OVER AGAIN: POTENTIAL NOVEL PERSPECTIVES FROM LEXICAL CONCEPTS & COGNITIVE MODELS THEORY
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Abstract: This article aims at analyzing the approaches by different authors to the English preposition over, showing their strengths and weaknesses. We then try to apply the theoretical constraints of Lexical concepts & Cognitive Models (hereafter: LCCM) to treat over from a novel perspective. Seth (2009) can describe the pragmatics of over in stances of use, but he fails to present the distinct senses of the word. Though Lakoff’s framework of Full-Specification could figure out the distinct senses of over, the vast proliferation of senses and a lack of methodological constraints make the approach inappropriate in certain cases. Other works by Kreitser (1997), Tyler & Evans (2003), Deane (2005) and Maria Brenda (2014) could, to certain extent, fill the gaps of Lakoff, but they have failed to address the issue of combining both the linguistic (parametric) and the non-linguistic (analogue) representations in analyzing the semantics of over. It is hypothetically proved that as a linguistic vehicle, the preposition over encodes 17 lexical concepts with unique semantic and formal selectional tendencies.

Keywords: over, distinct, LCCM, lexical representation

1. Introduction: The challenge of over

English prepositions were once neglected and linguists never seemed to take them seriously (Jackendoff, 1983: 345) but prepositions turn out to be appealing to cognitive linguists. Perhaps the English preposition over is the most special one as it has different syntactic functions and has received a great deal of attention from numerous researchers (Brugman, 1981; Boers, 1996; Deane, 2005; Dewell, 1994; Kreitzer, 1997; Lakoff, 1987; 416–461; Tyler and Evans, 2003:64-106; Yoon, 2004; Set, 2009; Roussel, 2013; Maria Brenda, 2014). In general, the approaches of above-mentioned authors could be classified into three main trends: The descriptivist approach (Seth, 2009); the Cognitive spatial division approach (Roussel, 2013) and the Cognitive semantics image-schemas approach (Brugman, 1981; Boers, 1996; Deane, 2005; Dewell, 1994; Kreitzer, 1997; Lakoff, 1987: 416–461; Tyler and Evans, 2003:64-106; Maria Brenda, 2014; Yoon, 2004).

1.1. The descriptivist approach

The preposition over, together with above, is introduced and analyzed in each instance of use by Seth Lindstromberg through the book English Prepositions Explained published in 2010. From the very beginning of chapter 9, Seth (2010:109) made a reference to Coventry et al (2008) to suppose that above has no or little functional meaning so its usages are far less varied as those of over.
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Seth Lindstromberg shows the usage of *over* and *above* in great details, and the difference between *over* and *above* was made clearly in each case of use from spatial senses to non-spatial ones. When denoting spatial meanings, *over* is neutral about geometrical separation while in every sense of *above*, the subject and landmark are separated. The pragmatics of *over* and *above* were shown through three levels: basic spatial meanings, variations from basic applications, and additional metaphorical usages. In chapter 12, Seth Lindstromberg clarifies the usage of *under* and *below*. The preposition *under* is the approximate opposite of *over* while *below* is the opposite of *above*. Here are the four basic spatial configurations that the four prepositions denote according to Seth Lindstromberg.

![Figure 1](image1.png)

Figure 1. Spatial configuration\(^1\) denoted by above (Seth, 2010: 110)

![Figure 2](image2.png)

Figure 2. Spatial configuration denoted by over (Seth, 2010: 110)

![Figure 3](image3.png)

Figure 3. Spatial configurations denoted by under & below (Seth, 2010: 158)

What Seth was trying to do is to describe the real usages of the four prepositions and distinguish between two pairs of synonymous prepositions *over-above, under-below*. The approach by Seth is similar to that of a dictionary with in-depth explanation and examples, which is of importance to learners of English. However, Seth fails to explain how extended senses of the four prepositions arise and the relationships between those senses.

\(^1\) The dark sphere represents the Subject (or Trajectory), the rectangle represents the Landmark.
1.2. The cognitive spatial division approach

This approach is advocated by Roussel (2013) when he analyzes the structure A over B. Particularly, he uses the componential analysis of the inanimate and animate referents of B with the total number of 196 instances of use. The main findings of the study show that the use of over in the structure A over B, as written by Roussel, is:

Over exhibits properties combining visual limits and motion, which seems to be a sign for perceptive calculations governing the linguistic establishment of spatial relations. The preposition appears to prioritize the expression of the observer’s visual assessment of their own relation to the surrounding entities. Therefore, the geometrical patterns and the various degrees of measure, place, position, height, passage or judgment may not reveal the meaning of the preposition, or the interpretation of the speaker, but they may convey the final stage of perceptive calculations which, subsequently, operate aspectually or pragmatically in the utterance.… More generally, the linguistic analysis demonstrates that the system of English prepositions seems not only to encode space relations egocentrically [DEANE 2005], but also allocentrically (by reference to the external world), as shown both by the body parts and the semantic features selected in the referents of A and B.

(Roussel, 2013: 223)

Although Roussel realizes the tendency of space limits of over, he fails to explain if the preposition in some cases carries or encodes distinct senses. The author is concerned with the “perception in the brain prior to the encoding of the extra linguistic world in new schematic forms”, but Roussel does not analyze the speaker’s meaning in each instance of use, or at least to generalize the speaker’s meaning when using the preposition over.

1.3. The cognitive semantics image-schemas approach

This is the approach that a number of scholars make use of when analyzing the semantics of over. In fact, Lakoff with his case study of over laid a foundation for other discussions (Brugman, 1981; Boers, 1996; Kreitzer, 1997; Tyler and Evans, 2001, 2003; Yoon, 2004; Deane, 2005; Dewell, 1994; Maria Brenda, 2014). The first two approaches, namely, Full-specification Approach and Partial-specification Approach, were critically analyzed by Tyler and Evans (2001) who then developed an approach termed Principled Polysemy. Maria Brenda (2014) exploited Langacker’s model of cognitive grammar (2000) to analyze the semantic and syntactic structure of over. The approach by Maria Brenda, to certain extent, can be described as Extended Principled Polysemy.

The notion of image schema was developed by Johnson (1987) and Lakoff (1987), and in their opinion, physical domain is the most significant level of human interaction. The two authors suppose that conceptual representations in human mind are arising from embodied experience. The definition of image schemas, proposed by Gibbs and Colston (1995: 347), are experiential gestalts and they come from different sensorimotor of human beings. Evans and Green (2006: 180-190) synthesized that image schemas possess eight properties: (i) Image schemas are pre-conceptual in origin; (ii) An image schema can give rise to more specific concepts; (iii) Image schemas derive from interaction with and observation of the world; (iv) Image schemas are inherently meaningful; (v) Image schemas are analogue representations; (vi) Image schemas are not the same as mental images; (vii) Image schemas are subject to transformations and; (viii) Image schemas can occur in clusters. In short, Lakoff supposes
that words are seen as radial categories, and
the following figure represents the diagram to
illustrate the radial categories.

![Diagram of radial categories](image1)

Figure 4. Modelling the radial categories
(Evans & Green, 2006: 332)

The following part represents the above
approaches with critical comments.

1.3.1. **Full-specification approach**

Lakoff took *over* as a case study in English
prepositions and his analysis is sometimes
described as the full-specification approach to
lexical semantics. The core point in Lakovian
theory is that the senses associated with
prepositions like *over*, which are grounded
in spatial experience, are structured in terms
of image-schemas. According to Lakoff, an
image schema combining elements of both
ABOVE and ACROSS is the prototypical
sense of *over*. The distinct senses associated
with *over* are structured with respect to this
image-schema which provides the category
with its prototype structure. In sum, Lakoff
claims that the schemas which are different
from the central schema are considered to
represent distinct senses associated with *over*.
According to this model of word meaning, the
central schema for *over* has at least six distinct
and closely related variants (see Figure 5),
each of which is stored in semantic memory.

![Diagram of central image schema](image2)

Figure 5. Central image schema (adopted
from Lakoff, 1987: 423)

Beside the ABOVE-ACROSS sense, *over*
denotes a number of other senses
summarized in Table 1. As can be seen, this
model results in a potentially vast proliferation
of senses for each lexical item.

**Table 1. Schemas proposed by Lakoff (1987) for over besides the central schema**
(Evans & Green, 2006: 337)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schema type</th>
<th>Basic meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE schema</td>
<td>The TR is located above the LM.</td>
<td><em>The helicopter is hovering over the hill.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVERING schema</td>
<td>The TR is covering the LM</td>
<td><em>The board is over the hole.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFLEXIVE schema</td>
<td>The TR is reflexive: the TR is simultaneously the TR and the LM. The final location of the TR is understood with respect to its starting position</td>
<td><em>The fence fell over.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCESS schema</td>
<td>When <em>over</em> is employed as a prefix it can indicate ‘excess’ of TR relative to LM</td>
<td><em>The bath overflowed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPETITION schema</td>
<td><em>Over</em> is used as an adverb to indicate a process that is repeated.</td>
<td><em>After receiving a poor grade, the student started the assignment over (again).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently, *over* has, at the very least, several dozen distinct senses. Tyler and Evans (2001, 2003) show two main problems of Lakoff: (1) a failure to distinguish between polysemy and vagueness, (2) unconstrained methodology. They indicated that Lakoff denied the role of context in meaning altogether. Particularly, Tyler and Evans (2003) argue that the examples in (1) do not represent distinct senses of *over* (one specifying contact and one specifying lack of contact):

(1a). The bird flew over the wall.
(b). Sam climbed over the wall.

Instead, Tyler and Evans suppose that the interpretation of *over* with respect to contact or lack of contact derives from the integration of *over* with the other elements in the sentence. Our knowledge about birds (they can fly) and people (they cannot) provides us with the inference that birds do not come into contact with walls when crossing over them while people do. In other words, the linguistic context together with encyclopedic knowledge provides the details relating to the presence or absence of contact. According to Tyler and Evans, *over* here is vague with respect to contact. Tyler and Evans argue that while Lakovian position on polysemy as a conceptual phenomenon is correct, it is also important to take into account the crucial role of context in word meaning.

Lakovian approach has also been blamed for a lack of methodological constraints. In other words, Lakoff provides no principled criteria for determining what counts as a distinct sense. This means that the polysemy account presented for *over* (or whatever lexical item we might apply the approach to) results purely from the intuitions (and perhaps also the imagination) of the analyst rather than actually representing the way a particular category is represented in the mind of the language user. This problem has been discussed in some detail by Sandra and Rice (1995) and by Sandra (1998) [cited in Evans, 2006: 342].

1.3.2. Partial-specification approach

Kreitzer (1997) made use of the works by Lakoff (1987) and Talmy (1983) to modify Lakovian framework to semantically analyze *over*. Kreitzer posits that there are three distinct levels of schematization inherent in the conceptualization of a spatial scene: the component level, the relational level, and the integrative level.

Evans (2001) criticized Kreitzer for failing to decide which sense is the primary sense of *over* and neglecting senses presented by Lakoff. Hence, there is a lack of how senses of *over* are distinguished.

1.3.3. Principled Polysemy

The framework’s aim is to analyze the meanings of certain English prepositions and present them in semantic networks. In fact, the framework is built upon works by Lakoff and Claudia Brugman as part of cognitive lexical semantics and provides a theoretical constraint how a sense is counted as distinct. Founders of the framework provided two criteria: (1) for a sense to count as distinct, it must involve a meaning that is not purely spatial in nature, and/or a spatial configuration holding between the TR and LM that is distinct from the other senses conventionally associated with that preposition; and (2) there must also be instances of the sense that are context-independent: instances in which the distinct sense could not be inferred from another sense and the context in which it occurs.

Tyler and Evans (2003:64-106) took *over* as a case study to shed light on the analysis of other prepositions. They provided a semantic network for *over* with one central meaning and fifteen extended meanings.

The framework Principled Polysemy could successfully explain “how new
meanings develop from established ones on the basis of experiential correlations” (Thora, 2004). However, to the best of our knowledge, Tyler and Evans’ network may not help us trace the meaning of over in certain cases. Consider over in the following sentence,

(2). British Ambassador in hot water over joke.

The above example is a headline on BBC, and there is no verb. The complete sentence, as understood by readers, is “British Ambassador is in hot water over joke”. We can analyze the structure of the sentence like in the following table. “Over joke” is treated as something new because it needs analyzing to understand the meaning of the whole sentence.

Table 2. Analysis of “British Ambassador in hot water over joke”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Ambassador</th>
<th>is</th>
<th>in hot water</th>
<th>over joke.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>Something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normally, over may denote a spatial-physical configuration between a LM and a TR in the above sentence; but in fact there is no such configuration. So in this case, over denotes a non-spatial meaning. In order to understand the non-spatial meaning of over, we consulted several dictionaries\(^2\); however, the consultation yields no answers. The semantic network for over proposed by Tyler and Evans did not give us any clues to trace the meaning of over in this case. Yet, reading through the article, we can see that it is the joke that makes the ambassador himself in trouble. Tyler & Evans may argue that the use of over in (2) is constructed online and perhaps the prototypical spatial function of over can help readers guess the meaning of over joke. This is true to certain extent; however, we do not suppose that the polysemous use of over is sufficient in the following figure.

Figure 6. The semantic network for over (Tyler and Evans, 2003:80)

Yoon (2004) reanalyzed the semantics of over in the light of Principled Polysemy and proposed a revised semantic network for the preposition as follows:

---

Additionally, recent research studies show that polysemy is not as simple as it is assumed, so Evans (2014) himself admitted errors in analyzing the phenomenon of polysemy:

In the final analysis, what this reveals is that polysemy is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. It is probably overly simplistic to assume, as has sometimes been done (e.g., Tyler and Evans, 2001, 2003) that discussions of polysemy boil down to the polemic of monosemy on the one hand, versus the multiple distinct sense-units of the principled polysemy approach that I espoused with Andrea Tyler in our 2003 book. This bifurcation is too neat, and consequently ignores some of the very phenomena that I have been addressing in this paper. While polysemy as viewed through the eyes of Charles Ruhl (1989) is surely empirically flawed, it is fair to say that the view of polysemy developed in Tyler and Evans (2003) is probably also too simplistic. There we argued for neat semantic networks, where word-senses constituted clearly demarcated, discrete nodes within a radiating lattice of semantic memory, which we thought, ultimately, would be locatable in the brain.

(Evans, 2014:122)

Hence, Principled Polysemy seems to be a rather simplistic view of *over*.

1.3.4. Extended Principled Polysemy

Inspired by Langacker’s work in 2000 and Tyler and Evans’ work in 2003, Maria Brenda wrote a monograph, published in 2014, on the cognitive perspective of the polysemy of *over*. We term the framework that Maria Brenda exploited *Extended Principled Polysemy*. Besides presenting what Tyler and Evans (2003) had done, Maria added new meanings of *over* by analyzing the syntactic structures of her corpus while taking context into consideration. She also succeeded in presenting the historic use of preposition *over* over the centuries. However, as Evans admitted (2015), the starting point of Maria Brenda’s work is rather, in Evans’ term, “simplistic”. In addition, the data collected were from various dictionaries, so it is *de facto* that usage-based model was not exploited.

1.3.5. Other works

Boers (1996) made a reference to Lakovian notion of image-schema to treat *over* in different metaphors. In general, what was semantically found by Boers was “grateful” to results of Lakoff and Brugman. However, Dewell (1994) proposed the six image-schema transformations more seriously to address *over* in each distinct sense. As a result, how extended senses of *over* arose from the prototypical sense was rigorously explained. Deane (2005) proposed a multimodality spatial representation to analyze *over*. He proved that the polysemy of *over* derives from the prototypical sense on the basis of preference rules.
Personally, we see that the works presented by above-mentioned scholars are of great significance and have their own values. In fact, The case of over by Lakoff laid a foundation for other theoretical framework to be built upon. However, there are two precautions that must be taken when treating English prepositions.

1. Linguists have proved that prepositions carry meanings, or in other words, encode certain senses. It is true that spatial configuration denoted by prepositions facilitates meanings in utterances. Non-spatial meanings are originally rooted from spatial ones through different mapping processes.

2. Evans showed that three prepositions in, at, on denote three types of polysemy: conceptual polysemy, lexical polysemy and inter-lexical polysemy. Then, he successfully proved the point of view that the polysemy of the three prepositions emerges from different sources and in different ways. Evans supposes that an account of the nature of semantic structure - a representational format unique to language - and conceptual structure - a representational format that is wholly non-linguistic in nature is needed (Evans, 2014:122).

Additionally, in reference to what Evans (2014) advocated, the works by Lakoff (1987), Brugman (1988), Kreitzer (1997), Tyler and Evans (2001; 2003), Maria Brenda (2014) and others have failed to address the issue of combining both the linguistic (parametric) and the non-linguistic (analogue) representations in analyzing the semantics of over. Hence, a more comprehensive framework would provide a more proper perspective for the polysemy of over.

2. A reanalysis of OVER

Inspired by Evans’ works (2005, 2009, 2014), we suppose that frameworks that analyze the semantics of over must follow the premises and assumptions below (Navarro, 1998; Evans, 2009):

1. A prepositional vehicle\(^3\) is always meaningful, and always contributes to meaning construction no matter what syntactic construction where it occurs.

2. The meanings of all the uses of a preposition should be explained by virtue of a single coherent semantic structure.

3. The semantic structure should represent the polysemy\(^4\) of a preposition with primary cognitive model and secondary cognitive model.

4. All the senses of the semantic structure should be linked with no gap in the chain.

5. Metaphorical and abstract uses should be derivable from senses based on bodily experience.

6. The semantic structure should make apparent the mechanisms and patterns of meaning elaboration and extension. These mechanisms and patterns should explain how the semantic category extends and how it could possibly extend in the future, but they do not predict the exact way in which this will happen, or if it will happen at all.

7. The interface between language, communication, and cognition constitutes the process of meaning construction which is influenced by usage.

8. The meaning of the prepositions under supervision is attached to a distinct syntactic and semantic structure.

In reference to the presented hypothesis together with the above-analysis of previous approaches to the English preposition over, we come to the proposal that the theory of LCCM is the most potential to account for the


\(^4\) Basically, there are two contrasting approaches to the semantics of prepositions: polysemy and monosemy. Recent studies have shown the appropriateness of the polysemy approach, especially in the light of cognitive linguistics (Tyler and Evans, 2003).
semantics and meaning transference of *over*. In the following part, we will first explain why LCCM is chosen as the theoretical framework, and then introduce how LCCM works, i.e. the semantics of *over* in the light of LCCM.

2.1. **LCCM as the conceptual framework**

It is seen that a new framework which can provide both the lexical representation and semantic compositionality of *over* is needed. In other words, that framework has to deal with the preposition’s conceptual structure and semantic structure - two distinct concepts which are discussed by Evans (2013:15) as follows:

Conceptual structure is a level of non-linguistic representation that derives from sensory-motor, proprioceptive and subjective experience. Semantic structure is a language-specific level of representation encoded at the semantic pole associated with words and other multiword constructions. These two levels are modelled by the theoretical constructs that give the theory its name: the lexical concept and the cognitive model.

(Evans, 2013: 15)

The novelty of LCCM is that “*lexical concepts – units of language-specific semantic structure – facilitate access to units of conceptual structure – cognitive models*” (Evans, 2013: 15). Additionally, LCCM also provides a detailed explanation for the *linguistically instantiated processes of integration* (Evans, 2013: 21). That is the reason why LCCM is made use of.

As the name of the framework denotes, there are two important notions: *lexical concepts and cognitive models*. In Evan’s view, a lexical concept is part of the linguistic knowledge that conveys various types of highly schematic *linguistic content*. Specifically, linguistic content includes information relating to the selectional tendencies associated with a given lexical concept - the range of collocational and collocutional behaviour of a given lexical concept. Evans supposes that because the lexical concept of an open-class word gives access to numerous association areas within the conceptual system, it also guides to access to numerous cognitive models. A *cognitive model profile* of a lexical concept is the range of cognitive models to which it facilitates direct access, and the range of additional cognitive models to which it therefore facilitates indirect access. In fact, the framework is the result of Evans’ continuous works (Evans 2006, 2007, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b) which were based on works of Langacker (2002), Goldberg (2006); but the difference lies in the fact that it provides a methodological framework for conducting semantic analysis of lexical concepts (Evans, 2013:25). Here is the architect of the framework:

![Figure 8. The architect of LCCM Theory (Evans, 2009: 76)](image-url)
According to Evans, there are two mechanisms of linguistically mediated usage events namely *lexical concept selection* and *fusion* in the semantic compositionality. Lexical concept selection serves to identify the most appropriate lexical concept associated with a given form during the processing of an utterance. Fusion is the integrative process and results in the construction of a conception. This is achieved by recourse to two sorts of knowledge: linguistic content and conceptual content. Fusion is itself made up of two constituent processes: *lexical concept integration* and *interpretation* (see figure 9).

Figure 9. Processes of semantic composition in LCCM (Evans, 2009: 219)

One more issue addressed by LCCM is figurative language (metaphor and metonymy). Evans proves that literal meaning of an utterance is interpreted within the default or primary cognitive model profile while the non-literal meaning must be understood in the secondary cognitive model profile. The distinction between metaphor and metonymy is due to the emergence of alignment between what were termed figurative target and figurative vehicle. In case of metaphor, there is divergence between the two while in case of metonymy, there is alignment.

2.2. The methodology to account for the lexical representation of a linguistic unit in the light of LCCM

In reference to LCCM, we can make a methodological procedure to identify the lexical concepts of the preposition *over* as follows. A lexical concept shows *selectional tendencies* made up of two types of information. The first kind, termed the lexical concept’s *formal selectional tendencies*, relates to the vehicle types that can encode the lexical concept. The second type concerns the semantic arguments that make up the argument-structure lexical concept: its *semantic selectional tendencies*. A lexical profile, in nature, refers to the two types of selectional tendency, and it is assumed to be unique for any given lexical concept. Hence, a given lexical concept will exhibit a range of formal and semantic selectional tendencies that, in principle, should be sufficient for identifying a distinct lexical concept. Look at the following sentences from Oxford Dictionary:

(3). I went *over* and asked her name.

(4). He’s gone *over* to the enemy.

It is rather easy to schematize the spatial scenes denoted in sentences (3), (4) and there is a shift in movement towards the other side of something or somebody, which can be represented by the following figure:

---

We advocate the usage-based thesis of Langacker (2000) but due to the role of this paper as a proposal, the data were collected from various dictionaries namely Oxford, Cambridge, Collin COBUILD, etc. and some examples are ours which are reviewed by native speakers of English.
Tyler and Evans (2003: 87) also provided another schematization for Transfer Sense.

Figure 10. The schematization of “I went over”

Figure 11. The schematization of “He’s gone over to the enemy.”

Figure 12. Transfer Sense (Tyler and Evans, 2003:87)
In figure 10, the use of a rectangular suggests that the participants in the conversation (I, her) must be in the same space, e.g. a classroom. In figure 11, the double arrow presents the hatreds between two parties, and the arrow in both figure 10 and 11 shows the moving direction of the speaker or person mentioned. It is noted that the space in sentence (3) may not be bounded in a particular room.

Now, it is time to review the above sentences in the light of LCCM. Examining the formal structures of sentence (4), we can see that the use of motion verb “go” makes a shift in movement in the cognitive process of the hearer, but the non-existence of “to” in sentence (4) denotes an “approaching action”. In sentence (4), the use of “to the enemy” shows that the subject “he” not only changed his position, from one side to the other side, but also merged with that side. Basing on such an analysis, we suppose that over in sentence (3) denotes [APPROACHING] lexical concept; over in sentence (4) has [TRANSFER] lexical concept. In order to verify whether the concepts found are distinct lexical concepts or not, we then examine the formal selectional tendencies and the semantic selectional tendencies of both sentences (Evans, 2013: 47).

Now, we have to look at the formal selectional tendencies associated with those hypothesized lexical concepts, then the semantic selectional tendencies. In sentence (3), the first clause is “I went over” and of course without the phrase “and asked her name”, the meaning of the first clause is very vague. We suppose that the use of open-class elements in order to create this is crucial. In sentence (4), there is a prepositional phrase with the head noun “enemy” together with the preposition “to” which is compulsory. Moreover, the opposite status between the involved subjects should be taken into account.

Based on the different sorts of selectional tendencies associated with these two distinct semantic functions, we could make the conclusion that over in the two sentences (3), (4) denotes two distinct lexical concepts which are glossed as follows:

1. a. Vehicle: NP VP over Conjunction OCE
   b. Lexical concept: [APPROACHING]
2. a. Vehicle: NPVP over-to-Prepositional
   b. Lexical concept: [TRANSFER]

2.3. The hypothesized semantics of ‘over’ in the light of LCCM

After being collected, the data were analyzed in the light of LCCM. To be clearer, as part of LCCM, Cognitive Construction Grammar by Goldberg (2006) and Cognitive Grammar by Langacker (2002) were made use of to account for the structure of the sentences in the data. Then we applied the methodological constraints of LCCM to explain if a lexical concept is distinct or not.

We are very clear that the meanings of a preposition are grounded in space, which serves as a basis for meaning extension to non-spatial ones. As we are dealing with the lexical representation of over, the processes of meaning extension are not the foci of the paper. Additionally, as a preposition, over has

[6] The use of square brackets shows that the lexical concepts are termed by the writer of the paper.


[8] We advocate the usage-based thesis of Langacker (2000) but due to the role of this paper as a proposal, the data were collected from various dictionaries namely Oxford, Cambridge, Collin COBUILD, etc. and some examples are ours which are reviewed by native speakers of English.
to collocate with certain verbs to constitute what is termed “phrasal verb”; so in some cases, the vehicles may be overlapped. Nonetheless, the semantic selectional tendencies of distinct lexical concepts are totally different. This is the summarizing table of the lexical concepts and vehicles that over possesses.

Table 3. A summary of concepts and vehicles of the preposition “over”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lexical concept</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[ABOVE-ACROSS]</td>
<td>NP (VP) over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ON-THE-OTHER-SIDE-OF]</td>
<td>(NP) VP over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[ABOVE &amp; BEYOND] (Excess I)</td>
<td>NP VP over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[COMPLETITION]</td>
<td>BE over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[TRANSFER]</td>
<td>VP over to-Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[TEMPORAL]</td>
<td>over NP-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[COVERING]</td>
<td>NP VP over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[EXAMINING]</td>
<td>VP over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[FOCUS-OF-ATTENTION]</td>
<td>Verb-over (over can be paraphrased as about)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[MORE]</td>
<td>over NP-number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[OVER &amp; ABOVE] (Excess II)</td>
<td>VP over NP (paraphrase: Entity X causes entity Y to receive Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[CONTROL]</td>
<td>over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[PREFER]</td>
<td>Prefer/like/ favour NP over NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[REFLEXIVE]</td>
<td>VP (a 90 degree arc) (NP) over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[REPETITION]</td>
<td>VP (process verb) over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[APPROACHING]</td>
<td>VP over Conj OCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>[UNEASE OVERCOMING]</td>
<td>GET/BE over NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are the lexical concepts together with their vehicles of the preposition “over” in the light of LCCM; analysis of the semantic and formal selectional tendencies is also presented.

1. a. Lexical concept: [X is ABOVE and ACROSS Y]
   b. Vehicle: NP (VP) over NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first noun phrase is the figure while the second noun phrase is the ground. The presence of the VP is optional.</td>
<td>The figure and ground are easily distinguishable. The ground is conceptualized as a point. Verbal ascription must involve a locative designation of height. The noun phrase must not make hearers conjure up an obscuration of vision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The [ABOVE & ACROSS] concept is the most common concept that over carries, and in reference to Lakoff (1987) and Tyler & Evans (2003) [ABOVE-ACROSS] is the prototypical sense of over. In fact, the above-described vehicle can sometime carry other meaning rather than [ABOVE-ACROSS], e.g. [ON-THE-OTHER-SIDE-OF], but the difference lies in the semantics of the noun phrase or verb kinds. Here are some examples from Longman Dictionary:
(5a). A lamp hung over the table.
b. She leaned over the desk to answer the phone.
c. The sign over the door said “Mind your head”.
d. We watched a helicopter flying low over the harbor.

As discussed above, the vehicle \( NP \) \( (VP) \over NP \) can denote \([\text{ON-THE-OTHER-SIDE-OF}]\) lexical concept. Let’s look at the following examples:

(6a). Somehow the sheep had jumped over the fence.
b. over the river Thames (Longman Dictionary)
c. to leap over a wall (Dictionary.com)

Analyzing the characteristics of the noun phrase, we realize that the presence of the first one is purely optional while that of the second one is compulsory. If the first noun phrase refers to a human construction, e.g. a bridge; the preposition will conjure up a stretch in human mind. Here is an example:

(7). Look at the birds flying over \(_1\) the bridge over \(_2\) the Thames! \(\text{(my own example)}\)

\(Over_1\) denotes the action of flying higher and in no contact with the bridge of the birds while \(over_2\) refers to the fact that the bridge stretches from one side of the river to the other side. Here is the summary of the second lexical concept of \(over\):

2. a. Lexical concept: \([\text{X is on the other side of Y}]\)
b. Vehicle: \((NP) \over \text{VP over NP}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The presence of the first noun phrase is purely optional.</td>
<td>The second noun phrase refers to a geographical barrier that can make an obscuration in vision or difficulties in commuting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of the VP is optional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third lexical concept that \(over\) has is \([\text{ABOVE & BEYOND}]\). In this aspect, the noun phrase following \(over\) is conceptualized as a target point, or a limit and there is a force driving towards the target, but it fails. Look at the following examples:

(8a). Your paper is over the page limit.
b. The arrow flew over the target point. (Adapted from Tyler & Evans, 2003)

Here is the summary of the concept:

3. a. Lexical concept: \([\text{X is ABOVE & BEYOND Y}]\)
b. Vehicle: \((NP \text{ VP over NP})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The presence of the first noun phrase and second one is compulsory.</td>
<td>The second noun phrase refers to a standard or required point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In case of short answer to a certain question, the phrase (over \text{ NP}) is sufficient to denote the concept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth lexical concept of \(over\) we glossed here is \([\text{COMPLETION}]\) which is characterized by the vehicle “\(VP \text{ over}\)” In this structure \(over\) is not a preposition, but its meaning is grounded in space so Tyler & Evans (2003:86) termed “adprep”\(^9\). Here is an example:

\(^9\) This is consistent with results of the previous researchers such as Langacker, 1992; Bolinger, 1971; O’Dowd, 1998.
(9). The game is over. (my own example)

4. a. Lexical concept: [COMPLETION]
   b. Vehicle: NP BE over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The structure BE over is permanent.</td>
<td>The noun phrase is conceptualized as an event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next lexical concept of over is [TEMPORAL], coded by the structure over + time. In this case, the noun phrase is a chronological unit which can be years, weeks, etc.

5a. Lexical concept: [TEMPORAL]
   b. Vehicle: over NP-time

(10a). Can we talk about this over dinner?
   b. Over a period of ten years he stole a million pounds from the company. (Longman Dictionary)

The sixth concept is [TRANSFER] with some typical phrases like go/turn/ switch/ hand NP over to NP. It is noted that the verb designates a shift in direction or the possession state; and the to-prepositional phrase refers to the beneficiary of the movement. Look at the following sentence:

(11). She handed her money over to the robber. (my own example)

In this sentence, the figure is the woman’s money which was forced to give the robber - the beneficiary of such an action. Of course, schematizing the spatial scene of the sentence helps us learn that the owner of the money is no longer the woman, but the robber. Another example is:

(12). The man has gone over to the other party. (my own example)

Here is the summary of the concept’s information:

6. a. Lexical concept: [TRANSFER]
   b. Vehicle: Verb over NP to-Prepositional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The presence of the first noun phrase is optional.</td>
<td>The verb designates a shift in direction or the possession state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of the VP and to-prepositional phrase is compulsory.</td>
<td>The noun phrase in the to-prepositional phrase refers to the beneficiary of the movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seventh lexical concept termed here is [COVERING] which is formally encoded by the structure over NP. In fact, the structure can be extended as follows: NP VP over NP. We realize that the first noun phrase is not necessarily higher than the second one, and even there is contact between them. Here is an example:

(13). The tablecloth is over the table. (Tyler & Evans, 2003: 90)

Apparently, the tablecloth must be in contact with the table and cover at least the central part or the whole table to beautify the table and provide the courtesy to the room. It is noted that both the table and the tablecloth are lower than our vantage point and we as construers/ viewers tend to perceive the covering relationship between the figure and the ground, rather than seeing that the figure is on and in contact with the ground. Analyzing
more examples denoting the same lexical concept, we see that the vantage point of the viewers/ construers changed to the position between the figure and the ground.

7. a. Lexical concept: [COVERING]
   b. Vehicle: VP NP over NP/ NP BE over NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The structure is compulsory; no parts can be omitted.</td>
<td>The figure covers most part or even the total surface of the ground from the cognition of viewers/ construers. The actual vantage point of the viewers/ construers has changed to the position between the figure and the ground.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eighth lexical concept that over possesses is [EXAMINING], formally encoded by the structure VP over NP. Typically, the verbs are those which denote a vision from a subject to another subject; and in this case the noun phrase is purely optional. However, if the verb does not denote such vision, e.g. go, the presence of the noun phrase is compulsory and it is the thing that can be presented in written or spoken form. Here are two examples:

(14). She carefully looked over the paper.

(15). Actually, it’s time to go over the evidence again, more critically.10

8. a. Lexical concept: [EXAMINING]
   b. Vehicle: VP over NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the verb denotes a vision, the presence of the noun phrase is purely optional. If not, the presence of the noun phrase is compulsory.</td>
<td>Typically, the verb denotes visions, e.g. watch, look. The noun phrase refers to something that can be presented in either spoken or written form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next lexical concept to be covered is [MORE] which is encoded by over NP-number. It is very easy to notify the formal selectional tendencies of the noun phrase, i.e. numbers, following over.

9. a. Lexical concept: [MORE]
   b. Vehicle: over NP-number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The noun phrase following over is elaborated by a number. The presence of verb phrase or noun phrase preceding over is purely optional.</td>
<td>The noun phrase following over denotes a number or quantity. The number or quantity is conceptualized as the ground which is lower than the figure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tenth lexical concept that over has is [OVER & ABOVE] which can be encoded formally by the di-transitive structure VP over NP. By saying so we mean that any sentences containing over that denote this concept can be paraphrased by the structure Entity X causes entity Y to receive Z (Goldberg, 1995). Let’s look at the following examples:

(16). The heavy rains caused the river to flow over its banks.

(17). Lou kept pouring the cereal into the bowl until it spilled over and onto the counter. (Tyler & Evans, 2003:99)

Here is the summary of the concept:

10. a. Lexical concept: [ABOVE & BEYOND]
    b. Vehicle: VP over NP (paraphrase: Entity X causes entity Y to receive Z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The typical structure VP over NP can be paraphrased by the di-transitive structure: Entity X causes entity Y to receive Z.</td>
<td>The figure and the ground are related to water or some forms of liquid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next lexical concept is rather clear [CONTROL] via the use of some verbs like control, stand or nouns like power, authority. The formal structure of the concept is VP/ NP

10 Source: http://context.reverso.net
over NP. If the component preceding over is a verb, the verb must directly evoke power or greater dynamic force than the referent of the noun phrase following over. If that component is a noun, the nouns are power, control, and authority.

11. a. Lexical concept: [CONTROL]
   b. Vehicle: NP/ VP over NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The nouns preceding over are power, control, and authority.</td>
<td>The figure is conceptualized higher and stronger than the ground. The figure can greatly influence the ground which to certain extent has to follow the figure. The verb preceding over must directly evoke power or greater dynamic force than the referent of the noun phrase following over.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelfth lexical concept of over is [PREFER] encoded formally by the structure prefer/ like/ favour NP over NP. This structure is unique in terms of the explicitness of the component preceding over since the verb must denote a mental feeling of likeness. The semantic selectional tendencies are explicit; i.e. both noun phrases are options in a certain context. Here are two examples:

(18). I prefer tea over coffee. (my own example)
(19). I favour soccer over tennis. (Tyler & Evans, 2003: 103)

In the above examples, the first noun phrase is preferred and it is personal opinion in this context. To be clearer, the speaker wants to convey the desire towards the first choice by making use of verbs like prefer or like.

12. a. Lexical concept: [PREFER]
   b. Vehicle: prefer/ like/ favour NP over NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The verbs are: prefer, like and favour.</td>
<td>The verb phrase denotes human feelings towards likeness. The first and second noun phrases are options in a certain context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next lexical concept that over is an adprep is [REFLEXIVE] which is the result of a reanalysis of a process (Tyler & Evans, 2003:104). Let’s look at the following example:

(20). Try not to knock that vase over. The wind must have blown it over. (Oxford Dictionary)

One again, the structure VP over encodes a novel meaning besides those presented. The semantic selectional tendencies of the concept are seen via verbs, e.g. blow, roll, turn, that make hearers conjure up a 90-degree arc. Tyler & Evans (2003), and Lindner (1981) noted that the figure and the ground possess multiple spatial configurations; however, they are still on one plane.

13. a. Lexical concept: [REFLEXIVE]
   b. Vehicle: VP over (NP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The verbs are: turn, roll and bend. The presence of the noun phrase is optional if the verb is intransitive.</td>
<td>The verb denotes a 90-degree arc in human cognition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another frequent use of over is to denote repetition. Let’s look at the following examples:

(21). He did the work so badly that I had to do it all over again. (Oxford Dictionary)
(22). He played the same piano piece over.
(23). After the false start, they started the race over. (Tyler & Evans, 2003:105)

We can see that if the verbs in [RELEXIVE] concept make hearers conjure up a 90-degree arc, the phrasal verbs in the above sentences provide readers with a 360-degree circle, or in other words, the concept involves a particular set of process verbs.

14. a. Lexical concept: [REPETITION]  
   b. Vehicle: VP NP over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs can be: do, make, start and begin. The noun phrase refers to things rather than humans.</td>
<td>The verb denotes a 360 degree circle in human cognition. The verbs denote a particular process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another use of over is to denote a topic of attention, and in this case, over can be paraphrased by the word “about”. Here are two examples by Tyler & Evans (2003: 95):

(24a). The little boy cried over his broken toy.

b. The little boy cried about his broken toy.

(25a). The generals talked over their plans for the invasion.

b. The generals talked about their plans for the invasion11.

Another example is from Collin COBUILD Dictionary:

(26). We had an argument over nothing.

In this sentence, “nothing” is not the foci of the talk; in fact, it could be the result of the argument, or it could refer to the topic of the talk which did not really focus on a particular theme. The sentence can be paraphrased as “We had an argument about nothing.”

11 Dirven (1993) noted that talk over is a verb-particle construction while talk about is not, so we cannot say “We talk it about.” (Tyler & Evans, 2003: 95)

15. a. Lexical concept: [FOCUS-OF-ATTENTION]  
   b. Vehicle: Verb-over (over can be paraphrased as about)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The construction verb-over cannot be changed except for the case of talk over.</td>
<td>The verb refers to a cause of interest, worries or discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Until now, we have been treating over in collocations with different kinds of verbs. Let’s look at the following examples when the verb preceding over denotes some kind of movement.

(27). I went over. (Hypothesized data)

The meaning of sentence (27) is vague. There is no context for hearers or readers to base on together with the encyclopedic knowledge to guess the exact meaning of the phrase went over. If following over is a plan, go over means check; or if it is the room, went over means cross. It is possible to say that the phrasal verb, i.e. go over, has ignited numerous access routes in human cognition. Talmy (2000:231-239) mentioned the strategies of both speakers and hearers to make the message across. According to Talmy, construers have to schematize a certain spatial scene by choosing certain spatial aspects while ignoring others; and when no preposition can convey the target meaning, the use of open-class elements after the phrasal verb is of great importance to make the meaning of the sentence coherent to listeners or readers.

(27’). I went over and asked her name. (Oxford Dictionary)

As discussed earlier, over in sentence (29’) possesses [APPROACHING] concept, encoded formally by the structure VP over Conj OCE in which the presence of conjunction and open-class element(s) is mandatory to help readers or listeners schematize the spatial scene and the whole processes. Hence, in the light of LCCM, over in this case denote a distinct concept.
16. Lexical concept: [APPROACHING]

b. Vehicle: NP VP over Conjunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The presence of the conjunction is compulsory as it is a strategy that speakers use to denote the concept, together with open-class element(s). Typical verbs are <em>go</em> and <em>come</em>.</td>
<td>The verb refers to an action of moving, especially in a small space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let’s look at some sentences without spatial configuration between the figure and ground:

(28a). I am *over* him now.

b. I think we’re *over* the worst of the crisis now.

c. He had a fever last night, but he seems to be *over* it now. (Longman Dictionary)

In the above sentences, the use of *over* cannot directly trace any spatial meanings; however, in reference to the movement of time, we can present the state of the subject before and after a certain point as follows:

![Figure 13. The presentation of the use of over in sentence (28)](image)

Experiencing the connotational meaning of the words on the “right-hand” side of *over*, we realize that it refers to something or somebody causing a kind of *unease* for the participants involved. We advocate that *over* in those sentences denotes [UNEASE OVERCOMING] lexical concept. There can be a controversial issue concerning the denotational term. Some people would argue that it is better if the term is [PSYCHOSOMATIC], a term with more neutral and broader meaning. However, we argue that since the prototypical meaning of *over* is *above-across* (Lakoff, 1987; Tyler & Evans, 2003), the use of *over* is, originally, to denote a kind of mental overcoming process. Surprisingly, if searching the sentence “*She is not over her ex*” on Google, we have 607 million results within 0.49 second. In this case, the semantic selectional tendencies of the noun phrase following *over* are different from that of other concepts, and of course the presence of the noun phrase is crucial for readers or listeners to understand the meaning of *over*.

17. a. Lexical concept: [UNEASE OVERCOMING]

b. Vehicle: NP GET/BE over NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal selectional tendencies</th>
<th>Semantic selectional tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The order of the vehicle component cannot be changed. Situational BE/ GET is right before <em>over</em> to help readers or listeners construe the experience.</td>
<td>The first noun phrase refers to an entity that to certain extent can experience some processes. The noun phrase following <em>over</em> refers to a state or an entity that was conceived as a negative by the referent of the first noun phrase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, in the light of LCCM, *over* possesses 17 distinct lexical concepts encoded formally by 17 structures.

4. Conclusion

After hypothesizing the lexical concepts associated with *over* in different structures, we have seen some issues. First, some syntactic structures paired with certain concepts are formally similar; hence, we need to semantically analyze the verb and noun phrase surrounding *over* and then categorize them. The key differences lie in the features of those verbs and nouns. Secondly, though the framework tends to be feasible, an empirical research study on both the lexical representation and semantic composition of the preposition is necessary to prove the feasibility of the framework. Last but not least, in certain cases, the notion of image-
schema is of great significance in order to treat the spatial configurations between the figure and the ground.
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