ce chien est à moi* 'This dog is mine (lit. to me)'), but may occasionally be extended to attributive possession.

HEINE's Goal Schema for encoding possession is well documented cross-linguistically. In particular, it is common in Creole languages, as illustrated in (24)-(25) for Jamaican Creole. In Jamaican Creole (Joseph FARQUHARSON, p.c.), a benefactive strategy is used for predicative and emphatic possessors:

         Jamaican Creole (Joseph FARQUHARSON, p.c.)
(24)   *di   buk   a   fi   jan*
         DET   book   COP   for   John
         'The book is John's.' (or: intended for John)
(25)   *fi   jan   buk   de   pan   di   tiebl*
         for   John   book   LOC.COP   on   DET   table
         '**John's** book is on the table.'

Thus, cases of possessive-benefactive convergence in Oceanic and Australian might in fact involve different diachronic scenarios. Yet, synchronically these patterns show important similarities. In both cases, the ambiguity is resolved through word order: the ambiguous phrase receives a possessive interpretation when used NP-internally, and is interpreted as a beneficiary when used NP-externally.

6. A cautionary note: Internal and quasi-internal recipients and beneficiaries

Above we have considered several cases where a recipient or beneficiary is coded NP-internally as a possessor. For some cases (for example, for Tungusic languages), this analysis is uncontroversial. In other cases, this statement needs to be qualified. Consider Baule, a Kwa language of Côte d'Ivoire, which was one of the first cases of possessive encoding of beneficiaries to figure in the typological literature (CREISSELS 1979).

In Baule, the recipient is introduced by a (postposed) resumptive pronoun, also used in possessive constructions (CREISSELS & KOUADIO 2010):

(26) Baule (CREISSELS & KOUADIO 2010: 177)
      Kuàkú   màn-nìn   kòfí   (í)   sìkă
      Kouakou   give-PFV   Kofi   (3SG)   money
      'Kouakou gave Kofi money.'

(27) *kòfí   (í)   sìkă*
      Kofi   3SG   money
      'Kofi's money' (lit. 'Kofi (his) money')

In an earlier publication, CREISSELS (1979) analyzed this structure as a case of internal (adnominal) recipient construction. Yet, in a more recent publication CREISSELS & KOUADIO (2010) revised this analysis, given that syntactic tests (e.g., extraction diagnostics) suggest that recipients are different from possessors. The following examples show that a theme (like other arguments) can be extracted in a focus construction (28f), while a possessed noun cannot be extracted independently of its possessor (28c); only the whole possessive NP can be extracted/focalized in this way (28a):

(28) Baule (CREISSELS & KOUADIO 2010: 180f.)

a. *Bè   bù-lì   Kòfí   suă-n.*
    3PL   demolish-PFV   Kofi   house-DEF
    'They demolished Kofi's house.'

b. *Kòfí   suă-n   yê   bè   bù-lì   í   ɔ̀.*
    Kofi   house-DEF FOC   3PL   demolish-PFV 3SG   FOC
    'It is Kofi's house that they demolished.'

c.   **Suă-n   yê   bè   bù-lì   Kòfí   ɔ̀.*
               house-DEF   FOC   3PL   demolish-PFV Kofi   FOC
    (intended: 'They demolished Kofi's **house**.')

d. *Kuàkú   màn-nìn   Kòfí   (í)   bólí.*
    Kouakou   give-PFV   Kofi   3SG   goat
    'Kouakou gave Kofi a goat.'

e. *Kòfí   yê   Kuàkú   mèn-nìn   í   bólí   ɔ̀.*
    Kofi   FOC   Kouakou give-PFV 3SG   goat   FOC
    'It is to Kofi that Kouakou gave a goat.'

f. *Bólí   yê   Kuàkú   màn-nìn   Kòfí   ɔ̀.*
    goat   FOC   Kouakou give-PFV Kofi   FOC
    'It is a goat that Kouakou gave to Kofi.'

Since extraction is restricted to verbal arguments, CREISSELS & KOUADIO (2010) conclude that, contrary to the appearance, possessive-marked recipients are NP-external in Baule. Such a possibility also exists for some other cases considered above, in particular those where the possessor is additionally marked by the applicative marker on the verb or licenses object agreement. Nevertheless, as noted above in some other cases (e.g., Tungusic), the construction is unmistakably NP-internal, but in such cases, importantly, it always involves additional marking.

7. Conclusions

In this article, I have considered different types of benefactive-possessive convergence across languages. While extending dative marking to possessors (along the lines of HEINE's Goal Schema) does not cause major problems, the opposite scenario when a possessive encoding is extended to beneficiaries and recipients is shown to be used restrictedly, as it gives rise to ambiguities. This is most noticeable when one extends possessive marking beyond verbs of creation to verbs of transfer (*I gave his money*); in the latter case, a regular possessive interpretation is also possible and in fact preferable.

As demonstrated in this paper, extension of possessive marking to recipients involves different types of disambiguation:
• through word order, as in Oceanic and Australian languages, where the same marker is interpreted as possessive/genitive if NP-internal and dative if NP-external;
• through overt marking of the possessor, as in Manipuri (18c);
• through overt marking of the possessed noun as in Tungusic and Samoyedic;
• through 'secundative' object agreement on the verb (as in Qiang);
• through benefactive applicative marking (as in Manipuri and Totonac);
• through directional marking (as in Qiang or Saliba);
• or, possibly, through a combination of these strategies.

In conclusion, I need to make a qualification (a disclaimer) to the effect that the availability of disambiguating mechanisms is clearly not the only factor that enables possessive marking of beneficiaries and recipients. As already observed in the literature (LEHMANN et al. 2004: 95; cf. CROFT 1985: 43), certain contextual features such as use in imperative contexts facilitate the benefactive interpretation of the possessor (cf. *Bring my coat = Bring me a coat*). Moreover, there may be additional structural features that enable possessive marking of recipients and other roles. Thus, LEHMANN et al. (2004: 152) and LEHMANN (2015) propose that the structural elaboration of the possessive domain in languages such as Yucatec Maya (which features possessive classifiers, and where expression of the possessor is often indispensable, especially in case of inalienable possession) may account for possessive marking of verbal arguments (recipients, beneficiaries, but also experiencers and locative arguments). These observations are highly suggestive, but systematic investigation of these additional factors is left for future research.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations in the glosses follow the "Leipzig Glossing Rules"
(https://www.eva mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php)

Other abbreviations:

ASP	aspect	OPB	Oblique Pronominal Base
DES	designative case	PAM	Person Agreement Marker
DEST	destinative form	PCL	Possessive Classifier
DIR	direct case	$2s_2$	Set$_2$ (oblique) PAM, 2nd sg.
DIRECT	directional (verbal) marker	$2s_1$	Set$_1$ (direct) PAM, 2nd sg.
NFUT	nonfuture	$1s_1$	Set$_1$ (direct) PAM, 1st sg.

References

AUSTIN, Peter 1981: *A grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

BAERMAN, Matthew 2008: "Case syncretism." In: Andrej MALCHUKOV & Andrew SPENCER (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. Oxford University Press, pp. 219-231

BHAT, Darbhe N. Shankara & M. S. NINGOMBA 1997: *Manipuri grammar* [*Studies in Asian Linguistics* 4]. Munich: Lincom Europa

BLAKE, Barry J. 1977: *Case marking in Australian Languages*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies

CREISSELS, Denis 1979: *Les constructions dites "possessives": Étude de linguistique générale et de typologie linguistique.* Paris: Université de Paris 4 dissertation

CREISSELS, Denis & Michael DANIEL 2006: "Monotransitive "give"-constructions: Exploring the periphery of ditransitives." Paper given at the Leipzig *Rara and Rarissima* Conference

CREISSELS, Denis & Jérémie KOUADIO 2010: "Ditransitive constructions in Baule." In: MALCHUKOV / HASPELMATH / COMRIE, pp. 166-189

CROFT, William 1985: "Indirect object 'lowering'." *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 11, pp. 39-51

HAIG, Geoffrey 2008: *Alignment change in Iranian languages. A Construction Grammar approach*. Berlin: Mouton

HASPELMATH, Martin 2005: "Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types." *Linguistic Discovery* 3.1, pp. 1-21 (free online journal, http://linguistic-discovery.dartmouth.edu/)

HEINE, Bernd 1997: *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

KAZAMA, Shinjiro 2010: "Designative case in Tungusic." In: Lindsay WHALEY & Andrej MALCHUKOV (eds.): *Advances in Tungusic Studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 123-155

KENT, Roland G. 1953: *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon* [*American Oriental Series* 33]. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2nd ed.

KHANINA, Olesya & Andrey SHLUINSKY 2014: "A rare type of benefactive construction: Evidence from Enets." *Linguistics* 52.6, pp. 1391-1431. doi:10.1515/ling-2014-0025

LAUGHREN, Mary 2001: "The complex genitive construction in northern Pama-Nyungan languages." Ms., University of Queensland

LAPOLLA, Randy J. & Chenglong HUANG 2003: *A grammar of Qiang with annotated texts and glossary*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

LEE, Kee-Dong 1975: *Kusaiean reference grammar* [*Pali Language Texts Micronesia*]. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press

LEHMANN, Christian 2015: "Valency classes in Yucatec Maya." In: MALCHUKOV / HASPELMATH / COMRIE, pp. 1407-1461