Бледнова О. Г. Из истории развития германских личных имен в древненемецком антропонимиконе.

В предложенной статье автор анализирует структуру германских личных имен в древненемецком антропонимиконе.

Ключевые слова: германские личные имена, антропонимика, древненемецкий антропонимикон, структура, семантика.

Blednova O. G. From the history of the development of German names in the old German antroponimikon.

In the following article the author analyses the structure of the Germanic proper names in the Old German language.

Key words: Germanic proper names, anthroponimic, the Old German language, structure, semantics.

УДК 811.111

Бокун I. A.

FAMILY RESEMBLANCE STRUCTURE OF "OVER"

Amongst the most polysemous words in English, and in other languages which have them, are the prepositions. As any foreign learner of English will confirm, the polysemy of prepositions verges on the chaotic. This impression is strengthened by the fact that the range of uses associated with any one preposition in one language rarely overlaps with the meanings of any single linguistic form in another language. In English you put gloves *on* your hands and a ring *on* your finger; in Italian gloves go *sulle mani*, but a ring goes *al dito*. In German, you go *auf Urlaub*, you live *auf dem Lande*, and you meet people *auf einer Party*, while in English you go *on* holiday, you live *in* the country, and you meet people *at* a party. Confronted with facts like these, language teachers and writers of textbooks and pedagogical grammars have generally despaired of giving a reasoned account of prepositions. Prepositional usage is idiomatic, and 'just has to be learnt'. Prepositional polysemy, in other words, is reduced to homonymy. Mainstream linguistics seems to have taken a similar line. To the extent that structuralist and generative linguists have had anything at all to say about prepositions [3, p.345], attention has been largely restricted to a small range of central senses. The staggering complexity of prepositional polysemy, not being subject to obvious rule, has been ignored.

In contrast, cognitive linguists have taken up the challenge of the alleged arbitrariness of prepositional usage. In fact, the demonstration that prepositional usage is highly structured has probably been one of the major achievements of the cognitive paradigm. Amongst the outstanding early contributions that should be mentioned are the dissertations by Brugman [1]and Hawkins [2]. Important also is Lindner's [6] account of the verb particles *in* and *out*. In this

article I will illustrate the approach on what is perhaps the most polysemous of the English prepositions, *over*. The account draws heavily on Brugman's [1] and Taylor's [7] monographs, and on Lakoff's [4] representation of Brugman's data.

The discussion, which does not pretend to be exhaustive, will be limited mainly to the spatial meanings of the preposition. First, it is appropriate to make a few remarks about prepositions in general. Prepositions, in their spatial sense, serve to spatially locate one entity with reference to another. Following terminology introduced by Langacker [5, p. 231], the entity which is located will be referred to as the trajector, or TR, while the entity which serves as a reference point will be referred to as the landmark, or LM. Prepositions may profile different aspects of the TR-LM relationship. An important distinction is between a static and a dynamic relationship. If the relationship is a static one, the preposition denotes the place of the TR. Alternatively, the relationship may be a dynamic one of goal (the end-point of the TR's movement is profiled), source (the starting-point of the TR's movement is profiled), or path (some or all of the trajectory followed by the TR is profiled). Other aspects that may be relevant are the shape, size, and dimensionality of the LM and the TR; the presence or absence of contact between the TR and the LM; the distance between the TR and the LM; the orientation (e.g. superior/inferior, inclusion/exclusion) of the TR with respect to the LM; and so on. Even on their spatial senses, prepositions may also be associated with various kinds of 'functional' relations, such as support (as with *on)*, containment *(in)*, and accompaniment *(with)*.

With these general characteristics of prepositions in mind, let us examine the following sentences with *over*:

(1) a.   The lamp hangs over the table.

b. The plane flew over the city.

c. He walked over the street.

d. He walked over the hill.

e. He jumped over the wall.

f. He turned over the page.

g. He turned over the stone.

h. He fell over a stone.

i. He pushed her over the balcony.

j. The water flowed over the rim of the bathtub.

k. He lives over the hill.

l. Come over here.

m. Pull the lamp down over the table.

n. He walked all over the city.

o. The child threw his toys (all) over the floor.

p. He laid the tablecloth over the table, q. He put his hands over his face.

The great diversity of meanings associated with *over* scarcely needs comment. Some meanings, in fact, such as (a), (g), and (1), appear to have practically nothing in common with one another. To attempt to extract a common meaning core from all the sentences in (1) would thus be a fruitless

undertaking. Our task will be to systematize nevertheless the data in (1) - to show, in fact, that OVER constitutes a complex family of related meanings.

In the first of the above sentences *(The lamp hangs over the table), over* denotes a static relationship of place. The TR is located vertical to, but not in contact with the LM. In *The plane flew over the city* (b), the TR is again vertical to, and not in contact with the LM. The relationship, however, has changed from static to dynamic. The expression *over the city* denotes (part of) the path followed by the TR. *He walked over the street* (c) is similar, except that now there is contact between the TR and the LM. *He walked over the hill* (d) is closely related to (c), that is, the TR traces a path vertical to, and in contact with, the LM. A new element, however, has been introduced, namely the shape of the path. In walking over a hill, a person first ascends, reaches the highest point, and then descends. In *He jumped over the wall* (e) this curved, arc-like path of the TR is again in evidence. A further element is making its appearance, namely, the notion of the LM as an obstacle that the TR must surmount by first ascending, then descending. The next few examples exploit the idea of a curved path, introduced in (d). In (f), the page moves through 180^0 as it is turned. (Note that in this and the next few examples *over* is more of an adverb than a preposition. As suggested earlier, polysemy need not require absolute identity of syntactic function.) In (g), the stone, in being turned over, likewise rotates on its axis. In *He fell over a stone* (h), the subject of the verb traces a more limited arc-like path (say, through 90^0), while the unfortunate victim in (i) *(He pushed her over the balcony)* traces a curved, downward path. In (j), water, in flowing over the rim of a bathtub, traces a path of a similar shape.

So far, we have identified a fairly extensive chain originating with (a) and leading, via intermediate links, to (j). Notice in particular how the notion of a curved path, introduced in (d), motivates a set of uses of *over* which at first sight are quite unrelated to the *over* of (a).

It is possible to identify other meaning chains in the sentences in (1). Let us return to (1d). In *He walked over the hill, over the hill* denotes the path of the TR, with, as already observed, the LM as a kind of obstacle along the path. A related use is (1k): *He lives over the hill,* where *over the hill* denotes not the path traced by the TR, but the end-point of the path which an observer would have to follow in order to arrive at the TR, while the LM is construed as an obstacle that the traveller would have to surmount. *Come over here* (1l) is an extension of (1k). *Over here* again denotes the end-point of a path, only now the path is an imaginary one, which originates at the addressee, follows an unspecified trajectory, and finishes in the region of the speaker.

Further uses of *over* denote a covering relationship, as in *He laid the table-cloth over the table* (p). We can relate the use in (p) to (c), via the intermediate uses in (n) and (o). A person who walks *over the street* (c) traces a path in the street. If he walks *all over the city* (n) we can think of the path as being so convoluted that it virtually covers the total area of the LM. Cases like (n) motivate sentences like *The child threw his toys (all) over the floor* (o), where the notion of covering comes more strongly to the fore. In (p), the covering is

complete; the LM has become invisible to an observer. In sentences like (o) and (p), the TR, in covering the LM, is still located vertical to it. The verticality of the TR to the LM is not essential, however, as shown by example (q) *He put his hands over his face.*

Over in the sense of covering can be derived by another route, starting from sentence (a). As we have already seen, (a) denotes the superior location of the TR, and absence of contact with the LM. The sentence has a further meaning nuance. Although the TR is not in contact with the LM, it is nevertheless construed as being fairly close to it, and can, in appropriate circumstances, exert an influence over it. In this respect, *over* contrasts with *above*. Thus, I am much more likely to be disturbed by noise from people living over me, than by people merely living above me. The idea of the TR influencing the LM comes out in (m): *Pull the lamp down over the table* (i.e. so that the table is illuminated by the lamp). Significantly, *over* in (m) cannot be replaced by *above*, a preposition which suggests, if anything, an absence of interaction between the TR and the LM. It is perhaps not too fanciful to see covering as a special instance of influencing. Certainly, the relative closeness of the TR to the LM, in (1a), seems a precondition for the semantic extension to covering.

So far, we have restricted our attention to some of the spatial uses of *over*. There are, in addition, a vast number of non-spatial, metaphorical uses. Some examples will be appropriate at this point. A metaphorical use of *over* is exemplified in (2):

(2) He has no authority over me.

This sentence is a metaphorization of (1a). The relationship between the TR and the LM is one of power, not of spatial orientation. In other words, we witness a transfer of the TR-LM relationship from the domain of vertical space to the domain of power relations. Power relations are typically conceptualized in terms of vertical space. Someone with power is 'higher' than someone without power. Hence a preposition denoting a higher vertical location comes to be employed to encode a position of greater power. *Over* is a particularly appropriate preposition in this case, since spatial *over*, as we have seen, often conveys that the TR is close enough to the LM to exert some kind of influence over it.

Significantly, *over* in (2) is not replaceable by *above*, a preposition which emphasizes the lack of influence of the TR on the LM. A further metaphorical use is exemplified in (3):

(3) He got over his parents' death.

This sentence is related to (1e), where *over* denotes a path surmounting an obstacle. The metaphorization is made possible by the fact that life itself is often construed as a path, and difficult episodes during one's life as obstacles in the path. Based on (1k), *over* can designate the end-point of an activity or state of affairs, as in (4):

(4)   a. Our troubles are over.
b. The lesson is over.
c. It isn't over till it's over.

The various senses of *over* that we have discussed form four major clusters. Firstly, there are the senses which have to do, in one way or another, with the higher location of the TR *vis-a-vis* the LM. Then there are the senses which indicate some kind of covering relationship between TR and LM. Thirdly, *over* designates a curved, arc-like movement. A final cluster of senses has to do with the end-point of a path. At the same time, each individual sense of *over* is itself a category with its own prototype structure. Let us consider the meaning exemplified in (1k): *He lives over the hill. Over,* in this sentence, is roughly equivalent to *on the other side of.* Some further examples:

(5)   a. He has a farm over the river/on the other side of the river.

b. You'll find the bookshop over the street/on the other side of the street.

c. He lives just over the frontier/on the other side of the frontier.

Yet *on the other side of is* not replaceable by *over* in all cases. We would not usually speak of a bookcase being over (= on the other side of) the coffee table, or of a greenhouse being over the lawn. *Over* in (1k) is associated with a very specific 'image'. As already noted, the LM is construed as an obstacle situated between the TR and an observer (usually the speaker), such that the observer, in approaching the TR, would have to surmount the obstacle (e.g. by tracing an ascending-descending path). More abstractly, the LM is construed as a boundary separating the TR from an observer. Hence, we find restrictions on the kinds of entities which can serve as LMs. Hills, mountains, and walls are good instances of obstacles which must be surmounted, while rivers, streets, and national frontiers serve as good instances of boundaries. Lawns and coffee tables, on the other hand, are not (usually) thought of as obstacles to be surmounted, or as boundaries to be crossed. Hence the strangeness of saying that something is located over (= on the other side of) a lawn or a table. The wider applicability of *on the other side of* results from the fact that this expression does not share the image of *over.*

The details of the family resemblance structure of OVER that we have been discussing are, needless to say, conventionalizations (albeit motivated conventionalizations) of the English language. There is no reason to expect that prepositional categories in other languages will be structured in a similar way, and indeed, a preposition in one language rarely has a single translation equivalent in another language. Yet the non-equivalence of prepositions across languages is no reason for accepting the view that prepositional usage is essentially arbitrary. Non-equivalence can be explained very simply in terms of different structurings of the categories, and in fact cross-language data even support the family resemblance approach advocated here. Let us suppose that a language has a lexical item with the meanings A, B, C, and D. According to the meaning chain model of polysemy, the association of meanings A and D within the same category is dependent on the existence of the intervening links in the chain, B and C. We can predict that if another language has a polysemous word with meanings A^l and D^l (i.e. with meanings identical to, or very close to, meanings A and D), that word will also have meanings B^l and C^l. (I ignore here the possibility that meanings B^l and C^l might have fallen into disuse, leaving A^l and

D^l stranded, as it were, as (relatively) unrelated meanings of a single linguistic form.) Conversely, if A^l has not extended in the direction of B^l meanings C^l and D^l will be absent. The presence of meaning B^l, however, does not necessarily imply the existence of C^l and D^l. These predictions receive confirmation from a comparison of English and Italian prepositions and English and German prepositions [7, p. 117-118].

To sum up, the family resemblance model is a powerful tool for explicating the structure of such highly polysemous lexical items as prepositions. Yet there are a number of matters which will need to be clarified if the model is to come to maturity. I will mention two particularly pressing issues here. The first concerns the possibility that some members of a family resemblance category might have a more central status within the category than others. If this is the case, what gives them their central status? The other problem with family resemblance categories concerns the range of meanings that can get associated within a category. Both require further investigation.

Literature

1. Brugman C. Story of OVER: MA thesis / C. Brugman // University of California, Berkeley, 1983. – 175 p. **2. Hawkins B.** The semantics of English spatial prepositions: Ph.D.diss. / B. Hawkins // University of California, San Diego, 1985. – 350 p. **3. Jackendoff R.** The base rules for prepositional phrases / S. Anderson, P. Kiparsky (eds); A Festschrift for Morris Halle. // New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973. – P. 345 – 356. **4. Lakoff G.** Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind / G. Lakoff // Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. – 107 p. **5. Langacker R. W.** Foundations of Cognitive Grammar / R. W. Langacker // Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. – 386 p. **6. Lindner S.** A lexico-semantic analysis of English verb particle constructions with UP and OUT: Ph.D.diss. / S. Lindner // University of California, San Diego, 1985. – 327 p. **7. Taylor J. R.** Linguistic Categorization / J. R. Taylor // Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. – 308 p.

Бокун І. А. Підхід сімейної подібності на прикладі лексичної одиниці «over».

Стаття висвітлює підхід сімейної подібності до полісемії на прикладі лексичної одиниці «over».

Ключові слова: прийменникова полісемія, траєктор, орієнтир, кластер, структура сімейної подібності.