Metonymical object changes: a corpus-oriented study on Dutch and German
Sweep, J.

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................................................. v

TYPOGRAPHICAL CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS ...................... xiii

I.  AIM OF RESEARCH AND STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK .............. 1
   1. Topic of the dissertation ..................................................................................... 1
   2. Different theoretical approaches ..................................................................... 2
   3. The need for Dutch and German corpus data ................................................. 4
   4. Dissertation outline ......................................................................................... 4

II. DEFINING METONYMY IN LINGUISTICS ................................. 7
   1. Metonymy: Merely a literary phenomenon? ................................................. 7
   2. Metonymy as a conceptual mechanism ........................................................ 8
   3. Contiguity relations and frames ...................................................................... 12
   4. Linguistic effects of metonymy on content and on form ................................ 16
   5. The onomasiological side of metonymical shifts .......................................... 18
   6. Reasons for using metonymical expressions ............................................. 22
   7. Defining metonymy as a twofold highlighting effect .................................... 24

III. TYPES OF METONYMY UNRAVELLED .............................. 29
   1. Reflections of metonymy and the direct object ............................................ 29
   2. Lexical, semantic or pragmatic interpretational effects ................................. 30
      2.1 Lexicalised metonymies and occasional referent-oriented ones ................... 30
      2.2 Metonymy: Semantic change, polysemy or other lexicalisations ................. 32
      2.3 Metonymy and the spectrum of lexical ambiguities .................................. 36
      2.4 Metonymical re-interpretations on a pragmatic level .................................. 39
   3. The complex relation of metonymy and grammar ........................................ 41
      3.1 Grammatical effects or grammatical metonymies? ....................................... 41
      3.2 Metonymy and morphological conversions ............................................. 45
      3.3 Grammar reflecting meaning: Determiners with proper nouns .................... 47
   4. Metonymical re-interpretations revised ......................................................... 52
      4.1 Referent transfers or sense transfers? ......................................................... 52
      4.2 Solving the puzzle of predicatively used metonymies ................................. 54
      4.3 Double possible analyses and strange cross-linguistic differences ............. 57
      4.4 Anaphor agreement in Dutch, English and German ................................... 60
      4.5 What does co-predication actually test? ..................................................... 64
      4.6 Metonymical transfers of anaphors ......................................................... 66
      4.7 Metonymical nouns, anaphors and real verbal sense transfers ....................... 71
   5. Syntax-semantics interface: Predicative metonymy ..................................... 72
VI. METONYMY AND DUTCH AND GERMAN LEXICOGRAPHY ..........89
1. Metonymy and lexicography .................................................................89
2. Metonymy in Dutch and German dictionaries .....................................89
   2.1 Metonymically tagged examples in Dutch and German dictionaries ...89
   2.2 The spectrum of metonymies reflected in dictionaries ......................96
3. A dictionary-based description of MOCs as predicative metonymies ....98
   3.1 Object changes and subject changes as instances of metonymy ..........98
   3.2 The difference between nominal metonymy and object change ........101
   3.3 The continuum between nominal metonymy and object change .....103
4. MOC, verb meaning and dictionaries ..................................................105
   4.1 MOCs and verb meaning: P-meaning vs. L-meaning ......................105
   4.2 Polysemy tests ................................................................................110
   4.3 Meaning descriptions in dictionaries ..............................................113
5. The metonymy-sensitivity of the direct object .....................................117
   5.1 Theoretical exploration of the significance of the DO ......................117
   5.2 Corroboration by dictionaries for the primacy of the DO ...............118
6. Dictionaries reflecting linguistic insights ............................................120

V. METONYMICAL OBJECT CHANGES (MOCs)..............................123
1. Finding data on Metonymical Object Changes (MOCs) ......................123
2. Searching for MOCs in dictionaries ....................................................124
3. Demarcating the data: MOC, verb polysemy, valency reduction ..........126
4. Improving the set of examples of MOC ................................................132
5. Presenting the data: Verbs and contiguity types ..................................134
6. Verbs allowing MOCs ........................................................................135
   6.1 Types of verbs ..............................................................................135
   6.2 Levin’s alternations and MOCs .....................................................137
   6.3 Simplex verbs and complex verbs .................................................141
   6.4 Prefixes, particles, prepositions and small clauses .........................145
   6.5 Particle verbs and the relation between both possible objects ........156
7. Metonymical Object Changes: Contiguity types .................................160
   7.1 Problems with a division into verb classes ....................................160
   7.2 Metonymical chains .....................................................................165
   7.3 Contiguity types and MOCs .........................................................168
   7.4 Additional examples of MOCs with EVENT-PARTICIPANT shifts ....176
8. Summary: Verbs and their shifted objects ..........................................178
VI. NON-EVENTIVE MOCs IN DUTCH AND GERMAN ........................ 181
1. Non-eventive MOCs ............................................................................................................. 181
2. Transitive locative alternations: Comparing sentences ................................................. 182
   2.1 Primarily shifting the direct object .................................................................................. 182
   2.2 Crosslinguistic differences in the analysis and usage of PPs ....................................... 186
   2.3 Morphological marking in Dutch and German? ............................................................ 193
   2.4 Concluding remarks: Comparing the right sentences ................................................ 199
3. Metonymy as the mechanism underlying object changes ............................................. 200
4. Some characteristics and constraints of MOC .............................................................. 207
   4.1 Crosslinguistic differences: to fill / vullen / füllen and related particle verbs .......... 207
   4.2 Verbs involving more than one container, such as to pour ....................................... 217
   4.3 Avoidance of ambiguity-of-DO-type: ‘to clear’, ‘to load’ and ‘to pack’ ...................... 223
   4.4 Metonymy types and their continuum: smeren / schmieren and ‘to squeeze’ .......... 230
5. Conclusions ....................................................................................................................... 234

VII. EVENTIVE MOCs OR LM IN DUTCH AND GERMAN .................... 237
1. Logical metonymy (LM) ..................................................................................................... 237
2. The usefulness of corpus samples .................................................................................... 239
3. LM with Dutch and German translations of ‘to begin’ ................................................... 244
   3.1 Direct objects and prepositional objects ................................................................. 244
   3.2 LM and prepositional objects with Dutch beginnen ............................................. 246
   3.3 Dutch beginnen met and logical metonymy ............................................................ 249
   3.4 Dutch beginnen aan and logical metonymy ............................................................ 251
   3.5 LM in POs with German beginnen and anfangen ................................................. 255
   3.6 LM with beginnen\(^D\) and with beginnen\(^G\) and anfangen\(^G\) ......................... 256
4. Logical metonymy with translations of ‘to finish’ / ‘to complete’ ................................. 257
   4.1 Cross-linguistic differences in expressing ‘to finish something’ .............................. 257
   4.2 LM with German beenden and Dutch beëindigen ................................................. 261
   4.3 The use of LM in Dutch with eindigen and eindigen met ....................................... 263
   4.4 The use of LM with beëindigen/eindigen and with beendigen/enden .................... 263
5. Genieten van’ and genießen’ combined with concrete things ......................................... 264
6. Dictionary information .................................................................................................... 266
   6.1 Lexicographical relevance ....................................................................................... 266
   6.2 Information in Dutch dictionaries ............................................................................ 268
   6.3 Information in German dictionaries ......................................................................... 270
   6.4 Logical metonymy and Dutch and German dictionaries .......................................... 271
7. Conclusions ....................................................................................................................... 272

VIII. AN IMPLEMENTATION INTO FRAME SEMANTICS ..................... 277
1. Waltereit’s analysis of Metonymical Object Changes ................................................... 277
2. Frames, Frame Semantics & FrameNet ......................................................................... 280
3. MOCs based on spatial and causal gestalts ................................................................. 283