Lu, Wei-lun

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkins, S. (1993). Tools for computer-aided lexicography: The Hector Project. *Acta Linguistica Hugarica* 41, 5–72.

Barcelona, A. (2000). On the plausibility of claiming a metonymic motivation for conceptual metaphor. In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 31–58). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110894677.31

Benveniste, E. (1971). Subjectivity in language. In M. E. Meek (Ed.), *Problems in general linguistics* (pp. 223–230). Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.

Boers, F. (1994). *Motivating meaning extensions beyond physical space: A cognitive linguistic journey along the up-down and the front-back dimension*. Ph.D. dissertation, Antwerp University.

Bolinger, D. (1971). *The phrasal verbs in English*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Breal, M. (1964). *Semantics: Studies in the science of meaning* (trans. Henry Cust). New York: Dover. [Original edition 1900]

Brugman, C. (1988). *The story of* over*: Polysemy, semantics, and the structure of the lexicon*. New York: Garland Press.

Buhler, K. (1990). *Theory of language: The representational function of language* (trans. D. F. Goodwin). Amsterdam: Benjamins. [Original edition 1934] https://doi.org/10.1075/fos.25

Cappelle, B. (2005). *Particle patterns in English: A comprehensive coverage*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leuven.

Chang, S. (1994). *V-qilai construction in Mandarin Chinese: A study for their semantics and syntax*. M.A. thesis, National Tsinghua University.

Chen, M, & J. Chang. (2010). The meaning extension of *xiang* and its polysemy network. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 8(2), 1–32.

Chou, T. (1999). A study of polysemous words *shang* and *xia* in Chinese. M.A. Thesis, National Tsinghua University.

Croft, W. (1990). Possible verbs and the structure of events. In S. L. Tsohatzidis (Ed.), *Meanings and prototypes: Studies in linguistic categorization* (pp. 48–73). London: Routledge.

Croft, W. (1993). The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4(4), 335–70. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1993.4.4.335

Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299554.001.0001

Croft, W. & D. A. Cruse. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803864

Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Dehe, N. (2002). *Particle verbs in English: Syntax, information structure, and intonation*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.59

Dewell, R. B. (1994). *Over* again: Image-schema transformations in semantic analysis. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5(4), 351–80. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1994.5.4.351

Dosedlová, A. & W. Lu. (2019). The Near-synonymy of classifiers and construal operation: A corpus-based study of 棵 *kē* and 株 *zhū* in Mandarin Chinese. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 17(1), 116–133. https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.00028.dos

Dosedlová, A. & W. Lu. (2021). A co-varying collexeme analysis of Chinese classifiers 棵 *kē* and 株 *zhū*. In B. Basciano, F. Gatti & A. Morbiato (Eds.), *Corpus-based research on Chinese language and linguistics*, 223–238. Venice: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.

Evans, V. (2004). *The structure of time: Language, meaning and temporal cognition*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.12

Evans, V. (2006). Lexical concepts, cognitive models and meaning construction. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4), 491–534. https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2006.016

Fauconnier, G. & M. Turner. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Fillmore, C. (1976). Frame semantics and the nature of language. *Annuals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 280(1), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1976.tb25467.x

Fillmore, C. J. & B. T. S. Atkins. (1992). Toward a frame-based lexicon: The semantics of RISK and its neighbors. In A. Lehrer & E. Kittay (Eds.), *Frames, fields, and contrasts* (pp. 75–102). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fillmore, C. J. & B. T. S. Atkins. (2000). Describing polysemy: The case of crawl. In Y. Ravin & C. Leacock (Eds.), *Polysemy: Theoretical and computational approaches* (pp. 91–110). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fillmore, C., P. Kay & M. K. O'Connor. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64(3), 501–38. https://doi.org/10.2307/414531

Firth, J. R. (1957). *Modes of meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geeraerts, D. (1993). Vagueness's puzzles, polysemy's vagaries. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4(3), 223–72. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1993.4.3.223

Goldberg, A. E. (1995). *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Grady, J. (1997). *Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Ph.D. dissertation, UC Berkeley.

Grice, P. (1978). Further notes on logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 9, Pragmatics* (pp. 113–128). New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368873_006

Gries, S. Th. (2006). Corpus-based methods and cognitive semantics: The many meanings of *to run*. In S. Th. Gries & A. Stefanowitsch (Eds.), *Corpora in cognitive linguistics: Corpus-based approaches to syntax and lexis* (pp. 57–99). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197709

Hampe, B. (2005). When *down* is not bad, and *up* not good enough: A usage-based assessment of the plus-minus parameter in image-schema theory. *Cognitive Linguistics* 16(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2005.16.1.81

Hanks, P. (1996). Contextual dependency and lexical sets. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 1(1), 75–98. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.1.1.06han

Herskovits, A. (1986). *Language and spatial cognition: An interdisciplinary study of the prepositions in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herskovits, A. (1988). Spatial expressions and the plasticity of meaning. In B. Rudzka-Ostyn (Ed.), *Topics in Cognitive Grammar* (pp. 271–98). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.50.11her

Hsu, Y. (2001). *An analysis of the Chinese spatial term* shang *in three reference frames*. M.A. Thesis, National Chung Cheng University.

Huang, C. & S. Chang. (1996). Metaphor, metaphorical extension, and grammaticalization: A study of Mandarin Chinese *-qilai*. In A. Goldberg (Ed.), *Conceptual structure, discourse, and language* (pp. 201–215). Stanford: CSLI.

Ikegami, Y. (1987). 'Source' vs. 'goal': A case of linguistic dissymmetry. In R. Dirven & G. Radden (Eds.), *Concepts of case* (pp. 122–46). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.

Ikegami, Y. (2008). Subjective construal as a 'fashion of speaking' in Japanese. In M. A. G. Gonzalez, J. L. Mackenzie & E. M. G. Álvarez. (Eds.), *Current trends in contrastive linguistics: Functional and cognitive perspectives* (pp. 227–250). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.60.14ike

Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Jakobson, R. (1957). *Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226177847.001.0001

Kilgarriff, A. (1997). I don't believe in word senses. *Computers in the Humanities* 31, 91–113. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1000583911091

Kim, H. (2005). *Semantic networks of* shang *and* xia *in Mandarin Chinese: A cognitive linguistic analysis*. M.A. Thesis, Providence University.

Kövecses, Z. (1991). Happiness: A definitional effort. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 6(1), 29–46. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms0601_2

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226471013.001.0001

Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1982). Space Grammar, analyzability, and the English passive. *Language* 58(1), 22–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/413531

Langacker, R. W. (1985). Observations and speculations on subjectivity. In J. Haiman (Ed.), *Iconicity in syntax* (pp. 109–50). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.6.07lan

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1990). Subjectification. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1(1), 5–38. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1990.1.1.5

Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Concept, image and symbol*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1999). *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110800524

Langacker, R. W. (2000). A dynamic usage-based model. In M. Barlow & S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Usage-based models of language* (pp. 1–64). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Langacker, R. W. (2006). Subjectification, grammaticalization, and conceptual archetypes. In A. Athanasiadou, C. Canakis & B. Cornillie (Eds.), *Subjectification: Various paths to subjectivity* (pp. 17–40). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001

Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5526.001.0001

Li, M. (1999). *A semantic study of modern Chinese localizer* shang. M.A. Thesis, National Taiwan Normal University.

Li, A. C. (1999). *On Mandarin directional verbs* qilai, xiaqu, *and* shanglai: *A reflection of grammaticalization*. M.A. Thesis, National Chengchi University.

Liang, H. & K. Sullivan. (2019). Chinese L2 acquisition of sense relatedness for *shàng* "to go up". *Chinese as a Second Language Research,* 8(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1515/caslar-2019-0001

Lindner, S. (1982). What goes up doesn't necessarily come down: The ins and outs of opposites. In *Papers from the 18th regional meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 305–23). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lindner, S. (1983). *A lexico-semantic analysis of English verb particle constructions with* out *and* up. Bloomington: University of Indiana Linguistics Club.

Lindstromberg, S. (1997). *English prepositions explained*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1515/caslar-2019-0001

Lloyd, S. E., Sinha C. G. & N. H. Freeman. (1981). Spatial reference systems, and the canonicality effect in infant search. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 32(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0965(81)90088-6

Lu, L. W. & L. I. Su. (2012). Antonymous polysemy: The case of *–shang* in Mandarin. In A. Bednarek (Ed.), *Interdisciplinary perspectives in cross-cultural communication* (pp. 36–50). München: Lincom Europa Academic Publishers.

Lu, W. (2015a). Image-schemas, domains, co-text and the semantics of resultatives: A cognitive linguistic approach to *–shang*. *Chinese Language and Discourse* 6(2), 162–182. https://doi.org/10.1075/cld.6.2.03lu

Lu, W. (2015b). A Cognitive Linguistic approach to teaching spatial particles: From contrastive constructional analyses to material design. In K. Masuda, C. Arnett & A. Labarca (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics and sociocultural theory* (pp. 51–72). Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514442-005

Lu, W. (2016). Polysemy and the semantic-pragmatic interface: The case of *up* in a context-based model. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 13(4), 563–589. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2016-0024

Lu, W. (2017a). Metaphor, conceptual archetypes and subjectification: The case of COMPLETION IS UP and the polysemy of *shàng* in Chinese. In A. Athanasiadou (Ed.), *Studies in figurative thought and language* (pp. 231–249). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.56.09lu

Lu, W. (2017b). Perspectivization and contextualization in semantic analysis: A parsimonious polysemy approach to *in*. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 134, 247–264. https://doi.org/10.4467/20834624SL.17.017.7091

Lu, W. (2020). Viewpoint and subjective construal across languages: English inversion, associated strategies and their Chinese renditions in multiple parallel texts. *Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 7(2), 333–355. https://doi.org/10.1075/cogls.00060.lu

Lu, W., N. Kudrnáčová and L. A. Janda (Eds.). (2021). *Corpus approaches to language, thought and communication* [Benjamins Current Topics 119]. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.119

Lyons, J. (1982). Deixis and subjectivity. In R. J. Jarvella & W. Kleins (Eds.), *Speech, place and action: Studies in deixis and related topics* (pp. 101–24). Chichester; New York: John Willey.

Mandler, J. (1988). How to build a baby: On the development of an accessible representational system. *Cognitive Development* 3(2), 113–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2014(88)90015-9

Mandler, J. (1992). How to build a baby II: Conceptual primitives. *Psychological Review* 99(4), 587–604. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.587

Pustejovsky, J. (1991). *The generative lexicon: A theory of computational lexical semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Radden, G. (2000). How metonymic are metaphors. In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 93–108). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110894677.93

Rhee, S. (2000). Frame of focus in grammaticalization. *Discourse and Cognition* 7, 79–104.

Rudzka-Ostyn, B. (2003). *Word power: Phrasal verbs and compounds*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197235

Ruhl, C. (1989). *On monosemy: A study in linguistic semantics*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ruhl, C. (2002). Data, comprehensiveness, monosemy. In W. Reid, R. Otheguy & N. Stern (Eds.), *Signal, meaning and message* (pp. 171–89). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sfsl.48.11ruh

Sinclair, J. (2004). *Trust the text: Language, corpus and discourse*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203594070

Soon, S. & S. Chung. (2016). Locative particle 'shang' in Chinese. In F. A. Almeida, I. O. Barrera, E. Q. Toledo and M. S. Cuervo (Eds.), *Input a word, analyse the world: Selected approaches to corpus linguistics* (pp.171–182). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Smith, C. S. (1997). *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5606-6

Sperber, D. & D. Wilson. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stefanowitsch, A. (2003). Constructional semantics as a limit to grammatical alternation: The two genitives of English. In G. Rohdenburg & B. Mohndorf (Eds.), *Determinants of grammatical variation in English* (pp. 413–444). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gryuter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110900019.413

Stefanowitsch, A. & A. Rohde. (2004). The goal bias in the encoding of motion events. In K. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Motivation in grammar* (pp. 249–68). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gryuter.

Stefanowitsch, A. & S. Th. Gries. (2005). Covarying collexemes. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 1(1), 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt.2005.1.1.1

Su, C. (1997). *The semantic versatility of Mandarin morphemes* shang *and* xia: *A cognitive linguistic analysis*. M.A. Thesis, Providence University.

Su, L. I. (1998). Metaphor, metonymy, and lexical meaning. *National Taiwan University Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 49–73.

Talmy, L. (1985). Force Dynamics as a generalization over causative. In *Georgetown University Round Table on languages and linguistics* (pp. 67–85). Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Talmy, L. (1996). Fictive motion in language and 'ception'. In P. Bloom & M. Peterson (Eds.), *Language and space* (pp. 211–76). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Taylor, J. (2003a). Polysemy's paradoxes. *Language Sciences* 25(6), 637–655. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(03)00031-7

Taylor, J. (2003b). Category extension by metonymy and metaphor. In R. Dirven and R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 323–48). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gryuter.

Traugott, E. C. (1989). On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65(1), 31–55. https://doi.org/10.2307/414841

Traugott, E. C. (1995). Subjectification in grammaticalisation. In D. Stein and S. Wright (Eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation in language* (pp. 31–54). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511554469.003

Traugott, E. C. (2003). From subjectification to intersubjectification. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for language change* (pp. 124–39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486937.009

Tyler, A., & V. Evans. (2001). Reconsidering prepositional polysemy networks: The case of *over*. *Language* 77(4), 724–65. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2001.0250

Tyler, A., & V. Evans. (2003). *The semantics of English prepositions: Spatial scenes, embodied meaning and cognition*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486517

Vandeloise, C. (1991). *Spatial prepositions: A case study in French*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vandeloise, C. (1994). Methodology and analyses of the preposition *in*. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5(2), 157–184. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1994.5.2.157

Vendler, Z. (1957). Verbs and times. *The Philosophical Review* 66(2), 143–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2182371

Verhagen, A. (2012). Construal and stylistics – within a language, across contexts, across languages. In *Stylistics across disciplines* (Conference CD-ROM Proceedings). Leiden.

Wang, B. P.-Y., & L. I. Su (2015). On the principled polysemy of *–kai* in Chinese resultative verbs. *Chinese Language and Discourse* 6(1), 2–27. https://doi.org/10.1075/cld.6.1.01wan

Wilson, D. (2003). Relevance theory and lexical pragmatics. *Italian Journal of Linguistics/ Rivista di Linguistica* 15, 273–291.

Xiao, R. & T. McEnery. (2004). *Aspect in Mandarin Chinese: A corpus-based study*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.73