

The mapping of space onto the domain of benefaction: Beneficiaries that are not Recipients and their sources

Oral/poster

The polysemy of Recipient and Beneficiary is cross-linguistically frequent, and is easily explained semantically (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2010:18-19); it often involves polysemy with allative and purpose (ib. 23-24; Schmidtke-Bode 2010).

Diachronically, the following development is assumed:

- (1.) allative > beneficiary > recipient > purpose
(Rice, Kabata 2010; Heine, Claudi, Hünemeyer 1991).

Thus, allative provides the spatial source for Beneficiary and Recipient markers, and benefaction is conceptualized as a directional process through the mapping of space onto its domain.

However, Beneficiary markers display patterns of polysemy that exclude Recipient, notably with Cause/Reason, as in the case of Finnish *vuoksi*:

- (2.) *Henkilo opettel-i suome-a yksilo-n vuoksi.*
person.nom learn-3sg.pst Finnish-part individual-gen for
“A person learnt Finnish for an individual.”
(3.) *Jaatelo sul-i sahkokatko-n vuoksi.*
ice.cream.nom melt-3sg.pst power.failure-gen for
“The ice cream melted because of the power failure.”
(Zúñiga, Kittilä 2010:22-23).

Moreover, the polysemy of Beneficiary and Purpose does not necessarily include Recipient, as shown in Georgian (M. Topadze, p.c.):

- (4.) *ertjeradi gamoq'eneb-is-tvis*
single usage-gen-for
“for a single usage”
(5.) *es bavshv-is-tvis viq'ide*
this child-gen-for I-bought
“I bought it for the child.”

Notably, Recipient is most often not included in the polysemy of Beneficiary, Cause/Reason, and Purpose. A readily available example is provided by English *for*, German *für*; another example is Turkish *için* (V. Tören, p.c.):

- (6.) *Söylemek için geldim*
say-inf for come-pst-1sg
“I came in order to say...”
(7.) *Bayram olduğu için toplar atıldı*
holyday be-pst.3sg for cannon-pl employ-pst-3sg
“Because of the holyday, cannons were shot.”
(8.) *sizin için bir kitap getirdim*
2pl-gen for one book bring-pst-1sg
“I took a book for you.”

Diachronically, markers that display the above polysemy do not originate from allatives, but involve relations that are located elsewhere in the domain of space, such as locative or path: English *for* derives from Proto-Germanic **fura*, ‘before’ (the directional meaning is secondary); the local meaning of Finnish *vuoksi* is ‘through’. In this paper, I describe this pattern of polysemy cross-linguistically, provide the spatial sources for Beneficiary markers that do not extend to Recipient, and show how semantic extension proceeds. I highlight the difference between a directional and a non-directional conceptualization of benefaction. (I concentrate of the mapping of space onto the domain of benefaction, and do not consider markers that derive from serial verbs, such as those discussed in Creissels 2010, which display a different pattern of polysemy.)

References

- Creissels, Denis 2010. Benefactive applicative periphrases: A typological approach. In F. Zúñiga and S. Kittilä 2010 (eds.), 29-70.
Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Rice, Sally and Kaori Kabata. 2007. Crosslinguistic grammaticalization patterns of the allative. *Linguistic Typology* 11: 451-514.
Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2010. The role of benefactives and related notions in the typology of purpose clauses. In F. Zúñiga and S. Kittilä 2010 (eds.), 121-146.
Zúñiga, Fernando and Seppo Kittilä (eds.). 2010. *Benefactives and Malefactives. Case Studies and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.