

---

# **Bemba benefactive constructions in the typology of applicatives**

**Lutz Marten**

---

Proceedings of Conference on  
**Language Documentation & Linguistic Theory 3**

Edited by Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond, Lutz Marten &  
David Nathan

19-20 November 2011 School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project  
Department of Linguistics  
School of Oriental and African Studies  
Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square  
London WC1H 0XG  
United Kingdom

Department of Linguistics:  
Tel: +44-20-7898-4640  
Fax: +44-20-7898-4679  
[linguistics@soas.ac.uk](mailto:linguistics@soas.ac.uk)  
<http://www.soas.ac.uk/academics/departments/linguistics>

Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project:  
Tel: +44-20-7898-4640  
Fax: +44-20-7898-4349  
[elap@soas.ac.uk](mailto:elap@soas.ac.uk)  
<http://www.hrelp.org>

© 2011 Lutz Marten

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author(s) of that part of the publication, except as permitted by UK copyright law.

ISBN: 978-0-7286-0398-1

This publication can be cited as:

Lutz Marten. 2011. Bemba benefactive constructions in the typology of applicatives. In Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond, Lutz Marten & David Nathan (eds) *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 3*, 183-192. London: SOAS.

or:

Lutz Marten. 2011. Bemba benefactive constructions in the typology of applicatives. In Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond, Lutz Marten & David Nathan (eds) *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 3*. London: SOAS. [www.hrelp.org/eprints/ldlt3\\_19.pdf](http://www.hrelp.org/eprints/ldlt3_19.pdf)

## Bemba benefactive constructions in the typology of applicatives

LUTZ MARTEN

*School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*

### 1. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

Applicative verbs typically introduce an additional nominal argument into the subcategorization frame of their corresponding base verb, so that, for example in Bemba, the transitive verb *-lamba* ‘write’ becomes ditransitive when the applicative suffix *-el-* is added.<sup>2</sup>

- (1) (a) *n-ka-lamb-a*                      *kalata*                      [Bemba]  
SM1SG-FUT-write-FV      9.letter  
‘I will write a letter.’
- (b) *n-ka-lamb-el-a*                      *bá-mayó*                      *kalata*  
SM1SG-FUT-write-APPL-FV      2-mother                      9.letter  
‘I will write my mother a letter.’

In (1b), the applied object *bámáyó* ‘mother’ is licensed by the applicative marker *-el-*. In this example, the applied object is thematically a beneficiary, but other thematic roles, such as location, instrument or reason, can typically be expressed in applicative constructions. Furthermore, different readings of benefactive applicatives can be distinguished, including plain benefactives, recipient benefactives and substitutive benefactives (Kittilä 2005, Van Valin & LaPolla 1997, Zúñiga & Kittilä 2010). However, languages differ as to how different interpretations of applicatives are formally distinguished: while some languages, for example Hakha Lai, distinguish

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to audiences at the LAGB Spring Meeting, University of Sheffield, April 2003, and the 11th LASU conference, Lusaka, May 2011, as well as to Nancy Kula, for helpful comments and suggestions on the ideas developed in this paper. Parts of the research reported in this paper have benefited from financial support for fieldwork in Zambia in 1998 from the University of London Central Research Fund, and in 2005 from the AHRC (grant B/RG/AN8675/APN16312), which is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>2</sup> Bemba examples without reference are from the author’s fieldwork in Zambia from 1998 to 2011. I am grateful to Fenson Mwape, Rhoda Sambwa, Honoria Kula and Nancy Kula for discussion of the Bemba data reported here. The following abbreviations are used: 1, 2, 3, ... = noun class number; 1/2/3 SG/PL = 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular/plural; ACC = accusative; APPL = applicative; ART = article; BEN = benefactive; CLR = clarification; COM = comitative; COMP = complementizer; DAT = dative; DEIC = deictic; DEM = demonstrative; EMP = emphasis; F = feminine; FUT = future; FV = final vowel; INST = instrument; LC = locative clitic; M = masculine; MAL = malefactive; NOM = nominative; OM = object marker; PE = perceived evidence; PI = past imperfective; POSS = possessive; PROG = progressive; PRT = preterite; REU = reported evidence unknown; SBV = subjunctive; SM = subject marker; SUB = subordinator; TWD = toward.

morphologically between different applicative constructions, many Bantu languages have only one applicative marker which can be used for a range of thematically distinct constructions (Peterson 2007). With respect to the different senses of benefactive constructions, many languages distinguish formally between recipient benefactives and substitutive benefactives, with plain benefactives often marked identically to one of the two groups (Kittilä 2005). This paper presents a discussion of Bemba benefactive constructions, and locates them in this wider typological field of applicative constructions. In particular, the paper shows that Bemba belongs to a group of languages in which substitutive benefactives are marked both by applicative and substitutive benefactive morphology. In addition, this paper develops a small typology of the interaction of applicative and benefactive markers.

## 2. FORMAL MARKING OF APPLICATIVES

Applicative constructions are typically marked by verbal morphology, as in example (1) above, and for some authors, this is a defining quality of the construction (e.g. Peterson 2007:1). On the other hand, some authors include applicatives expressed periphrastically (e.g. Creissels 2006), and comparative analyses of benefactive constructions, which are in some sense a sub-type of applicatives, that often includes both verbally and nominally marked constructions (e.g. Zúñiga & Kittilä 2010). However, irrespective of formal marking, applicatives can express a range of thematically different relations, the most common of which include benefactive, malefactive, recipient, goal, instrument, location, and circumstantial (e.g. Mchombo 2004, Peterson 2007). In some languages, different thematic relations are expressed by different applicative markers. Hakha Lai (Tibeto-Burman), for example, has seven different applicative suffixes, distinguishing benefactive/malefactive, malefactive/allative, comitative, instrument, additional benefactive, prioritive, and relinquitive applicatives. The first four of these are illustrated below (Peterson 2007:18-23):

- (2) *ʔa-ka-thi ʔ-piak* [Hakha Lai]  
SM3SG-OM1SG-die-BEN  
'He died for me.'
- (3) *kheej ʔa-ka-hlo ʔn-hno ʔ*  
dish SM3SG-OM1SG-throw-MAL  
'She threw the dish at me.'
- (4) *ka-law ʔan-ka-thlo ʔ-pii*  
POSS1SG-field SM3PL-OM1SG-weed-COM  
'They weeded my field (together) with me.'
- (5) *tiilooy khaa tiiva kan-Ø-tan-naak*  
boat DEIC river SM1PL-OM3SG-cross-INST  
'We used the boat to cross the river.'

In contrast to languages like Hakha Lai, most Bantu languages only have one applicative marker, which is typically a reflex of the Proto-Bantu applicative marker *\*-il-* (Meeussen 1967), and which can be used in thematically different constructions, as illustrated from Bemba in the examples below.

- (6) *bá-á-ípík-il-a*                      *Chisángá*      *ify-ùmbù*                      [Bemba]  
 SM2-PAST-cook-APPL-FV   1.Chisanga    8-potatoes  
 ‘They have cooked potatoes for Chisanga.’
- (7) *baRhoda*   *bá-léé-ciish-il-a*                      *ify-akufwala*      *mu-ngánda*  
 2.Rhoda   SM2-PROG-iron-APPL-FV   8-clothes      18-house  
 ‘Rhoda is ironing clothes in the house.’
- (8) *bá-á-<sup>1</sup>bwél-él-a*                                      *ku-mu-shi*  
 SM2-PAST-return-APPL-FV                      17-3-village  
 ‘They returned to the village’ (Sims 1959:129)
- (9) *mutalé*   *a-léé-<sup>1</sup>ípík-il-a*                                      *na*   *supuni*  
 Mutale   SM1-PROG-cook-APPL-FV   with   9.spoon  
 ‘Mutale is cooking with a spoon.’
- (10) *tu-léé-<sup>1</sup>bómb-él-a*                                      *indálama*  
 SM1PL-PROG-work-APPL-FV                      9.money  
 ‘We are working for money.’ (Sadler 1964:270)

The examples show that the Bemba applicative marker *-il-/-el-/-in-/-en-* (the various forms are due to vowel and nasal harmony) is found in applicative constructions with different thematic meanings: benefactive (6), locative (7), direction (8), instrument (9), and motive (10). However, Bemba is unusual for a Bantu language in that there is a formal distinction between different readings of benefactive applicatives, as will be seen in Section 4.

### 3. DIFFERENT TYPES OF BENEFACTIVE APPLICATIVES

Benefactive applicatives can express events with slightly different meanings. Often three different senses are distinguished, depending on whether the event involves the passing of an entity from the agent to a recipient (recipient benefactives), whether there is a beneficiary who simply benefits from the event without necessarily receiving anything (plain benefactives), or whether the agent performs an action during the event instead of, or in place of, a substitute (substitutive benefactives). According to Kittilä (2005), languages vary with respect to how these different senses are formally distinguished. Four different broad types can be distinguished: tripartite languages, recipient-prominent languages, benefactive-prominent languages, and neutral languages, illustrated in more detail below.

Tripartite languages are rare, and are only exemplified by English and Icelandic in Kittilä's (2005) study. In these languages, all three benefactive senses are marked differently, as shown from Icelandic (Germanic, Indo-European) (Kittilä 2005:278):

- (11) *maðurinn gaf konu/konunni bók* [Icelandic]  
 man.NOM gave woman/woman.DAT book  
 'The man gave the woman a book.'
- (12) *hann bakaði köku handa mér*  
 he.NOM bake.PAST cake.ACC for me  
 'He baked me a cake.'
- (13) *hann bakaði köku fyrir mig*  
 he.NOM bake.PAST cake.ACC for me  
 'He baked me a cake/he baked a cake for me (instead of me).'

Recall that studies of benefactives, including Kittilä's, tend not to restrict benefactives to constructions marked by verbal morphology and so the differences between the Icelandic examples above result from different nominal marking. Recipient benefactives are expressed by a bare dative NP (11), while in plain benefactives (12), the beneficiary argument is introduced by the preposition *handa*, and in substitutive benefactives (13), the substitutive argument is marked by the preposition *fyrir*.

In recipient-prominent languages, such as Finnish, Yorùbá, and Southeastern Tepehuan, recipient benefactives and plain benefactives are marked identically, but substitutive benefactives are marked differently, as seen in Yorùbá (Niger-Congo) (Rowlands 1969:83-84, quoted in Kittilä 2005:280):

- (14) *ó fi owó náà fún mi* [Yorùbá]  
 he put money the give me  
 'He gave me the money.'
- (15) *rà á fún mi*  
 buy it give me  
 'Buy it for me.'
- (16) *bá mi lọs' ójà*  
 COM/BEN me go to market  
 'Go with/for me to the market.'

In Yorùbá, both recipient and plain benefactives are marked by *fún* 'give' in a serial verb construction (see e.g. Shibatani 1996 for the relation between 'give' and benefactive constructions), in contrast to substitutive benefactives, which are marked by the preposition *bá* 'with, on behalf of' which can introduce comitative and

substitutive arguments and which may be related to the verb *bá* ‘meet, catch up with’.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, in Southeastern Tepehuan (Uto-Aztecan) (Willett 1991:76-77, 182-183; quoted from Kittilä 2005:280), recipient (17) and plain (18) benefactives pattern together, as opposed to substitutive benefactives (19):

- (17) *jaró ba-m-b#-dya-c gu-m sa'ua?* [Tepehuan]  
 who TWD-2SG-pass-APPL-PI ART-2SG blanket  
 ‘Who brought you your blanket?’
- (18) *ma'n-ap jiñ-som-dya-‘ gu cutun*  
 one-2SG 1SG-sew-APPL-FUT ART shirt  
 ‘Please sew a shirt for me.’
- (19) *chiñi-a'-ap gu-m xix cu-m t#miñ-xi-dya-‘*  
 ask-FUT-2SG ART-2SG sibling so-2SG lower-BEN-APPL-FUT  
*gu-m sa'ua na gu' tē'cov dá*  
 ART-2SG blanket SUB but high sit  
 ‘Ask your (older) sibling to get your blanket down for you because it’s up high.’

The Tepehuan facts are particularly interesting because benefactive constructions are marked by verbal morphology, and thus comparable to Bemba applicatives. Furthermore, because substitutive benefactives are in fact doubly marked, as (19) shows, the verb form includes both the applicative marker *-dya* and the substitutive benefactive marker *-xi*. A similar distribution of morphemes is found in Dakota (Siouan), where recipient and plain benefactives are marked by a prefix *ki-*, but substitutives by *kici-* which might reflect a historical reduplication of *ki-* (Boas & Deloria 1941:86). In both languages substitutives are marked by a general applicative marker in addition to a specific substitutive benefactive marker. We will see below that the same is true in Bemba.

Beneficiary-prominent languages are the opposite of recipient-prominent languages in that plain and substitutive benefactives pattern together, while recipient benefactives are marked differently, as in Tamil (Dravidian) (Lehmann et al. 2000:70, 76, 93, quoted from Kittilä 2005:281-2):

- (20) *Raman biravy-ukku pant-ai kuṭu-tt-aan* [Tamil]  
 Raman Biravy-dat ball-acc give-prt-3sg.m  
 ‘Raman has given Biravy a ball.’
- (21) *avan en-ukk-aaka oru ttopi-yai vangi-n-aan*  
 3SG.M 1SG-DAT-BEN a hat-ACC buy-PRT-3SG.M  
 ‘He has bought a hat for me.’

---

<sup>3</sup> I am grateful to Akin Oyètádé for discussion of the Yorùbá examples.

- (22) *Rani pi[[ai-akk-aaka muṭi-yai vari-vittaa]*  
 Rani child-DAT-BEN hair-ACC comb-COMP-3SG.F  
 ‘Rani has combed the child’s hair (for him/her).’

In Tamil, benefactives are marked by nominal suffixes on the benefactive object. Similar to the Tepehuan data, Tamil benefactives involve double marking: recipient benefactive objects are marked by a dative suffix, and plain and substitutives are, in addition, marked by the benefactive suffix *-aaka*. As in Tepehuan, substitutives are double marked and recipients are single marked. However, in contrast to Tepehuan, plain benefactives are double marked in Tamil as well.

Finally, neutral languages do not formally distinguish between the three different readings of benefactives. In Thai (Daic) (Bisang 1992:366, quoted from Kittilä 2005:285), like in Yorùbá, benefactives are based on a serial verb construction involving a ‘give’-type verb, but unlike in Yorùbá, the verb involved in Thai is the same in all three constructions:

- (23) *Kháw sòṅ còdmǎaj hâj phýan* [Thai]  
 he send letter give friend  
 ‘He sends his friend a letter.’

- (24) *Dεεṅ jīṅ nóg hâj sùdaa*  
 Deng shoot bird give Suda  
 ‘Deng shoots a bird for Suda.’

- (25) *Dεεṅ paj talàad hâj sùdaa*  
 Deng go market give Suda  
 ‘Deng is going to the market for Suda.’

Of course, the same is also true of most Bantu languages, where different thematic readings, as well as different benefactive readings, are typically expressed by the same applicative marker, as shown by the Swahili examples below:<sup>4</sup>

- (26) *Juma a-li-m-let-e-a m-vulana samaki* [Swahili]  
 Juma SM1-PAST-OM1-bring-APPL-FV 1-boy 9.fish  
 ‘Juma brought the boy a fish.’

- (27) *Bi Subira a-li-jeng-e-a familia y-ake nyumba*  
 Ms Subira SM1-PAST-build-APPL-FV 9.family 9-POSS3SG 9.house  
 ‘Ms Subira built a house for her family.’

---

<sup>4</sup> I am grateful to Kamariyah Mbamba for providing and explaining the Swahili examples.

- (28) *Mw-aname a-li-m-fung-i-a m-vulana m-lango*  
 1-man SM1-PAST-OM1-close-APPL-FV 1-boy 3-door  
 ‘The man closed the door for the boy.’

While it is often difficult to distinguish between different readings out of context,<sup>5</sup> the examples above show that in Swahili, recipient, plain and substitutive benefactive readings are all marked by the applicative marker *-i/-e-*. Thus, Swahili is a neutral language with respect to benefactive marking.

#### 4. BEMBA SUBSTITUTIVES AND THE DOUBLE MARKING OF BENEFACTIVE APPLICATIVES

As illustrated in section 2, Bemba applicatives are marked by the applicative suffix *-il/-el/-in/-en-* and can express a range of thematic relations, as is typical for Bantu languages. When it comes to benefactives, however, Bemba is different from most Bantu languages in that substitutives can be formally distinguished from plain and recipient benefactives. While the latter two are marked by the applicative marker (29, 30), substitutives are also marked by the (noun class 17) locative clitic *-ko* (31):

- (29) (a) *U-n-túm-in-e mw-an-ó* [Bemba]  
 SM2SG-OM1SG-send-APPL-SBV 1-child-POSS2SG  
 ‘Send me your son.’ (Sambeek 1955:86)
- (b) *Tu-a-ku-lét-él-a i-búúku ili*  
 SM1PL-PAST-OM2SG-bring-APPL-FV 5-book 5DEM  
 ‘We brought this book for you.’ (Sadler 1964:270)
- (30) (a) *Lek-a n-kw-ikát-il-e ncinga*  
 Leave-FV SM1SG-OM2SG-hold-APPL-SBV bike  
 ‘Let me hold your bicycle for you.’ (Sambeek 1955:85)
- (b) *Bá-mayó bá-á-<sup>1</sup>ípik-il-a ábá-ana ify-umbu*  
 2-mother SM2-PAST-cook-APPL-FV 2-children 8-potatoes  
 ‘The mother has just cooked potatoes for the children.’
- (c) *Á-ká-<sup>1</sup>bá-téyánish-ish-a i-tébulo*  
 SM1-FUT-OM2-prepare-APPL-FV 5-table  
 ‘He will set/prepare the table for them.’ (Sadler 1964:270)

---

<sup>5</sup> Marten & Kula (forthcoming) discusses contextualized Swahili examples which support the same conclusion.



- (31) (a) *Ábá-icé bá-ká-send-el-a-kó im-fúmu ubu-ta*  
 2-children SM2-FUT-carry-APPL-FV-LC17 9-chief 14-bow  
 ‘The children will carry the bow on behalf of (instead of) the chief.’
- (b) *A-alí-n-sós-éel-e-kó*  
 SM1-REM.PAST-OM1SG-speak-APPL-PFV-LC17  
 ‘He spoke in my favour/defence.’ (cf. Sambeek 1955:85)
- (c) *Á-ká-<sup>l</sup>bá-téyánish-ish-a-kó i-tébulo*  
 SM1-FUT-OM2-prepare-APPL-FV-LC17 5-table  
 ‘He will set/prepare the table instead of them.’ (Sadler 1964:271)

The examples show that only substitutive benefactives are marked by the locative clitic *-ko*. The difference in interpretation is particularly clear from the ‘minimal pair’ (30c) and (31c), distinguishing between plain benefactive ‘for them’ and substitutive ‘instead of them’. Bemba substitutives are built on benefactive applicatives, and are incompatible with malefactive, directional or instrumental applicatives. Like Bemba applicatives in general, they are syntactically asymmetric while semantically, substitutives express that the agent performs the action in place of, instead of, or on behalf of a substitute, usually encoded by the applied object (see Marten & Kula (forthcoming) for a more detailed discussion of Bemba benefactive constructions).

In terms of formal marking, Bemba patterns with Tepehuan and Dakota. In all three languages, benefactives are marked verbally by two different markers. There is a general applicative marker, found in all three benefactive constructions, and there is a specific substitutive benefactive marker found in addition to the general applicative marker only with substitutives: *-ko* in Bemba, *-xi* in Tepehuan and *ci-* in Dakota. As noted above, this contrasts with languages like Tamil and Swahili, where all three benefactives are marked by the same applicative marker, and also with Tamil, where plain and substitutives are marked by two markers. The situation is summarized in the mini-typology in Table 1, where A stands for applicative marker, and B for benefactive marker:

**Table 1**  
 Applicative and benefactive marking

	Swahili, Thai	Bemba, Dakota, Tepehuan	Tamil			
Recipient	A	A	A	AB	AB	AB
Plain	A	A	AB	AB	AB	A
Substitutive	A	AB	AB	AB	A	A

The summary shows how applicative and benefactive markers combine in different languages. As noted above, a further difference exists between the Bemba group and Tamil, namely that marking in the former involves verbal morphology, while in Tamil, marking involves nominal morphology. Further research will show to what extent this difference is significant for the pattern noted in Table 1. An interesting feature in Table 1 is that the right half of the table is empty. It would be populated by languages in which all three readings of benefactives are marked by two morphemes, where recipient and plain benefactives are marked by two markers, or where only recipients are doubly marked. However, in the small convenience sample of this paper – based on the work of Kittilä (2005) and a few Bantu languages – no languages with these patterns were found. Whether this is accidental or systematic has to be addressed by a larger study.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that Bemba, like many Bantu languages, has one applicative marker which is used in a range of thematically different constructions. However, unusually for a Bantu language, Bemba formally distinguishes substitutive benefactives from recipient and plain benefactives by marking the former by means of a locative clitic *-ko*, in addition to the applicative marker. Cross-linguistically, Bemba is similar to Southeastern Tepehuan and Dakota, since all three languages mark substitutives by a specific marker in addition to the applicative marker. A related pattern is found in Tamil, where not only substitutives, but both plain and substitutive benefactives are doubly marked, albeit by nominal morphology. The small typology in Section 4 shows the relation between the four languages, and languages like Swahili and Thai, where all three readings are marked simply by an applicative marker. However, more comparative research with a larger sample of languages is needed to show the typological distribution of double applicative-benefactive marking.

## REFERENCES

- Boas, Franz & Ella Deloria. 1941. *Dakota grammar* (Memoirs of the National Academy of Science, vol. 23, 2<sup>nd</sup> memoir). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- Bisang, Walter. 1992. *Das Verb im Chinesischen, Hmong, Vietnamesischen, Thai und Khmer*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Creissels, Denis. 2006. *Syntaxe générale, une introduction typologique. Vol. 2 : la phrase*. Paris: Hermès.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Recipient-prominence vs. beneficiary-prominence. *Linguistic Typology* 9, 269-297.
- Lehmann, Christian, Yong-Min Shin, & Elisabeth Verhoeven. 2000. *Direkte und indirekte Partizipation: Zur Typologie der sprachlichen Repräsentation konzeptueller Relationen*. München: Lincom Europa.

- Marten, Lutz & Nancy C. Kula. forthcoming. Benefactive and substitutive applicatives in Bemba. MS., SOAS and University of Essex.
- Mchombo, Sam A. 2004. *The syntax of Chichewa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meeussen, Achille E. 1967. Bantu grammatical reconstruction. *Africana Linguistica* 3, 79-121.
- Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rowlands, E. C. 1969. *Yoruba*. Teach Yourself Books. Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Sadler, Wesley. 1964. *Untangled Bemba: A language of Northern Rhodesia, Central Africa*. Kitwe: The United Church of Central Africa in Rhodesia.
- Sambeek, J. van. 1955. *A Bemba grammar*. Cape Town: Longmans.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1996. Applicatives and benefactives: A cognitive account. In Masayoshi Shibatani & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*, 157-94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willett, Thomas L. 1991. *A reference grammar of Southeastern Tepehuan*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Zúñiga, Fernando & Seppo Kittilä (eds.). 2010. *Benefactives and malefactives: Typological perspectives and case studies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.