

1. Introduction

1.1 *Prepositional groups and their semantics*

1.1.1 The basic structure of prepositional groups

Before we consider the preposition מן (*min*) more specifically some remarks on the basic pattern of clauses containing a preposition are necessary. The considerations, however, will keep in mind that we are dealing with the semantics and the communicative functions of the preposition, not with all its syntactical issues.¹ We first take up the systematisation as established by E. Jenni.² Following his explanations, the basic pattern for prepositional expressions is:

$$X - r - Y$$

The letter “r” stands for “relation” expressed by a preposition, X and Y are the two correlatives. We can precise that r - Y is the prepositional group, formed by the preposition and a noun or pronoun, which may also be a nominalised infinitive. The correlative X, however, is much more variable:

Jg 13,2: “There was a man of Zorah” (וַיְהִי - מִצֹרַח) which functions like a nominal clause, וַיְהִי just indicating past tense.

Gn 2,9: “Yahweh God caused to grow from the soil every kind of tree”. In this case, the correlative X represents a whole verbal clause: וַיִּצְמַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים - מִן - הָאֲדָמָה; the correlative Y is formed by the prepositional group מִן - הָאֲדָמָה, placed between the first syntagm (the subject) and the second one (object).

To avoid incomprehensible or senseless clauses both correlatives, X and Y, should not be identical: * “Yahweh God caused to grow from the soil every kind of soil”. On the other hand, they should not be completely different either: * “There was a tree of Zorah”. To obtain well-shaped sentences, indispensably, the correlatives must have at least one semantic feature in common, at least one must be different.³

Furthermore, it is necessary to take into consideration both correlatives (the syntagmatic relation or word combination).⁴ If we compare our example Gn 2,9 (“Yahweh God caused to grow from the soil every kind of tree”) with 2,7

¹ For this reason we will not outline the very interesting approach by R. W. LANGACKER 2008, 117, 122, 420. He shows that prepositions and prepositional groups can have adverbial uses specifying a verbal clause: “Escape from Babylon”, Jr 51,6 (נוס מן), the prepositional group specifies the verb in an adverbial sense. Conversely, adverbs and connecting particles may function like prepositions.

² Cf. E. JENNI 1992, 11–39.

³ E. JENNI 1992, 16.

⁴ Cf. St. L. SHEAD 2011, 22.

(“Yahweh God shaped man – (as) soil of the ground”), we notice that the Y correlative both times has an identical wording: מִן־הָאֲדָמָה. The prepositional group, however, has to be noted in two different categories. In Gn 2,7 the ground represents the material from which man is taken and shaped. Here, we have to do with a realisation marked by the preposition מִן; the ground is, so to speak, the resource of God’s shaping man. The difference to Gn 2,9 is obvious because in this sentence, the Y correlative designs the local origin and the carrier of the trees.

On the other hand, the ground/ soil is well distinguished from a city or village. The מִן־הָאֲדָמָה marks a space in a general sense, not a locality that can be described geographically. In both cases, Gn 2,7,9, the expression מִן־הָאֲדָמָה represents already a transfer of the original local meaning and function of the preposition מִן. We will explain the transfers further down.

1.1.2 The preposition מִן and its meaning compared to the Hebrew basic prepositions

We can assume that the prepositions represent paradigmatic sense relations. This means that everyone of them has a meaning and function that cannot be replaced by another because “a different choice at a particular point would alter the meaning of the sentence”.⁵ The basic prepositions as expressions of the most general relations between the correlatives are complementary to each other: a choice is made which relation is aimed, the relations are not interchangeable. On the other hand, there must be a relation; it is not possible that any relation between them would be absent.⁶

In this system, the prepositions כּ and ל mark the difference between unitive and diversive relations: the preposition כּ identifies the two correlatives X and Y as regarding to place, time, action or function, according to the particular issue of the clause. The preposition ל, despite the relation it establishes between X and Y, maintains the difference between both: giver and recipient, material and product, person and social role, to name only a few examples.⁷ Thus, the three prepositions כּ, כ and ל have the most general meanings that express identity, partial identity and difference between the correlatives. On the background of this system, מִן represents a preposition of higher specialisation introducing a

⁵ St. L. SHEAD 2011, 15. There are slight exceptions in Hebrew: אִתּוֹ and עִמּוֹ meaning “with” with minor differences; the same is true for אֲרָא and עַד meaning “until”.

⁶ Cf. E. JENNI 1992, 30–31.

⁷ E. JENNI 1992, 30–31 with the complete list of semantic areas. The preposition כּ expresses a partial identity, respectively a partial dissimilarity, cf. E. JENNI 1992, 37–39 and E. JENNI 1994, 11–12.

directional axis that indicates a separation of X from Y.⁸ However, this classification has to be specified. As we will see below, there are a couple of interchanges between מִן and ב and ל , even in Biblical Hebrew, ב and ל also expressing distinction/separation. This use of the prepositions shows analogies to the Ugaitic system which did not know a preposition similar to מִן .

If originally the meaning and function of מִן was neutralised by northwest-semitic *b* and *l* (for Eblaite *mi-nu* see 1.2.1), then our preposition, as a new element, has to be defined in contrast with *b* and *l* and is, so to speak, the “cancellation” or, better, the overstepping of their functions in a given clause and the reaching of a new level. Defining מִן as preposition that expresses a directional axis would not be sufficient, although it is an important function of it.⁹ Rather, מִן expresses what distinguishes X from Y, insofar one is the origin or base of the other. Thus, two correlatives that, in another context, are equalised (“A man in Zorah”) are now distinguished from each other: “A man from Zorah” designating his origin, regardless if, at this moment, he is in Zorah or elsewhere. While with the preposition ל material becomes a product (Ex 7,15: “... the staff that turned into a snake”, לְנֶחָשׁ), with מִן the product comes from a material, totally or partially: Gn 2,7: “Yahweh God shaped man – (as) soil of the ground”. It is this changing of perspective that marks up our preposition. It looks, so to speak, backwards to the starting point or base from which something originates and is distinguished. However, the perspective backwards cannot be localised on a directional axis exclusively and is even not the only direction מִן is pointing to. The comparative sense (e. g. Pr 15,16: “Better to have little ... than immense wealth”, $\text{מִן} \dots \text{טוֹב}$) has to be explained by a meaning like “X is good (gradually distinguished) from Y”. We may note that the comparative sentence contrasts with the comparison expressed by כ : Pr 15,19 “The way of the lazy is like a thorny hedge”, מִן reversing the comparison and partial identity for the purpose to emphasize the difference. In Gn 27,1 we would expect ל rather than מִן : “his eyes were so weak that he could no longer see”, מִן־אֵת . In cases like this, the meaning is “without” or the function is negation,¹⁰ difficult to explain as a directional

⁸ Cf. E. JENNI 1992, 18. In the terminology of R. W. LANGACKER 2008, 117–118 we may speak on a complex path preposition in contrast to the simplex local prepositions.

⁹ L. LEMMER 2014, 63, 74 and 2017, 222 argues for a “proto-scene” of the preposition indicating a double primary sense: the source of a motion and the separation of X from Y. Although the concepts are close to each other we prefer to speak on conceptualisation instead on prototypes, see 1.2.3. Introduction to and critique of the theory of semantic prototypes: D. BUSSE 2009, 50–57; J. PAFEL, I. REICH 2016, 59–63.

¹⁰ Cf. E. JENNI 2007, 432: “eine separative, exkludierende oder eine Unmöglichkeit anzeigende Anwendung”. Jenni sees here, like in Ex 18,18, the transition from *min comparativum* to *min separativum* indicating an indirect comparison.

axis.¹¹ For this reason, it is preferable to interpret מִן as a preposition that marks the distinction between X and the origin or base Y which passes into static or directional meaning (in this latter case we may speak about a starting point).¹²

“Distinction” implies, as showed above, that equalisation, comparison or relation between X and Y are possible as well. So, not their inherent difference is noticed, but the base and origin reference between each other and the distance that results because X detaches or is detached from Y. Especially in non-privative contexts, the relation between both may continue to exist, so in 1 K 1,27: “If this order proceeded from my lord, the king ...”. Without a continued existence of relation between the order and the king Nathan’s speech would be senseless. The point is, however, that the order is represented having left the king (its origin) to achieve some purpose. The fact that מִן expresses distinction and distance from a base or starting point raises it, for a subset of its uses, to a different, vertical, level than the basic horizontal prepositions ב , כ and ל and makes מִן a three-dimensional preposition. The coming up of three-dimensional מִן in Hebrew transforms ב , כ and ל into horizontal prepositions, whereas Ugaritic *b* and *l* absorbed a broader, multidimensional spectrum. We may find here the explanation of its neutralisation by *b* and *l*, and of the cases of interchangeability, described above (see 1.2.1).¹³

Because of this double level, מִן does not belong to the basic prepositions. “Distinction” and “base/ origin reference” as path is more specific than the basic relations expressed by ב , כ and ל , we may call it a relation of middle semantic

¹¹ E. JENNI 1997a, 100–101 denies (against E. VOGT 1967) a static basic meaning of the preposition מִן arguing that, because of the frequent double formula “from ... to”, the basic meaning and function was directional and that a static meaning only rises if the preceding verb or noun contains already a static element. It is, however, difficult to assume this directional basic meaning if a non-directional meaning can be found inside the different categories of the polysemious preposition, even the local one. It seems that there is no static nor directional basic meaning of the preposition, but rather an even more basic meaning of distinction. If, at the next level, the preposition has a static or directional meaning depends on the cognitive concept of the speaker (cf. J. PAFEL, I. REICH 2016, 248 citing R. Jackendoff, and chapter 1.2.2). The controversy of Jenni and Vogt gets invalid.

¹² This means that מִן does not lose 500 times its separative meaning to accept a local one if connected with one of 40 words that express an orientation in space, as E. JENNI 2004–2007, 96–97 had argued. The difference between מִן and תַּחַת is that the latter precedes the correlative Y that, in a given moment, is over a local base, while the base X precedes the prepositional expression (r – Y). The meaning “under” or “instead of” is constitutive for תַּחַת . מִן precedes a base Y, from which X is distinct in different ways (also temporal and causal); the spatial orientation of “under” is only one of numerous possibilities and is not specific at all to מִן .

¹³ The system of Ugaritic prepositions does not know *min* and *ʿil*, but it knows *ʿad* and *ʿal*.

specialisation. The converse equivalents¹⁴ are לָרָם (three-dimensional) and דָּרָם (one-dimensional and temporal, including the goal).¹⁵

We may here make some comments on the book “The Development of Biblical Hebrew Prepositions” by H. H. Hardy II, published in 2022. The author does not deal with the basic prepositions of one or two radicals. The reason for this is that “they do not provide language-internal evidence of their source” and that because of this “a complete pathway of change cannot be definitively reckoned”.¹⁶ The author does research on the nouns of local orientation (e. g. דָּרָם), called by him “Simple Prepositions”, and the “Multi-Word Prepositions” like מִן־מִפְּנֵי. From this it appears that the fundamental system of Hebrew prepositions is not subject of the study and that the relations between these basic prepositions do not become clear.¹⁷ Instead, Hardy describes the morphosyntax and the usage of the lexemes and tries to conclude in the chapter “Grammaticalization” from the syntactic structure and the functions of the lexemes (such as “noun”, “preposition” or “adverb” of different kind) to the successive historical linguistic development of the use of the words.¹⁸ This method, however, seems highly speculative and in the end short-circuited. The texts cannot produce evidence of this assumed development; the different syntactic and functional uses possibly emerged simultaneously simply because of simultaneously practical needs: language must be able to express a lot of different facts that constitute the own world. Although it must be admitted that the lexemes under discussion initially denoted parts of the body or localisations, it is hardly possible to trace such a detailed development of prepositions and adverbs after the detachment from the local primary meaning as Hardy does.

If we transfer this approach to our topic, this procedure could not explain that the privative category is strongly differentiated and by far the most extensive of all the categories of the preposition מִן throughout all stages of biblical

¹⁴ “Converse” means: “X over Y” = “Y under X”, but “X not over Y” is not necessarily “X under Y”. Similarly, “X before Y” = “Y behind/ after X”, but “X not before Y” is not necessarily “X behind/ after Y”, cf. E. JENNI 1992, 30–31.

¹⁵ Cf. the grid in E. JENNI 1992, 18–19.

¹⁶ H. H. HARDY 2022. 37.

¹⁷ The three volumes by E. JENNI 1992–2000 are mentioned on three lines (213) as limited “to synchronic connections without reference to diachronic and typological developments”. HARDY does not realise that JENNI could show that the local-terminative use of ל is not the basic meaning, but a secondary development under aramaic influence (E. JENNI 1992, 21–24). As far as HARDY’s book is concerned, it must be said that to attempt to present the development of Hebrew prepositions in 200 pages is in itself an ambitious undertaking.

¹⁸ Cf. H. H. HARDY 2022, 50–51 for אַחֲרַיִם: “the noun first developed into the locative preposition (BEHIND) which further was used as the ACCORDANTIVE, COMITATIVE and TEMPORAL/ADVERBIALIZER (AFTER). The CONJUNCTIVE ADVERB (THEN) likely developed from the temporal function of the preposition phrase.”

Hebrew. As deontic application dealing with a separation which should or must happen, the privative use should be the last step of successive semantic development of our preposition, whereas the local category should be at the beginning of the use of the preposition and should tend to be more strongly represented in the early layers than the deontic variant. The local nouns functioning as adverbial terms of orientation (2.19) should show a similar tendency compared to the “normal” use of ל in the context of belonging or designing the starting point of movements, what is not the case. Furthermore, Hardy seems to be unaware of back developments, which do exist. In Hebrew Sira, the combinations of prepositions that are so characteristic of Biblical Hebrew are very rare, due to Aramaic influence. It is very probable that the use of words does not function this way, the transfers and different uses of polysemious words, and *a fortiori* prepositions, was developed long before language was written. Furthermore, syntactic developments (in the broad sense), if they can be proven, do not prove semantic or pragmatic ones, the pragmatic diversity of the use of words may come up much earlier than the corresponding developing of different forms at the grammatical level.

1.2 *The preposition ל*

1.2.1 Notes on the linguistic history, etymology and morphology of the preposition ל

It seems very likely that in the Ugaritic language the preposition *mn* never existed. If, as J. Tropper suggests, the Ugaritic locative also functioned as an “ablative” this locative was able to express the relationship of separation. Furthermore, the Ugaritic prepositions *b* and *l* which were not fixed at any directional sense could function as prepositions of separation.¹⁹ Several studies dealt with the question. In 1976, D. G. Pardee in his doctoral thesis “The Preposition in Ugaritic”, resumed that “The preposition *b* basically indicates position ‘within the confines of’; in translation it appears most frequently as ‘in’, ‘on’, ‘from’, and ‘into’, depending on the nature of the verb and the author’s perspective.” The position ‘from which’ appears also as partitive *b*, that’s to say with the meaning ‘one/ some of’.²⁰ The Ugaritic preposition *l* may be combined with “Entfernungsverben”, transitive or intransitive ones; in this case it means “from”.²¹

¹⁹ J. TROPPER 2012, 762–763 (§ 82.22.).

²⁰ D. G. PARDEE 1976, 312. About *mn*, attested once only, see 315–316.

²¹ K. AARTUN 1978, 40–41.

As for Biblical Hebrew, G. Schmuttermayr as one of the first authors²² proved the changing of מן and ל, respectively ל and מן in several texts, so with regard to parallel text traditions as to verbs using both prepositions. According to him, there may be a choice of ambivalence or difference of aspect (Aspekt-differenz) that leads to the phenomenon that מן and ל can mean ‘in’ respectively ‘to’ and ‘from’.²³ The opposite, suggested by him, that in 2 S 5,13a; 13,34; Pr 20,4; 2 Ch 15,8bR מן should be ל meaning “in”, can be disproved. The polysemious character of the preposition מן is not taken sufficiently into consideration (cf. the analysis of every instance).

While the Ugaritic language does not provide the preposition *mn*, texts from Ebla seem to contain it in the form of *mi-nu/ me-nu*. Against the interpretation as a preposition, the derivation from the Akkadian *mīnu* “what” or “why” was proposed, as an alternative explanation the parallelisation with the allquantifying expression *mīnummê* “all”, “whatsoever” was mentioned either. But there seems to be evidence that Eblaite *mi-nu* in fact functions as a preposition with separative sense meaning “from”.²⁴ In this case, the linguistic history shows itself not being consistent: northwest-semitic *mi-nu* which didn’t exist in Akkadian, was not transferred from Ebla to Ugarit, but reappeared in Hebrew and Aramaic, having been completely integrated in the system of northwest-semitic languages only after the language of Ugarit.²⁵

As to the etymology of *mn*, therefore the evidence is not very rich. As far as the archaic south-arabic language of Sabaic is concerned, “only in texts with Hiram as known or probable provenance” a preposition *mn* shows up.²⁶ The usual wording is *bn* bearing the meaning “‘from, away from’, locally and temporally”,²⁷ whereas Sabaic *b* functions as its Hebrew equivalent does.²⁸

²² Twelve years earlier than Schmuttermayr, N. M. SARNA 1959 described the same phenomenon in a short article.

²³ G. SCHMUTTERMAYR 1971, 40–51. “Aspekt-differenz” means that the point of view may be different in the case of speaker (writer) and the viewer. The first sees the point of departure of a movement, the latter the direction from where the movement comes to him.

²⁴ Examples are given by J. KRECHER 1984, M. BALDACCİ 1985a and 1985b. Baldacci claims a second meaning for *mi-nu* referring to “spettanza” or “property, dues”, thus bringing to mind the Akkadian word *manû*, Ugaritic *MNY* or Hebrew מנה. M. BALDACCİ 1985b, 107–108 also claims a temporal-causal meaning of *mi-nu* “in occasione di, per”.

²⁵ Cf. E. JENNI 1992, 11, fn. 5.

²⁶ A. F. L. BEESTON et al. 1982, 86.

²⁷ A. F. L. BEESTON 1984, 55–56 (§ 34:4).

²⁸ A. F. L. BEESTON et al. 1982, 24.

If *b* and *mn* etymologically originate from hamitosemitic **mb*, a specific preposition *mn* would be a secondary differentiation to compensate the neutralisation.²⁹ We may mention in passing that prepositions constitute a grammatical category on their own, realising the same function as case-inflections do in other languages.³⁰ As case-inflections are not nouns and because of the etymological reasons we mentioned above it is today untenable to explain מן as a noun or verbal noun. It is not the biliteral root of מןן either meaning “separation” or something similar.³¹

On the assumption that the preposition is *mn*, Hebrew מן, the assimilation of the *n* to the following consonant by gemination is easy to explain, with a guttural virtual gemination takes place or, as it occurs normally, compensatory lengthening (Ersatzdehnung): the *i*-vocalisation becomes \bar{e} . This is the case in more than 95% of the occurrences in the Hebrew biblical texts. It is noteworthy that these phenomena almost do not exist in Aramaic.³² It can, however, not be claimed that unassimilated constructions generally indicate a late stage of Hebrew language: late books use the assimilated forms, the Hebrew portions of Ezra exclusively, Esther only knows the assimilation.³³ Rather, Aramaic influence may be claimed, not directly connected with the question of late Hebrew. Further evidence comes from mixed cases containing a kind of contamination: Lv 1,14; 14,30a; Jos 11,21; Jg 7,23; 10,11 These occurrences contain the regular cases of unassimilated constructions before the article and unassimilated forms without article where one would expect assimilation. It is probable that the regular unassimilated forms influenced the “irregular” ones, and that we can assume Aramaisms, eventually bilingual scribes.³⁴

Gemination and compensatory lengthening also occur with the heavy plural-suffixes: מְקַם, מְקָהּ.³⁵ An open question is the extension with the light singular-

²⁹ Cf. J. TROPPER 2012, 763 (§ 82.22.) who refers himself to A. FABER 1980, 107–110. There is, however, no proof of a mono-consonantal preposition *m* in Hebrew, as E. HABER 2009, 29 suggests. It seems that the *n*-extension belongs to the preposition from its very beginning on.

³⁰ Cf. J. LYONS 1971, 302.

³¹ This theory was proposed by N. ZERWECK 1893, 3–6.

³² The nine exceptions are: Jr 10,11; Dn 2,45; 4,22d.30d; 5,21e; 6,5; Ezr 5,11; 6,8c.14 (the unassimilated form occurs 82 times), occurrences listed in V. OLIVERO 2022, 94.

³³ Cf. R. REZETKO 2003, 230–231 (with further proofs, especially for Chronicles who contain 272 assimilated and 54 unassimilated constructions, mostly if preceding בּי, so that phonological issues may be important) and I. YOUNG 2003, 289.

³⁴ The occurrences are listed and analysed by V. OLIVERO 2022, 99–101 who rightly claims Aramaic influence.

³⁵ P. JOÜON, T. MURAOKA 2008, 314 (§ 103 h).

suffixes, so מִמִּי and מִמֶּנּוּ. Grammarians explain the phenomenon by reduplication (*minmin* > *mimmin*)³⁶ or by *mim-man*³⁷ without giving the reason for it. A possible explanation may be that an old extension *-man*³⁸ was used to avoid an identical expression מִי which is a poetic form of the simple preposition, but could be taken as מן with the suffix of the first person singular. The same extension, then, was applied to the second and third person. It might be possible that the preposition (not noun) possesses a longer alloform like מִנָּן which appears by reduplication.³⁹

1.2.2 A draft of the uses of the preposition מן – polysemy and the deontic dimension

In 1.1.2, the basic meaning of מן was identified as that of distinction in the sense of a reference to an origin, a base or starting point between X and Y, i. e. one is the base of the other, from which it is distinguished or detaches and that defines their difference. The approach we will follow is that of polysemy: a polysemic lexical item has both a central or primary functional sense and a network of distinct, though related, meanings. A single meaning is not assumed, the distinct meanings should be derived from the primary functional sense in a motivated way that is not to be mistaken for a comprehensible successive historical development.⁴⁰ The different meanings of polysemic מן will be presented below. The representation of the distinct meanings is organised by transfers of growing abstraction from the basic local meaning. The growing degree of abstraction then leads to the division of the non-deontic and deontic character of the transfers (1.2.2.1).

It is noteworthy that we focus on the semantics of sentences defined by the presence of one predicate, not of verses or complete texts. The reason for this is quite obvious: prepositions are particles that are repeated very often,⁴¹ they may even appear more than once in one and the same sentence. As they express the

³⁶ P. JOÜON, T. MURAOKA 2008, 314 (§ 103 h).

³⁷ R. MEYER 1992, 298 (§ 87.3).

³⁸ K. AARTUN 1978, 26: “hervorhebende Partikel” in Ugaritic *k + w* and *k + m*, *k + m + t*. Cf. also E. JENNI 1994, 15.

³⁹ Cf. E. JENNI 2013, 208–209; Jenni gives another example of this phenomenon: מִיָּעִי (with me).

⁴⁰ A good overview is given by L. LEMMER 2014, 45–52. The dissertation by N. ZERWECK 1893 knows only the categories of local, temporal and partitive meanings. The privative function is part of the local category that he splits up in that of belonging, origin and realisation (“von ... her”) and in that of privative use (“von ... weg”), the latter even containing the comparative function of the preposition. It is obvious that the progresses in linguistics and semantics of the last 130 years demand another approach to the issue.

⁴¹ E. JENNI 1997b, 175: The Hebrew prepositions are “eine kleine, sympathische Gruppe von Relationswörtern, die 60000mal im Alten Testament ihren Dienst tun, ...”

relation X – r – Y which might be followed in the next clause by another relation of the same structure, or be preceded by such a relation the focus on sentences is advisable. For this reason, frame semantics which deals with more or less large concepts embedding a concrete term are too wide-ranging.⁴² Nevertheless, conceptualisations are inevitably involved as it appears from the transfer scheme below. For our purpose, we will apply a simplified and modified version of so called Cognitive Semantics as outlined mainly by Ronald W. Langacker from the beginning of the 21st century on.⁴³ The basic assumption is that “meaning” is not limited to the propositional content of a sentence, but always has to do with our general knowledge of the world that forms the context of our language and communication, which means that both speakers and hearers with their respective knowledge are involved. The human cognition forms out concepts, so that “meaning is identified with *conceptualisation*, broadly defined as encompassing any kind of mental experience”.⁴⁴

Among the conceptualisations, image schemes are of special relevance, “described as schematised patterns of activity abstracted from everyday bodily experience, especially pertaining to vision, space, motion, and force”.⁴⁵ One important notion of image schemes are “highly schematic configurational concepts, e. g. contrast, boundary, change, continuity, contact, inclusion, separation, proximity, multiplicity, group, and point vs. extension.”⁴⁶ It is obvious that prepositions are an important element of the verbal expression of these configurational concepts. The most concrete embodiment and realisation of a concept is the spatial one.⁴⁷ We can refer to Langacker’s terminology using the terms trajector (X in our scheme) and landmark (Y).⁴⁸ Thus, the spatial and most concrete image scheme of our preposition is that of local separation with reference to the origin; the functional complexity of any preposition, however, generates a higher level of its conceptual organisation that goes beyond the local separation

⁴² For an introduction to frame semantics cf. S. LÖBNER 2015, 368–375. His example is the frame of passports embedding attributes as “name”, “place of birth” etc. For our purpose it is not relevant if a sentence like “born at X” is part of a passport frame or a mythological frame talking about the birth of a goddess. What is decisive here is the local meaning of the preposition and the nature of the place (a city, heavens etc).

⁴³ For an introduction cf. R. W. LANGACKER 2003, 182–184 and J. PAFEL, I. REICH 2016, 245–250.

⁴⁴ R. W. LANGACKER 2007, 431 (emphasis by the author).

⁴⁵ R. W. LANGACKER 2008, 32.

⁴⁶ R. W. LANGACKER 2008, 33.

⁴⁷ Cf. also J. PAFEL, I. REICH 2016, 181, 248–250 and the authors they are referring to (E. LANG, R. JACKENDOFF). In the case of prepositions, they establish with E. LANG the “two-level-approach” which contains the logical-semantic structure and the cognitive level of linguistic phenomena, the last denoting our cognitive imagery of spaces and spatial objects.

⁴⁸ R. W. LANGACKER 2003, 190 and R. W. LANGACKER 2008, 71–73, adopted by L. LEMMER.