

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Record Nr. | UNINA9910808643603321 |
| Titolo | Perspectives on semantic roles // edited by Silvia Luraghi, Heiko Narrog |
| Pubbl/distr/stampa | Amsterdam, Netherlands ; ; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : , : John Benjamins Publishing Company, , 2014 ©2014 |
| ISBN | 90-272-6985-8 |
| Descrizione fisica | 1 online resource (342 p.) |
| Collana | Typological Studies in Language (TSL) ; ; Volume 106 |
| Disciplina | 401/.43 |
| Soggetti | Semantics Typology (Linguistics) |
| Lingua di pubblicazione | Inglese |
| Formato | Materiale a stampa |
| Livello bibliografico | Monografia |
| Note generali | Description based upon print version of record. |
| Nota di bibliografia | Includes bibliographical references at the end of each chapters and indexes. |
| Nota di contenuto | Perspectives on Semantic Roles; Editorial page; Title page; LCC data; Table of content; Perspectives on semantic roles; 1. Semantic roles; 2. Encoding semantic roles; 2.1 Case; 2.2 Semantic roles and structural case vs. lexical (inherent) case; 2.3 Adpositions; 2.4 Semantic roles and lexical meaning; 3. Semantic maps; 4. Contents of this volume; Acknowledgments; References; Inducing semantic roles; 1. Introduction; 2. Using cross-linguistic variation to approach semantics; 3. The data: Case-like marking in parallel texts; 4. Analysis of roles; 5. Comparison of languages; 6. Conclusion AcknowledgementsReferences; Appendices; Appendix A: Sampled contexts; Appendix C: Wordforms; Appendix D: Contextual role distances; Appendix E: Clustering of contextual roles; Appendix F: Alternative flat clustering; Appendix G: Language specific structures; The grammaticalization chain of case functions ; 1. Introduction: Directionality of semantic/functional change in the domain of case; 2. Semantic and constructional change; 3. Directionalities that fit the chain; 3.1 From domain 1 (spatial functions) to domain 2 (human participants) 3.2 From domain 1 (spatial functions) to domain 3 (human activity)3.3 From domain 1 (spatial functions) to domains 4 to 6 (inanimate |

concepts); 3.4 From domain 2 (human participants) to domain 3 (participants in human activity); 3.5 From domain 2 (human participants) to domain 4,5,6 (inanimate concepts); 3.6 From domain 3 (participants in human activity) to domains 4, 5, 6 (inanimate concepts); 3.7 Summary; 4. Directionalities contra the claim; 4.1 From domain 3 (participants in human activity) to domain 2 (human participants); 4.1.1 Changes likely due to constructional change
4.1.2 Changes likely due to semantic extension
4.2 From domains 4,5,6 (inanimate concepts) to domain 2 (human participants); 4.3 From domains 4,5,6 (inanimate concepts) to domain 3 (participants in human activity); 5. Directionalities within domain 2; 6. Result; 7. Discussion; 8. Conclusion; Acknowledgments; References; Plotting diachronic semantic maps; 1. Introduction; 2. Encoding semantic roles: Source and target domains; 2.1 Spatial relations; 2.1.1 Basic spatial relations and the position of path; 2.1.2 A merger without polysemy: Location and source; 2.1.3 Space and time
2.2 Human relations
2.2.1 Two maximally distinct metaphors; 2.2.2 Possession: Direction or location?; 2.2.3 Comitative and the domain of spatial relations; 2.2.4 A spatial metaphor or an extension from other human roles?; 2.2.5 Competing metaphors: The case of possessor; 2.2.6 Recipient and beneficiary; 2.2.7 Beneficiaries that are not recipients; 2.2.8 Competing metaphors: Beneficiary; 2.2.9 A Balto-Finnic perspective on the Indo-European dative; 2.2.10 Path as a source for human relations: Intermediary; 2.2.11 Interim summary; 2.3 Non-human relations; 2.3.1 Source domains for instrument
2.3.2 Instrument as a source domain

Sommario/riassunto

This paper targets the phenomenon of non valence-governed datives of affectedness linked to possession. By adopting a constructional approach based on Goldberg (1995) and a revision of Raineri and Evola (2008), I work out a grid that may be adopted for cross-linguistic purposes. By applying this model to German, French and Italian, I show that the latter language, contrary to the two former ones has thoroughly grammaticalized this function. I also propose a tentative account of the grammaticalization paths that may have led to the heterogeneous behavior of the languages under discussion with r
