

## Differential marking of spatial relations: the case of direction with human landmarks

Category: oral presentation

Direction markers (be they cases or adpositions) tend to extend to recipient marking diachronically (see e.g. Blansitt 1988 and Rice and Kabata 2007). For example, in English, direction can be coded through the preposition *to*, with both inanimate and human landmarks, in addition to which *to* also codes recipients, as shown below:

- (1) *John went to the station*
- (2) *I went to Mary and asked her a favor*
- (3) *John gave a present to Mary*

The kind of polysemy illustrated above is by no means restricted to English, but similar cases are also attested in many other languages (such as Japanese and Classical Arabic). The occurrence of this polysemy is accounted for by the fact that all the events in (1)-(3) involve movement of an entity to(wards) another entity. However, as will be shown in our paper, direction-recipient polysemy is in many languages confined to cases such as (1) and (3), while languages often resort to other mechanism for coding (2). In other words, many languages have differential marking of direction depending on animacy of the landmark. For example, in Finnish (1) and (3) are coded by the allative case, while a postposition is necessary for coding (2). Besides, in many languages that have a dative case (perhaps in most languages with a dative case), the dative can be used only for coding recipient, while direction is coded either with another case (such as allative or locative) or with adpositions. These languages may also display animacy-based differential marking of direction.

In our paper we will address the issue of direction coding with human landmarks from a cross-linguistic perspective, and explore its relation with direction coding with inanimate landmarks and with recipient coding (is the coding identical, or are there differences). Possible patterns of direction and recipient marking that emerge are the following:

- i. direction (animate) = direction (inanimate) = recipient
- ii. direction (animate) = direction (inanimate)  $\neq$  recipient
- iii. direction (animate)  $\neq$  direction (inanimate) = recipient
- iv. direction (animate)  $\neq$  direction (inanimate)  $\neq$  recipient

In our paper, the potential types will be illustrated in light of actual linguistic data. We will argue that the frequent tendency toward differential direction marking depends on the marked nature of human beings as endpoints of trajectories; their typical and expected role is recipient. Further evidence for this claim is provided by the fact that recipients are coded by cases (if cases are available in a given language), while direction is coded by adpositions. This means that the semantically marked role is coded more elaborately, which is in line with the more elaborated marking of animate objects in languages with Differential Object Marking.

## References

- Blansitt, E. L. Jr. 1988. Datives and allatives. Hammond, M., Moravcsik, E. and Wirth J. (eds.), *Studies in syntactic typology*, 173-191. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rice, S. & Kabata, K. 2007. Cross-linguistic grammaticalization patterns of the allative. *Linguistic Typology* 11: 451-514.