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Abstract
This paper studies the different flavours of beneficiaries in Modern Greek beyond the usual suspects. The purpose of this paper is to give a full account of this function in Modern Greek and to reassess the category benefactive in general. Greek data are compared with those taken from Spanish.
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1. Introduction
The last twenty years have seen an increase in studies on semantic roles. One of the functions which has drawn much attention is the so-called beneficiary/benefactive (and its counterpart malefactive). This semantic role is defined as a (usually) human or animate participant who gets a beneficial (or adverse) effect from a State of Affairs (henceforth SoA) (Dik 1997, Givón 1984, Lehmann et al. 2000), although this initial definition has been frequently forgotten in practical discussions (Kittilä & Zúñiga 2010, Givón 1984).

The purpose of this paper is to study the different markers that can fulfil this function and the different ‘flavours’ of benefaction conveyed by them in Standard Modern Greek (SMGrk), although data and information from other languages (particularly Spanish) will be provided as well. The Greek examples are mainly taken from the Hellenic National Corpus (hence HNC, http://hnc.ilsp.gr).

Apart from the usual suspects (NPs in genitive, PPs headed by σε and για as
recipient beneficiaries), there are many other candidates which have received little or no attention at all:

(i) Behalf or deputative beneficiaries like ἐκ μέρους + gen., γιὰ λογαριασμό + gen., στο όνομα/ἐπ᾽ ὅνοματι + gen.

(ii) Cause/reason benefactive markers like γιὰ + acc., γιὰ χατίρι + gen., γιὰ χάρη + gen.

(iii) Pure beneficiaries like ὑπέρ/προς ὀφέλος/ἐπ᾽ ὀφελεία/ἐπ᾽ αγαθό/γιὰ το καλό + gen.

(iv) Malefactive expressions like κατά/ἐναντίον/εἰς βάρος/ἐπί ζημία + gen. and ενάντια σε + acc.

Although these many different classes of beneficiaries (and others) have been established, their similarities and differences have not been thoroughly studied. My paper aims to tackle this issue in SMGrk and to draw some general conclusions.

This paper is part of a larger project on semantic functions; the purpose of this larger project is the description of the semantic functions in SMGrk, the identification of the different markers of each function and the comparison with their Spanish counterparts.

2. Beneficiaries as recipients

One of the ways in which the beneficiary can benefit the beneficiary is by providing him/her with something (benefactum). For example, the verb μαγειρεύει (‘to cook’) has only two arguments in nominative (subject) and accusative (object). A third additional (adjunct or satellite) participant can be included that refers to the final recipient of the object. This recipient can be marked in SMGrk by a genitive (NP or clitic) or the PPs σε + acc. or γιὰ + acc. (Anagnostopoulou 2005):

---

2 See Anagnostopoulou (2005).
4 The SMGrk preverbs ὑπέρ- and κατα- may exhibit benefactive and malefactive meanings (see ὑπηρεσία ‘to vote in favour’ and καταφροκτίζω ‘to vote against’), but they are not so productive as they were in Ancient Greek (Revuelta forthcoming). For the incorporation of benefaction/malefaction into the verb through morphological modification, see the works on applicatives by Payne (2000), Creissels (2010), Peterson (2007:6-10, 17-19, 46-47) or van Valin (2005:121-122). This article also omits the connection between direct objects and benefaction with clearly benefactive verbs like βοηθεῖ οὐφέλει, εννοεῖ (Mulder 1988, Revuelta forthcoming): these verbs take accusative in SMGrk, but in Ancient Greek they could, or had to, take dative.
The same applies to many other verbs with the same predicate frame, as for example φτιάχνει (‘to make’):

(5) Τού φτιάξαν φαΐ. (‘They prepared him some food’, HNC 1100457)
(6) Μόνο ένα μπουφέδακι της φτιάξαν της Χιλλαρι στην Ακρόπολη; (‘Did they just prepare a small buffet for Hillary on the Acropolis?’, HNC 1886338)
(7) Τους ντοματοκεφτέδες [...] τα παλιά χρόνια τους φτιάχναν το μεσημέρι στους αγρότες για κολασίο. (‘In the past they used to prepare tomato fritters for the farmers for lunch’, HNC 210093)
(8) Είχαν φτιάξει ρουχαλάκια για το μωρό. (‘They had made some clothes for the baby’ HNC)

This role differs from other recipients in three-place predicates like δίνω (‘to give’) in three ways. First, beneficiaries are adjuncts (optional constituents) rather than arguments (obligatory constituents). Secondly, beneficiaries can appear in addition to argument recipients, as in the following examples (see the beneficiaries headed by για + acc. in addition to the recipients in genitive or introduced by σε in 9 and 10).

(9) Μου έδωσε για σένα αυτό το γράμμα. (http://goo.gl/XeW1d0)
    Me dio esta carta para ti.

(S)he gave me this letter for you.
(10) Μερικά τα έδίνε στις θείες μου για τα δικά τους παιδιά. (HNC 172800)

Algunas se las dio a mis tías para sus hijos.

She gave some of them to my aunts for their children.

The third difference is that third-argument recipients cannot be marked through για + acc., unlike recipient beneficiaries.\(^6\) Cross-linguistically there is a certain parallelism between a class of markers open to argument recipients (sometimes also to adjunct recipients) and a class restricted to recipient beneficiaries (adjuncts):\(^7\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Recipients (arguments (adjuncts))</th>
<th>Beneficiary recipients (adjuncts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>to (PP)</td>
<td>for (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>genitive (NP) / σε acc. (PP)</td>
<td>για (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>a (PP)</td>
<td>para (PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>dative (NP)</td>
<td>für (PP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{Table 1}\)

Despite certain overlapping between them, there seems to be another difference between για (PP) and the remainder of the recipient beneficiary markers. According to Anagnostopoulou (2005, based on Kayne 1975) some beneficiaries are actual recipients (genitive and σε + acc.), whereas others (για + acc.) are only potential recipients. In the next two examples both the subject and the final beneficiary are alive, but in the third no such restriction exists:

(11) Αγοράζει παιχνίδια στον εγγόνο του εγγόνου του

Compra juguetes al nieto de su nieto

He buys toys to his grandson’s grandson

(12) Αγοράζει παιχνίδια του εγγόνου του εγγόνου του

Compra juguetes al nieto de su nieto

He buys toys to his grandson’s grandson

(13) Αγοράζει παιχνίδια για τον εγγόνο του εγγόνου του

Compra juguetes para el nieto de su nieto

He buys toys for his grandson’s grandson

\(^6\) See Anagnostopoulou (2005: 74).

\(^7\) English has the additional double object construction.
As the Spanish translations make clear, this difference is not exclusive to SMGrk or English.

3. Behalf beneficiaries
Another way to benefit a person is to carry out an action (s)he is unable or does not want to perform on his/her own behalf (see also ‘deputative’ in Luraghi 2010, Van Valin and LaPolla 1997). The markers in Greek, Spanish and English are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εκ μέρους + gen.</td>
<td>de parte de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>για λογαριασμό + gen.</td>
<td>por cuenta de</td>
<td>on behalf of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στο όνομα (επ᾽ ονόματι) + gen.</td>
<td>en nombre de</td>
<td>in the name of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2*

The following examples illustrate this type of benefactive flavour:

(14) Θα θάλσ θάπνηα δήλωση εκ μέρους του Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών (HNC 1353763)
Haré alguna declaración de parte del Ministerio de Exteriores
I will make some statements on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

(15) Μέσα στον κριτικό μηχανισμό δρούν ακόμη οι πρώην πράκτορες της Στάζι, όμως τώρα πια για λογαριασμό των Αμερικανών. (HNC 425713)
Dentro del mecanismo estatal todavía están actuando agentes de la STASI, aunque ahora ya por cuenta de los americanos.
There are former STASI agents in the state apparatus, but working now on behalf of the Americans.

(16) Θεωρείται ότι δρούν στο όνομα κάποιας συγκεκριμένης κοινότητας ή θρησκευτικού δόγματος (HNC 8545)
Sostienen que actúan en nombre de cierta comunidad o credo religioso
They claim they are acting in the name of a certain community or religious belief

Although the entities headed by εκ μέρους, για λογαριασμό and στο όνομα (επ᾽ ονόματι) are responsible for the actions and are their instigators, they do not act
themselves but are replaced by the subjects, who carry out the action for them.

In some cases the preposition για can also be used in this sense, but due to its polysemy, its use as a behalf beneficiary is quite restricted (the following example has other possible readings):

(17) Θα πιεξώζσ θη εγώ γηα σένα. (HNC 193129)

Pagáre por ti.

I will pay for you.

This kind of beneficiary seems to be in diathetic alternation with intermediaries expressed by μέσω + gen., μέσα από + acc., and δια + gen. (‘through’). In beneficiary constructions a subject (A) carries out the actions instead of the beneficiary (B). However, in intermediary constructions although a subject (B) initiates the action, it is carried out by the intermediary (A): 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Intermediaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A does X on behalf of B</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A μιλάει εκ μέρους του B</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A habla de parte de B</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A speaks on behalf of B</td>
<td>≈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B does X through A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B μιλάει μέσω του A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B habla a través de A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B speaks through A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

The following examples of the verb μιλάω (‘to speak’) illustrate the connections between both alternative constructions. The lawyers are the real agents in both examples, but they appear as subjects in the behalf benefactive construction (example 18) and as intermediaries in the other (example 19), whereas their clients appear as beneficiaries and subjects, respectively:

(18) Ο κ. Φώτης Χατζιότης, δικηγόρος, μιλώντας εκ μέρους των επιλαχόντων, είπε: […] (HNC 1812585)

El sr. Fotis Chatziotis, abogado, hablando en representación de los candidatos que habian quedado en segundo lugar, dijo […]

Mr. Fotis Chatzifotis, a lawyer, speaking on behalf of the second-place competitors, said […]

8 See Levin (1993) for this kind of verbal alternations.
(19) Η Μόνικα [...] «μιλάει» μέσω των δικηγόρων της (HNC 864948)

Mónica «habla» a través de sus abogados

Monica speaks through her lawyers

Some markers of behalf benefaction exhibit a complex behaviour in SMGrk. In passive constructions they can be used as agents, as in the following examples, where the same expression operates as beneficiary in active and as agent in passive for the verb χρησιμοποιεῖται (‘to use’):

(20) Αιτιημήρη γλώσσα χρησιμοποίησε εκ μέρους του ΠΑΣΟΚ, η Άννα Διαμαντοπούλου (‘Anna Diamantopoulou used a sharp language on behalf of the Pasok’, http://goo.gl/hZhHyS)

(21) Το θέμα των πυραύλων χρησιμοποιείται εκ μέρους της ελληνικής πλευράς (‘The issue of the missiles is used by the Greek side’, HNC 1448651)

This agentive meaning is almost regular in combination with nominalizations (see χρησιμοποιήση):

(22) Η χρησιμοποίηση των ακροδεξιών εκ μέρους του κράτους σε αποστολές ειδικά στο εξωτερικό, είναι κάτι που γινόταν και επί χούντας. (‘the use of far-right radicals by the state in missions, particularly abroad, is something that was happening during the dictatorship’, HNC 1763680)

The behaviour both in passives and nominalizations should be considered as a reflection of the agentivity underlying behalf beneficiaries: although their sentences have a subject, the real instigators and those responsible for the action are the entities appearing as behalf beneficiaries.

4. Cause/reason

Some beneficiaries introduced by για are compared to recipients (Anagnostopoulou 2005), but they should be classified as a different kind of beneficiary:

(23a) Ο Γιάννης μαγείρεψε του Πέτρου σπανακόπιτα

(‘Giannis cooked Petros some spanakopita’)

(23b) Ο Γιάννης μαγείρεψε σπανακόπιτα στον Πέτρο

(‘Giannis cooked Petros some spanakopita ’)

(23c) Ο Γιάννης μαγείρεψε σπανακόπιτα για τον Πέτρο

(‘Giannis cooked some spanakopita for Petros’)

---
(24a) *Ο Γιάννης διέσχισε της Μαρίας την έρημο
('Giannis crossed the desert to Maria')

(24b) *Ο Γιάννης διέσχισε στη Μαρία την έρημο
('Giannis crossed the desert to Maria')

(24c) Ο Γιάννης διέσχισε την έρημο για την Μαρία
('Giannis crossed the desert for Maria')

In the first example (23a-c) για is more or less equivalent to *σε and the genitive NP, because the three expressions refer to a kind of recipient. The ungrammaticality of versions a and b in the second example (24) is due to the fact that there can be no recipient. Instead version c in the second example (24) is grammatical because για does not refer to the recipient of the action but rather to the entity the subject takes into account when carrying out the verbal action: in the example Maria is the (final) reason or motive that moves Giannis to cross the desert and at the same time she is the first beneficiary of his action. Unlike previous examples of για translated into Spanish by 'para' (purpose, recipient), in the example 24 για την Μαρία has to be translated by 'por Maria', which expresses cause and not recipient. Unlike other languages Spanish distinguishes clearly between cause ('por') and purpose/recipient ('para').

The use of για in this sense is more restricted than similar expressions in other languages due to the polysemy of this preposition in SMGrk: it can convey cause ('because of'), purpose ('for'), theme ('about'), direction ('to/towards'), and other contents (see the ΛΚΝ). Other similar expressions used for referring to the entity that is both the main beneficiary of the verbal action and the reason the subject has in mind for his/her action are για το χατίρι + gen. and για χάρη + gen. ('for the sake/benefit of'), as in the following examples.

(25) Άκουσαν τον υψυπουργό να τραγουδάει για το χατίρι τους από το «λεμονάκι μιμωδάτο» ('They heard the Secretary sing the song "Scented Lemon" for their sake’, HNC 793096)

(26) Ο [...] σηκώνεται από την καρέκλα για να τραγουδήσει το "Οτσιτσόρνια" για χάρη του Γεβγέλιν ('The tenor [...] gets up from his chair to sing "Ochichornia" for Yevgueni's sake', HNC 1762595)
5. Pure beneficiaries

A third group of benefactive expressions does not fit into any of the previous categories: members of this group do not refer to the recipient, or to the entity replaced (behalf), or to the reason and beneficiary of the action (cause/reason). These expressions refer to the entity for whose benefit the SoA takes place. The markers in SMGkr are νπέρ/προς όφελος/για (το) καλό + gen. and the katharevousa expressions επι’ οφελεία/επι’ αγαθό + gen.⁹

(27) Μιλάνε υπέρ των εργαζόμενων (HNC 1717385)
    Hablan en favor de los trabajadores
    They speak in favour of the workers

(28) Δεν κυβερνάτε προς όφελος του ελληνικού λαού. (HNC 2448481)
    Usted no está gobernando en beneficio del pueblo griego
    You are not governing for the benefit of the Greek people

(29) Θα εργαστούν για το καλό των δημοτών τους (HNC 624283)
    Trabajaran por el bien de sus conciudadanos
    They will work for the good of their citizens

(30) Θα την ιδιωτικοποιήσουμε επι’ οφελεία της ελληνικής κοινωνίας (HNC 2008802)
    La privatizaremos en beneficio de la sociedad griega
    We are going to privatize it for the benefit of the Greek society

(31) Καλείται να [...] αξιοποιήσει όλες τις υπάρχουσες δυνάμεις [...] επι’ αγαθό του λαού του Θεού. (To Βήμα 29/6/97)
    Es llamado a aprovechar todas las fuerzas [...] en bien del pueblo de Dios.
    He is called upon to make the most of all the energies [...] for the benefit of God's people.

These expressions are interchangeable in some contexts, as in the following.

(32) Ενεργήσαμε προς όφελος των μαθητών. (HNC 994874)
    Actuamos en beneficio de los estudiantes
    They acted for the students’ benefit

⁹For the benefactive value of these expressions since Ancient Greek see Revuelta (forthcoming).
(33) Ενεργούσε υπέρ των Νορμάνων. (HNC 2525386)
   Actuaba a favor de los normandos.
   He acted in favour of the Normans.

But in other contexts these markers are not interchangeable, as in the following examples:

(34) Οι Βρετανοί δεν έχουν λόγο να ψηφίσουν υπέρ των Τόρις. (HNC 109911)
   Los británicos no tienen motivos para votar a (favor de) los tories.
   The British people have no reason to vote for the Tories.

(35) Οι Βρετανοί δεν έχουν λόγο να ψηφίσουν προς όφελος των Τόρις.
   Los británicos no tienen motivos para votar en beneficio de los tories.
   The British people have no reason to vote for the benefit of the Tories.

In the first example ψηφίζω υπέρ των Τόρις is equivalent to give one's vote to the Tories, whereas in the second the action of voting can benefit the Tories without giving them the vote. In the next example the vote benefits the suppression of the Public Housing Agency (the direct object, ‘vote (for) the suppression’) and this vote benefits big business (the beneficiary):

(36) Ψήφισαν την κατάργηση του Οργανισμού Εργατικής Κατοικίας προς όφελος των μεγάλωργοδοτών (http://goo.gl/l0mIKW)
   Votaron la desaparición del Organismo de la Vivienda de Protección Oficial en beneficio de los grandes empleadores
   They voted (for) the abolition of the Public Housing Agency for the benefit of big business

The marker υπέρ + gen. operates more closely to the verb, as a kind of quasi argument, whereas προς όφελος + gen. functions rather as an adjunct, more distant from the nuclear predication. Therefore, their difference is one of scope: [[verb υπέρ + gen.] προς όφελος + gen.].

One of the most relevant features of this fourth benefactive flavour is that the beneficiary can be a human or a non-human entity, as in the following examples.

(37) Οι μαθητές είχαν ψηφίσει υπέρ της κατάληψης. (HNC 595356)
   Los estudiantes habían votado a favor de la ocupación
   The students had voted in favour of the occupation
(38) Οι καταναλωτές μειώνουν τις αποταμιεύσεις τους προς όφελος της κατανάλωσης. (HNC 3580)

Los consumidores reducen sus ahorros en beneficio del consumo

Consumers reduce their savings for the benefit of consumption

These examples challenge the initial vision of beneficiaries as human entities (see § 1): at least part of the so-classified beneficiaries does not need to be human.

6. Malefactives

Malefactives are presented as the negative counterpart of beneficiaries: they refer to the entity adversely affected by the SoA. Some of the most usual markers are κατά/εναντίον + gen., ενάντια σε + acc. (‘against’), and εις βάρος/επί ζημία + gen. (‘at the expense of’, ‘to somebody's detriment/disadvantage’):

(39) Δεν "συνωμοτεί ο ιδιος κατά των στελεχών της ΔΑΚΕ (HNC 975834)

He is not conspiring against the officials of the DAKE

(40) Οι «καπιταλιστές» συνωμοτούν εις βάρος του κόσμου. (HNC 892)

The “capitalists” conspire against the World.

(41) Ο Άντονι Χόπκινς [...] αγωνίζεται ενάντια σε σαδιστές κυνηγούς. (HNC 387263)

Anthony Hopkins […] fights against sadistic hunters.

(42) Η επιχείρηση κινδυνεύει να είναι επί ζημία σου (Iordanidou 2001)

The operation could harm you.

But malefactives are not co-extensive with all beneficiaries: there are no negative counterparts for recipient, behalf or cause/reason beneficiaries. Only pure benefactives display a negative counterpart, as the following examples show:

(43a) Του μαγείρεψε ἐνα θαυμάσιο cassoulet (‘She cooked him a marvellous cassoulet’, HNC 1198358)

(43b) Μαγείρεψε ἐνα θαυμάσιο cassoulet εναντίον του (‘She cooked against him a marvellous cassoulet’)
(44a) Θα κάνω κάποια δήλωση εκ μέρους του Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών (‘I will make some declarations on behalf of the Foreign Office’, HNC 1353763)

(44b) Θα κάνω κάποια δήλωση εναντίον του Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών (‘I will make some declarations against the Foreign Office’)

(45a) Άκουσαν τον υφυπουργό να τραγουδάει για το χατάρι τους από το «λεμονάκι μυρωδάτο» (‘They heard the Secretary sing the song "Scented Lemon" for their sake’, HNC 793096)

(45b) Άκουσαν τον υφυπουργό να τραγουδάει εναντίον τους από το «λεμονάκι μυρωδάτο» (‘They heard the Secretary sing the song "Scented Lemon" against them’)

(46a) Μιλάνε υπέρ των εργαζομένων (‘They speak in favour of the workers’, HNC 1717385)

(46b) Μιλάνε εναντίον των εργαζομένων (‘They speak against the workers’)

It is possible to cook (43) for somebody (recipient beneficiary), but not against somebody (except in a comical sense flouting the linguistic rules). It is possible both to make declarations (44) in someone’s place (replacing him/her, behalf or deputative beneficiary) and to make declarations against somebody (malefactive), but the second case is not the negative counterpart of the first. And to sing (45) against somebody is not the opposite of singing for somebody’s sake (cause/reason). Instead it is possible to speak (46) in favour (pure beneficiary) or against somebody (malefactive) and the second case is clearly the opposite version of the first.

7. A single semantic role?

Now that some of the possible flavours of benefaction have been described, it is time to discuss whether they configure a single homogenous semantic role or not. There are similarities and differences among them. I will start by discussing two common features that connect at least some of them: (i) their replacement by genitive clitics and (ii) their contextual equivalences.

(i) Replacement by genitive clitics

Replacement by genitive clitics could be a good argument for a single homogenous semantic role if it applied to all benefactive flavours. Genitive clitics can replace recipient beneficiaries:
(47a) Μπορούμε να μαγειρέψουμε ένα πρώτο έδεσμα για 4-6 άτομα. (‘We can cook a first course for 4-6 people’, HNC 1092650)
(47b) Του μαγείρεψε ένα θαυμάσιο cassoulet (‘She cooked him a marvellous cassoulet’, HNC 1198358)

Sometimes clitics in genitive can express behalf, but their use seems to be almost always restricted to transitive verbs. In the next sentences the subject waters the flowers and writes the text the owner and author cannot or do not want to (other interpretations are possible):

(48) Είναι εκείνοι που μου ποτίζουν τα λουλούδια όταν λέεισ (‘They are the ones who water the flowers for me when I am absent’, http://goo.gl/lExOEr)
(49) Τον βοηθούσε σε ό,τι ήθελε, τον έγραφε κείμενα που του υπαγόταν (‘He helped him in whatever he wanted, he wrote the texts (for him) that he dictated’, HNC 340125)

However the use of genitive clitics as behalf beneficiaries is excluded in some cases (mostly for intransitive verbs) and in other cases they do not always seem able to replace other behalf markers.

(50a) Θα κάνω κάποια δήλωση εκ μέρους του Υπουργείου Εξωτερικών για τις εκλογές στην Αλβανία. (‘I will make some statements on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the elections in Albania’, HNC 1353763)
(50b) ≠ Θα του κάνω κάποια δήλωση για τις εκλογές στην Αλβανία (‘I will make him/it some statements about the elections in Albania’)

Genitive clitics cannot replace pure beneficiaries, and—only in combination with transitive verbs—can they cover just part of the meaning conveyed by cause/reason beneficiaries. In the first of the following examples (51) για το χατίρι refers to the entity that is the reason and final beneficiary of the subject’s action, whereas in the second (52) the genitive clitic refers just to the recipient of the action (the addressee of the song):

(51) Άκουσαν τον υψηλοφωνό να τραγουδάει για το χατίρι τους από τo «λεμονάκι μυρωδάτο» (‘They heard the Secretary sing the song "Scented Lemon" for their sake’, HNC 793096)
(52) Τώρα μια γερή γυναίκα θα σας τραγουδήσει δημοτικά (‘Now a strong woman will sing popular songs for you’, HNC 574236)
Additionally, this replacement cannot be used as a criterion for homogenous behaviour, since, apart from recipients or behalf beneficiaries, genitive clitics can replace many other functions, like argument recipients, source and other semantic roles.\(^{10}\)

(53a) Αμέσως ἐδώσε τὸ βιβλίο στὸν συνεργάτη του (‘Immediately, he gave the book to his partner’, http://goo.gl/v9jBRO)

(53b) Τοῦ ἐδώσε τὸ βιβλίο του (‘He gave him his book’, HNC 815221)

(54a) Σοκαρισμένη πήρε το μαχαίρι από τὴν 16χρονη (‘In shock, she took the knife from the 16-year-old girl’, http://goo.gl/c14tD3)

(54b) Εκείνος τῆς πήρε το μαχαίρι (‘He took the knife from her’, http://goo.gl/wRpn1x)

In fact, genitive clitics in combination with a verb like παίρνω can refer not only to the person from whom something is taken (source, previous example), but also to the person for which something is taken (recipient beneficiary), as in the following example.

(55) Τοῦ πέταξα μια πλαστική σακούλα. «Σου πήρα κάτι πραγματάκια.» (‘I threw a plastic bag at him. "I got you some little things."’ (= ‘I got some little things for you’), HNC 175180)

(ii) Contextual equivalences

The other fact that to some degree might support the existence of some common factor among all these different flavours are those contexts where the differences between a recipient marker and other beneficiary markers seem to be blurred. For example, in combination with the expression δίνω πέναλτι (‘to give a penalty’) we can find argument recipient expressions (genitive clitics, σε + acc.), adjunct recipient markers (για + acc.) and pure beneficiaries or malefactives (νπέρ + gen. or σε βάρος + gen.) with a quite similar global benefactive/malefactive meaning.

(56) Δεν μας ἐδώσε πέναλτι (‘He did not give us a penalty’, HNC 261949)

(57) Έδωσε αυτό το πέναλτι στὴν Κροατία (‘He gave this penalty to Croatia’, HNC 779689)

(58) Στο 45’ ἐδώσε ἐνα πέναλτι-μαίμου υπέρ τῆς SKODA Ξάνθης (‘At minute 45 he gave a false penalty in favour of the SKODA Xanthi’, HNC 338080)

\(^{10}\) For other uses of the genitive (particularly the clitic pronoun) see Holton et alii (2012: 236-239).
This equivalence is restricted to a very few cases and cannot be extended to other uses of the verb δίνω (‘to give’) or to many other verbs.

As we will now see, the differences outnumber the few and weak similarities which we have just discussed.

(i) As we have seen in previous sections, malefactors alternate only with pure beneficiaries (see § 6).

(ii) Behalf beneficiaries alternate with intermediaries diathetically, but not with other classes of beneficiaries (§ 3).

(iii) Whereas recipient beneficiaries seem to be human entities, other flavours of benefaction admit non-human entities (see pure benefactives § 5).

(iv) Perhaps the most striking difference is the different possible interpretations of the markers classes in combination with the same verb. For example, in combination with the verb τραγουδώ (‘to sing’) a) the marker για (61) refers to the recipient or addressee of the song, (b) για λογαριασμό (62) refers to the entity replaced by the subject (the person who should have sung), but the real instigator of the action, (c) για το χατίρι (63) and για χάρη (64) invoke the entity the subject has in mind for carrying out the action and its main beneficiary, (d) υπέρ (65) refers to a different entity, to the entity benefited but not responsible for the action, whereas (e) εναντίον + gen. (66) refers to the entity negatively affected (the song constitute a negative critique or an attack).

(61) Ο Γιώργος Μαρίνος […] τραγουδά για ένα κοινό που τον τιμά με το χαυροκρότημα του (“George Marinos […] sings for an audience that honors him with applause”, HNC 1332756)

(62) Η υψίφωνος τραγούδησε για λογαριασμό της Κίρστεν Φλάγκκσταντ δύο υψηλά ντο κατά την ηχογράφηση της όπερας του Βάγκκνερ "Τριστάνος και Ιζόλδη", (“The soprano reached two top C on behalf of Kirsten Flagstad while recording Wagner’s opera "Tristan und Isolde””, HNC 1298195)

(63) Άκουσαν τον υψιφωνικό να τραγουδάει για το χατίρι τους από το «λεμονάκι μουρωδάτο» (“They heard the Secretary sing the song "Scented Lemon" for their
The question whether all these flavours belong to one single semantic role, or to different semantic roles seems difficult to solve. Perhaps this is because there can be different answers according to the perspective adopted. If we take a purely synchronic perspective, the differences among the several flavours of benefaction perhaps would lead us to consider them to be different semantic roles. Instead, a diachronic perspective may allow us to explain the similarities and even their development. For example, pure causal Ancient Greek διά + acc. (‘because of, by’, Luraghi 2003, Revuelta forthcoming) has developed into today’s benefactive (among many other meanings) για (‘for’) in SMGrk. This diachronic approach could help explain other similarities among the different benefactive flavours and their evolutions (see Revuelta forthcoming, Luraghi, 2005).

Apart from this issue, this study allows us to establish a preliminary classification of benefactive/malefactive markers in SMGrk and Spanish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Modern Greek / Spanish</th>
<th>Beneactive</th>
<th>Malefactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιά + acc. / para</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιά λογαριασμό + gen. / por cuenta de</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εκ μέρους + gen. / de parte de</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στο όνομα/επ’ ονόματι + gen. / en nombre de</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιά χάρη + gen. / por</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιά χατίρι + gen. / por</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
για το καλό + gen. / por el bien de
επί αγαθώ + gen. / por el bien de
προς όφελος + gen./ en beneficio de
υπέρ + gen. / a favor de
εις/εκ βάρος + gen. / en perjuicio de
ενάντια σε + acc. / en contra de
εναντίον + gen. / en contra de
επί ζημία + gen. / en perjuicio de
κατά + gen./ contra

| Table 4 |

This table includes many more markers than those usually studied or classified as benefactive/malefactive. Further research should establish the complete repertoire and the exact similarities and differences among them. This paper is just a preliminary approach.
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