

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
