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V. METONYMICAL OBJECT CHANGES (MOCS)

1. Finding data on Metonymical Object Changes (MOCs)

As insights into metonymy increased, linguists recognised the huge influence metonymy has on language. As I pointed out in chapter III, more and more phenomena are analysed as involving metonymy. This simultaneously caused linguists to become aware of the problem of finding real metonymical data (cf. e.g. Stefanowitsch & Gries 2006).

Mostly, dictionaries are not taken into account as sources for instances of metonymy. In the previous chapter I clarified that the use of dictionaries in metonymy research can be fruitful: I showed that some Dutch and German dictionaries reflect linguistic insights on metonymy and are useful resources, in which a lot of linguistic material has explicitly been tagged as metonymical.120 Dictionaries can therefore be used as a kind of linguistically tagged collection of data, i.e. a kind of corpus tagged with lexicographic labels (cf. Hoeksema 2011; Moerdijk 2008a: 151). On the basis of their explicit metonymy tags, a basic material set for further linguistic research can be extracted from them. This set can be extended and used for further quantitative and qualitative corpus analyses.

In this chapter, I will discuss how a set of Dutch and German examples of predicative metonymy in the direct object (MOCs) can be collected on the basis of information found in dictionaries. The chapter is organised as follows. Section 2 will explain how verbs were extracted from Adelung, the DWB, Van Dale 2005 and the WNT. Sections 3 and 4 will discuss which verbs should be dropped from this dictionary set and which verbs can be added to it.

Sections 5-7 will present the examples of MOC in more detail. Section 5 will show that MOCs can be presented in two different ways: On the basis of the types of verbs, as will be illustrated in further detail in section 6, and on the basis of the relevant contiguity types, as will be set out in section 7. In these two sections, the relationship of these data classifications with linguistic literature will also be discussed: The types of verbs found will be compared with Levin’s alternations (1993) and the classification of contiguity types will be discussed in relation to existing studies on contiguity, especially in relation to studies by Blank (1999) and by Peirsman and Geeraerts (2006). In addition, I will discuss some studies on logical metonymy, on the basis of which more verbs that allow shifts between concrete objects and events can be found. This will bring me to my conclusions in section 8.

---

120 Of course linguists make use of dictionaries for their metonymy research (cf. e.g. Waltereit 1998; Stoeva-Holm 2010), but, as far as I know, not on the basis of lexicographic metonymy-tags.
2. Searching for MOCs in dictionaries

Adelung’s dictionary is a good starting point for gathering data, because of the consistent use of the tag “metonymisch” for Metonymical Object Changes (MOCs) (cf. previous chapter). A search with the term “metonymisch” results in a collection of 101 verbs (109 different shifts) which allow MOC (cf. the appendix). In addition, there is one fixed shifted combination (Ader lassen, ‘to let blood’, lit.: “to let vein”). Four more verbs are incorporated in the entry for the particle ab (cf. chapter IV, §4.3). During this search, I discovered that Adelung uses the phrase “auf solche Art” (‘in a similar way’/’in such a way’) for highly similar cases. Therefore, verbs with this tag in their meaning description (106 in total) were also analysed, which resulted in 32 more MOCs.

Carlberg states that Adelung uses “metonymisch” as well as “figürlich” (‘figuratively’) to label MOCs (Carlberg 1948: 12). Carlberg illustrates this with the verb packen (‘to pack’), which cannot only be used with objects such as clothing, books, goods, etc., but also ‘figuratively’ with containers, such as boxes or suitcases (cf. http://lexika.digitale-sammlungen.de/adelung/lemma/bsb00009133_4_0_38, May 2010). A search for the word figürlich, however, gives more than 3300 hits. The new online search interface prevents one from extracting all the dictionary entries. A search in each separate volume of the dictionary still gives too many hits in all parts of speech to display them all (Band 1: >1000; Band 2: 896; Band 3: 700; Band 4: 746).

In addition to this practical search problem, it turned out that “figürlich” is only sporadically used for MOCs: An analysis of a sample of more than 300 verbs, only revealed 9 instances of MOCs (i.e. abschalen ‘to flay / to decorticate’, drehen ‘to turn / to create by turning’, einschenken ‘to pour out’, fischen ‘to fish’, gießen ‘to cast / to mould’, graben ‘to dig’, heilen ‘to heal’, lesen ‘to gather / to pick’, lodern ‘to set alight’). Some of these examples are obsolete and furthermore, these examples, or very similar ones, had already been found in other Dutch and German material or on the basis of other queries. The verbs gießen (‘to pour’), lesen (‘to gather’/’to pick’) and packen (‘to pack’) are, for instance, also tagged with “auf solche Art”. For all these reasons, I have not considered Adelung’s entries labelled “figürlich” any further.

The verbs found in Adelung’s dictionary were supplemented by a number of verbs from the DWB. Only eleven relevant MOCs were found. Ten of these were not found in Adelung’s dictionary. Three examples (gichten, in the meaning of ‘to heal’, träufen ‘to drip’, treiben, in the meaning of ‘to drive’ and of ‘to let pay’) are

---

121 The same consistent use of the label meton can be found in Sanders’ dictionary (cf. also Carlberg 1948: 15-16). Unfortunately, this dictionary is not available in a digital version. Only the first half of the second volume is accessible for a digital search (via Google-books), which reveals examples, such as einlegen (‘inlay’/‘encrust’), löschen (in the meaning ‘wipe’), mischen (‘mix’).

122 These are all 196 verbs from Band 2 and 120 verbs from Band 1. The examples from the first volume were extracted by means of the old search interface.

123 The CD-ROM published by Zweitausendeins allows a full text search.
tagged by Grimm as object change (“Objektsverschiebung”). Four relevant MOCs were labelled metonymical (“meton.”); *impfen* (‘to inject’), *lösen* (‘to discharge / fire off’), *mähen* (‘to mow’) and *pflanzen* (‘to plant’). In four other relevant cases (g*ießen* ‘to pour’, *schleifen* ‘to flay / to decorticate’, *verschwatzen* ‘to waste by chatting / to talk away’, *versichern* ‘to warrant / to guarantee’) the DWB states that there is a change (lit.: “jump”) of the predicative concept (“der Verbalbegriff springt über”, cf. also Carlberg 1948: 14). Only the verbs *gießen* (‘to pour’) and *pflanzen* (‘to plant’) overlap with Adelung’s set (tagged by Adelung as “auf solche Art”).

Van Dale’s dictionary of Dutch (2005) and the WNT provide even larger sets of verbs allowing MOCs (cf. also Table 3 in chapter IV, p. 119). Out of 127 verbs tagged as MOC in Van Dale (cf. the appendix), only 76 exactly overlap with the around 400 verbs in the WNT. Furthermore, very similar shifts are sometimes labelled differently, for instance “metonymisch” (‘metonymical’). Six more verbs allowing MOC can be identified using the material collected by Moerdijk, who extracted all occurrences of *metonymisch* and *meton* from the tome “aanvullingen” of the WNT (cf. Moerdijk 2006: 57ff). These verbs are *afvlaggen* (‘to flag down’), *betegelen* (‘to tile’), *continueren* (‘to continue’), *evacueren* (‘to evacuate’), *ontzilten* (‘to desalinate’) and *onduleren* (‘to crimp/perm’). The verb *toedammen* (‘to dam up’), which is also labelled “metonymisch”, can also be added to this set. In Van Dale, I found 26 relevant MOC-verbs with the label “metonymisch”. In the WNT, MOCs are sometimes described in a verb entry as “vervolgens met” or “vervolgens van” (‘further with’ / ‘further (said) of / further (applied) to’); examples are *lossen* (lit.: “release”, i.e. ‘to fire (off)’) or *toesluiten* (lit.: “to(wards)-close”, i.e. ‘to close/lock’).

Although the Dutch and German dictionaries provide a large and wide-ranging set of verbs, this data set (given in the appendix) can be improved in two ways. Some examples should be taken out, since they do not show real MOC, while at the same time other, new examples should be added. I will discuss this in more detail in the following sections.

124 In the previous chapter, it was argued that MOCs do not have to be analysed as causing a shift in the predicative concept (cf. especially chapter IV, §4).

125 For several reasons, these numbers of verbs differ from expectations raised by the previous chapter. First of all, only verbs have been taken into account. Van Dale also uses the label MOC with the preposition *af* and the adjectives *uitgeput* and the WNT with the preposition *af* (‘off’), the adjectives *afhandig* (*iemand iets afhandig maken* = ‘to snatch something from someone’), *uitgeput* (‘exhausted’) and the nouns *afkorting* (‘reduction’), *rente* (‘interest’), *uitspraak* (‘pronouncement’), *verzetting* (‘resetting’), and *zuivering* (‘purge’). Secondly, in some dictionary entries several tags (for instance “objectverwisseling” as well as “objectsvver.”) have been used. They are counted only once in the numbers mentioned in this section. Thirdly, the WNT-search engine on the internet seems to have a bug: selecting the hits based on *verwisseling* by hand resulted in 55 more verbs that were not directly found under “verwisseling van object”. The final result of the WNT consists of 388 verb entries. They can be found in the appendix. Some other examples with verbs are given under *af* (which is also the case in Van Dale). Several shifts can occur within one entry: The 122 Van Dale verbs tagged with “objectverwisseling”, for instance, correspond with 165 different shifts. Five additional verbs are only tagged with the abbreviation “objectverw.” in Van Dale.
3. Demarcating the data: MOC, verb polysemy, valency reduction

Not all examples tagged as MOC in dictionaries are equally interesting. There are two reasons for this. First of all, some German or Dutch examples are not really relevant. Some examples are clearly archaic, while others are so specific or belong to such a specific jargon that it will be of no use describing them in this dissertation. Also, some verbs are synonyms or near-synonyms, displaying the same behaviour. These verbs are irrelevant or redundant and will not be considered any further.

Secondly, it is doubtful whether all examples marked as MOCs are in fact instances of MOC. Two general conditions need to be fulfilled in the case of MOC. First of all, it only makes sense to speak of a shift concerning the direct object, if the action or activity expressed by the verb remains the same, at least on a general level. This is in line with the fact that in most instances of MOC both possible objects are incorporated in a single general verb meaning (cf. above chapter IV, §4). In this respect, MOC clearly differs from metonymical polysemy of the verb, as discussed in chapter III (cf. also examples discussed by Stoeva-Holm 2010). The transitive metonymically polysemous Dutch verb *kuipen* illustrates this difference. Obviously, the metonymical meaning shift from ‘to make barrels’ to ‘to put something into barrels’ (cf. above chapter III, §4.7) also causes the combination to different direct objects: The WNT points out that in its first meaning this verb can be used with ‘barrels’ as a direct object, while in its second meaning it is combined with objects or substances that can be put in barrels, such as herrings. In contrast to MOCs, the two meanings refer to two different actions with, of course, different types of direct objects. In a similar way, some tagged MOCs in Dutch dictionaries should be considered verbal sense shifts, i.e. as instances of polysemy.

This can be illustrated by the Dutch verb *aanslaan* (lit.: “at-hit/ strike”). One meaning of *aanslaan* is its use in combination with a direct object denoting signs or announcements. Used in this way, the verb expresses an action of hanging up signs somewhere (a “posting-activity”). Posting signs is often done on cars or houses which are for sale. In this context, the verb *aanslaan* can also be collocated with cars or houses as a direct object rather than with the sign. However, in this combination the posting-activity itself no longer plays a direct role and in most cases no posting-activity will be involved at all. The verb then simply expresses that the house is for sale and the original meaning is lost. In such cases the supposed object change is accompanied by a different verbal action and therefore is not an example of MOC.\(^{126}\)

A second condition for MOC is that there must be a shift from one type of direct object to another from a synchronic point of view. The fact that the object slot has to be affected is a specific requirement of MOCs: If the type of direct object required remains the same and only the noun used is reinterpreted (as in *I am reading*

\(^{126}\) Cf. the only example of this verb in this meaning in the ANW-corpus: “Later vluchten ze met diens inboedel. Het huis en de Mercedes worden aangeslagen.” (‘After some time they take refuge with with his home contents. The house and the Mercedes are for sale [lit.: “at-hit”].’) This sentence does not entail the placing of a sign to indicate that the house and the Mercedes are for sale. The sentence simply tells us that the house and the Mercedes are for sale.
Goethe), the example only involves a common nominal metonymy, not a predicative metonymy. This requirement does not only demarcate MOCs from general nominal metonymies, but also clarifies the difference between MOCs and other, more general valency shifts.

The term *valency* (or *valence*), which originates from chemistry, was introduced in linguistics by Tesnière (Tesnière 1959; cf. also Herbst & Götz-Votteler 2007: v). In its most basic sense, the term valency is used for the number of obligatory arguments of a predicate (cf. Cappelle 2005: 291-292). Since there are different degrees of obligatoriness, the term *valency* can also refer to the possible number of arguments which are combined with the predicate.

The difference between valency referring to obligatory arguments and valency referring to all verb-dependent arguments can be illustrated by the contrast between *name* and *give*: The former verb always requires three arguments to be realised (‘someone names someone something’), while for the latter the third argument is syntactically optional (‘someone gives (someone) something’). Therefore, both verbs could be analysed as being three-place predicates, although only *to name* is syntactically a three-place predicate in the strict sense. However, many linguists also consider the verb *to give* to be a three-place predicate.

According to Honselaar, for instance, verb valencies are specified variables in the meaning of the verb (1980: 11). This applies to all three arguments of *to name* as well as to the three arguments of *to give*. Although in the case of *to give* the argument of the receiver can be left out in actual utterances and the receiver can be realised in a different way, viz. as *to give something to someone* (cf. Honselaar 1980: 11-12), it is semantically directly involved in the verbal action (cf. 1980: 11). The action of giving something can only be performed if there is someone to receive it. This necessary role in the verb meaning is different for, for instance, the Dutch verb *bijschenken* (‘to fill up’) (cf. Honselaar 1980: 12). Although an optional person argument can also be used with this verb ((voor iemand / iemand) iets bijschenken, ‘to fill something up (for someone)’), this person is not essential to the verbal action. Hence, whereas *to name* is a three-place valency predicate in the strict sense and *to give* should also be regarded as a three-place verb, *bijschenken* should be considered a two-place predicate.

Besides the difference between valency in a strict and more general sense, there is also a distinction between quantitative and qualitative valency. The former only refers to the number of arguments (cf. Dik & Hengeveld 1997: 8), whereas the latter also takes into account the type of argument, i.e. its morphosyntactic form (cf. Brdar 2007: 140) or its semantic function (cf. Dik & Hengeveld 1997: 15).

Changes in quantitative valency may lead to a reduction or an extension. An example of valency reduction is the intransitive use of a transitive verb. Valency extension can be illustrated by examples such as *John walked the dog*. Although it has been suggested that metonymy could be a motivating factor for changes in quantitative valency (cf. Ruiz de Mendoza & Pérez 2001: 334-336; Ruiz de Mendoza & Diez 2001(2003): §3.3), MOC affects the qualitative valency (cf. also Cappelle 2005: 301).
The fact that there must be a qualitative shift of the direct object slot distinguishes MOC from a number of other changes in valency. It clarifies, for instance, why grammarians and lexicographers never consider German examples of verbs with double accusatives (i.e. two direct objects) to be MOCs. Examples of verbs with two direct objects are jemanden etwas angehen (lit.: “someone [accusative] something [accusative] on-go”, i.e. ‘be of someone’s concern’); jemanden etwas bitten (‘to request something from someone’); jemanden etwas fragen (‘to ask someone something’); jemanden etwas kosten (‘to cost someone something’); or jemanden etwas lehren (‘to teach someone something’). Since both direct objects can be realised simultaneously, the realisation of one of them cannot be considered a metonymical shift. The realisation of one of the accusative objects is merely a reduction of the number of expressed arguments without a real change in the structure of the verb phrase.

These double accusative constructions could be compared with verbs that have a valency pattern of a subject, an accusative object and a dative argument (or free dative, if this dative is not considered to be a valency realisation). Consider, for instance, the German verb auftun (lit.: “up-do”, i.e. ‘to dish up / to serve’). This verb can be combined with an accusative and a dative, as in deiner Tante die Suppe auftun (lit.: “your aunt [dative] the soup [acc] up-do”, meaning ‘to serve your aunt the soup’). Expressing only one argument, i.e. die Suppe auftun or deiner Tante auftun, does not cause a shift in case marking. In the same way, no shift of a direct object slot is involved in double accusatives. Double accusatives are therefore, correctly, not tagged as MOCs by lexicographers, and will be left out of consideration in this study.

Although Dutch has no case marking for nouns, which makes it more difficult to distinguish between different types of objects, a comparable distinction can be made in Dutch. Consider for this purpose the Dutch equivalent of German auftun, i.e. opscheppen (lit.: “up-scoop”, i.e. ‘to dish up / to serve’). The direct object of this verb can be a person or a dish, i.e. soep opscheppen or je tante opscheppen (lit.: “soup up-scoop” or “your aunt up-scoop”). Like their German counterparts these alternative arguments should not be considered an example of MOC. First of all, both arguments can also be realised simultaneously, i.e. je tante soep opscheppen (lit.: “your aunt soup up-scoop”, i.e. ‘to serve your aunt soup’). This shows that realising only one of the arguments is only a quantitative valency reduction and does not involve a qualitative shift of the direct object.

Moreover, it is doubtful whether the argument je tante in je tante opscheppen is a direct object. Although Dutch has no case marking, two tests can be used to make clear that the latter example does not contain a real direct object. First of all, je tante (‘your aunt’) is not a real direct object, because this argument cannot occur as a subject in the passive voice (*Je tante wordt opgeschept). Unfortunately, this test...

127 No examples of this kind can be found in ANW-corpus or on the internet. Such constructions are only used under a different interpretation in the variant of Dutch spoken in Belgium, in which a person is literally scooped, for instance by a train or car (cf. the Flemish-Dutch ANW-example “Zijn uitgeputte lichaam wordt door de trein opgeschept.”, i.e. ‘His
cannot always be applied, because it only functions in a negative direction: If an argument cannot appear as the subject of the passive voice, it cannot be a direct object in the active equivalent of the sentence, but if it can appear as the passive subject, there is no certainty that it is a direct object. In Dutch, indirect objects can sometimes also be used as subjects of passive constructions (cf. ANS 22-2:1 number 2b). Secondly, there is a prepositional alternative for the phrase, i.e. voor je tante (soep) opscheppen. Rather than a direct object, je tante is a benefactive phrase, just as in German. Again, this shows that no shift of the direct object slot has taken place.128

On the basis of these arguments, some tagged examples in Dutch dictionaries are excluded from the realm of MOCs. They are in fact not real shifts between two direct objects, but provide examples of different realisations of a direct object and an indirect object or a benefactive constituent. In examples of this type, the benefactive argument is not semantically necessary for the verbal action and it can be left out or realised in a different way.

A further example is de deur / iemand opendoen (lit.: “the door / someone open-do”, meaning ‘to open the door’ / ‘to open (the door) for someone’). Van Dale tags this example as an example of MOC. It is, however, far from certain that the word iemand is a real direct object. It is not a real verb valency, given that it is not necessary for the verbal action. It can also be left out or realised as a prepositional phrase: (voor iemand) de deur opendoen (“to open the door (for someone)”). Furthermore, it is doubtful whether it can appear as the subject in a passive construction (*ik werd al opengedaan, ‘I was already opened’ / ?Jan werd al door

exhausted body is scooped by a train.” or the internet example taken from the Belgian newspaper Het Nieuwsblad (16-11-2010) “Ze werd opgeschept, belandde met haar hoofd tegen de voorruit en daarna tegen de straatstenen.”, ‘She was scooped, landed with her head against the windscreen and thereafter against the paving stones’). In the variety of Dutch spoken in the Netherlands, the simplex verb scheppen would be preferred in such contexts. If a passive voice is used with opscheppen in the serving-meaning, the benefactive phrase voor is used, as in internet examples, such as “dus als u niet veel eet, maak dat dan ook duidelijk voordat er voor u wordt opschept.” (‘so if you do not eat much, please indicate this before you are served’), [lit.: ‘so if you not much eat, make that than also clear before there for you is up-scooped’], source: http://www.sunandforesttours.com/omgang.html [May 2011]) or “De kinderen krijgen 1 x per dag eten en staan keurig in de rij te wachten tot er voor ze wordt opgeschept.” (‘The children receive food once a day and stand patiently in line waiting till they are served’ [lit.: ’till there for them is up-scooped’], source: http://www.stichtinghulp.nl/default.asp?articleid=140 [May 2011]).

128 In French, the comparable verb servir has been considered to display MOC (cf. Waltereit 1998: 64; Waltereit 1999: 234) (cf. also chapter III, §5.3). In French, however, the verb can occur in passive sentences with the person as the subject. The French verb is also different, in that both the served object and the person being served can be realised as prepositional phrases (’servir quelqu’un de quelque chose’ or ‘servir quelque chose à quelqu’un’). The former is impossible in Dutch and German. In French, the shift is therefore similar to shifts such as to load the ship with carbon / to load carbon onto the ship.
The parallel with German can also be used to support the view that *iemand in iemand open doen* is no real direct object: The German equivalent of *iemand open doen* is always realised in the dative case, *jemandem die Tür aufmachen* (lit.: “someone [dative] the door [acc] open-do”). If only one object is expressed, the cases remain the same, i.e. *die Tür aufmachen* and *jemandem aufmachen*.

To summarise, the term metonymical object change (MOC) should not be used for syntactic patterns in which only one of two direct objects is realised or where one of them is no real direct object. Such sentences only show a reduction in the number of arguments realised and there is no qualitative shift concerning the direct object slot. Therefore, I have not included these general argument shifts in either Dutch or German.

However, this does not mean that all German examples in which both arguments can be realised simultaneously in the dative and the accusative should be excluded from the realm of MOC: Some verbs occur with a qualitative shift of the direct object slot, while at the same time allowing the realisation of the other argument as an additional dative. This can be illustrated with the German verb *abziehen*, which is considered to be a classic instance of MOC (cf. Adelung; Carlberg 1948; Havers 1931: 166; Oksaar 1984). The verb *abziehen* (lit.: “off-pull”, i.e. ‘to skin’) can be combined with an animal as well as with its skin as a direct object in the accusative case. When it collocates with the animal’s skin, the verb and direct object can optionally be accompanied by a dative representing the animal: *dem Hasen die Haut abziehen*. In contrast to the valency reductions with verbs allowing a dative and an accusative argument, this example really shifts its direct object, given that the hare (*der Hase*) can only acquire accusative case if it is the only argument occurring with the verb (*dem / den Hasen abziehen*). The dative in *dem Hasen die Haut abziehen*, termed a “Pertinenzdativ”, possessive dative (cf. Zeller 2001) or free dative, must always be animate. The verb *abziehen* also shows MOC with inanimate arguments, such as *das Bettzeug abziehen* (‘to change sheets’) or *das Bett abziehen* (‘to change the bed’). These cases therefore do not allow the realisation of both arguments (*dem Bett das Bettzeug abziehen*). These observations show that the verb *abziehen* in fact allows a shift of the direct object slot (i.e. MOC): If one of the arguments is realised, the location-argument always has accusative case; the arguments cannot be realised simultaneously as direct objects; and only with animate location arguments is it possible to add an optional possessive dative.

The border between instances of MOC and other shifts in argument structure is, however, artificial to some extent. There is a large area of in-between cases. A
problematic group of verbs, which are tagged in Dutch dictionaries as instances of metonymy or MOC, are, for instance, the verbs *afbetalen* (‘to pay off’) and *uitbetalen* (‘to pay (out)’). These verbs can be combined with a noun denoting a sum of money (a concrete sum, a debt, a salary, etc.) or one denoting a person. 133 Given that both objects can be realised simultaneously without one of them having to be a prepositional phrase (*iemand iets uitbetalen / afbetalen, ‘to pay someone something’*), it is doubtful whether the direct object slot is shifted, if only one of them is used. It is also doubtful whether the noun phrase denoting a person is a real direct object. It can appear as a subject in the passive voice, but, as I pointed out before, this does not exclude the possibility that it is an indirect object (cf. ANS 22·2·1 number 2b). The fact that the person can also be expressed in a prepositional phrase, viz. (*aan*) *iemand een schuld afbetalen* (to pay a debt to someone’) and (*aan*) *werknemers loon uitbetalen* (‘to pay wages out to employees’) indicates that they are in all probability indirect objects, given that the preposition *aan* is a marker for indirect objects.

In German, similar examples also display slightly ambivalent behaviour. With the verbs *bezahlen* (‘to pay’) or *ausbezahlen* (‘to pay out’), the dative is not always used for nouns denoting persons as it is with, for instance, *auftun*. The dative only occurs if the accusative is also realised. Therefore, German exhibits shifts which are comparable to those in Dutch: The person in the dative (*jemandem*) *etwas bezahlen* (‘to pay (someone [dat]) something [acc]’) can be changed into an accusative object *jemand bezahlen*. Similarly (*Arbeitnehmern*) *Lohn ausbezahlen* (‘to pay wages [acc] out (to the employees [dat])’) can shift to the accusative *Arbeitnehmer ausbezahlen*. Because the persons shift between a single accusative or a simultaneously realised dative, these cases are similar at first sight to *dem Hasen die Haut abziehen*. A crucial difference is that we cannot regard the dative as a possessive dative. Another indicator for the fact that *abziehen* is different from *bezahlen* and *ausbezahlen* is that we can add the preposition *an* (‘to’) to the persons that are paid. The verbs *ausbezahlen* and *bezahlen* therefore show complex shifts, which should be considered shifts of the dative argument and not just of the direct object slot. I will therefore not analyse such paying-examples any further.

A comparable but again different example is the Dutch verb *aanspelen* (lit.: “at-play”, i.e. ‘to pass (a ball in soccer)’). This verb can be combined with a player and with the ball that is passed to the player, both of which are necessarily involved in the verbal action. Both noun phrases can also be realised simultaneously in Dutch, cf. *iemand de bal aanspelen* (‘to pass someone the ball’). Both arguments can also occur as the subjects of corresponding passive sentences. This example is different form the paying-examples, however, in that the person seems to be the default direct object while the ball is shifted. Furthermore, the player does not seem to be an indirect object or a benefactive constituent, since it cannot be part of a prepositional phrase (*voor / aan iemand de bal aanspelen*). German again only uses a dative when both arguments are realised: *jemanden anspielen* can occasionally be shifted.

133 The archaic example *iemand / de huur opslaan* (‘to raise *someone / the rent’*) is probably of the same kind.
to (jemanden) einen Ball anspielen. These examples could therefore be taken into account as MOCs.

In sum, an analysis of the metonymical object shifts found in dictionaries reveals two general characteristics of MOCs. First of all, the action expressed by the verb must remain the same. Secondly, the shift must really apply to the direct object slot. These two conditions show that some examples which are tagged as MOCs are actually not real instances of MOC. Examples in which the original verbal action no longer applies to the situation described are no examples of MOC. Shifts that do not concern the direct object slot should also not be included as MOCs. An example is the realisation of one particular accusative object if a verb allows two accusative objects. Another example are shifts between a direct object and an indirect object. The Dutch tagged examples opendoen, afbetalen and uitbetalen should therefore also be excluded, because the persons that can be used as direct objects can also be realised in a prepositional phrase with aan / voor, which indicates that they are not real direct objects but rather benefactive constituents. These changes in argument pattern are of a different nature than real MOCs. On the other hand, German examples to which a possessive dative can sometimes be added (such as abziehen) are clear MOCs. These examples do not show a shift between a dative and accusative, because additional datives only occur with animite arguments.

4. Improving the set of examples of MOC

Although some tagged MOCs in dictionaries are too archaic, too specific, redundant or are in fact other valency shifts, the opposite problem also exists: Not all MOCs can be extracted on the basis of dictionary data. There are several reasons why not all possible MOCs can be found by searching dictionaries.

First of all, the lexicographical labels used are very diverse and numerous. We have seen that it is not only Dutch “metonymisch” and “objektsverwisseling” or German “metonymisch” and “Objektsvertauschung” that indicate possible MOCs, but also more general terms (such as Adelung’s “auf solche Art” or in the WNT “vervolgens met/van”). However, the number of tags used is so large that this makes it almost impossible to find all relevant lexicographically tagged examples.

Besides this practical problem, it turns out that it is not necessary or even very useful to keep searching for new lexicographical tags. First of all, the examples identified as MOCs but tagged differently either have already been identified as MOCs or provide examples of archaic, specific or synonymous shifts (cf. §3 above). Secondly, it turns out that dictionaries do not tag all examples of MOC or do not

---

134 Cf. e.g. the examples from the DeWac-corpus: “Dabei ist es allgemein üblich, dem aufschlagenden Spieler die Bälle übers Netz anzuspielen.” (‘With that, it is common practice, to play the balls over the net to the serving player [dative case]’) or “Vor einem Hütchen wird der Ball schräg angespielt und vor einer Torschusslinie auf das Tor mit TW geschossen.” (‘In front of a marker on the field (lit.: “a little hat”) the ball should be played crosswise and in front of a goal line it should be shot towards the goal with the keeper’). In German, this shift is not as frequent as in Dutch.
always incorporate the possibility. So even repeated searches of the various dictionaries do not capture all MOCs. This becomes clear, for instance, when we compare the Dutch set of verbs with the German one: Some German verbs are not reflected in the Dutch set and vice versa, although equivalent verbs allow MOC in both languages.135

In addition, other German verbs discussed as allowing “Objektsvertauschung” can be found in the literature, cf. Carlberg 1948, Wellander 1911, Hundsmurscher 1986 or McIntyre 2001. Other, very similar examples are discussed by Apresjan. Apresjan (1992: 240ff) does not only discuss many equivalents of Dutch and German verbs that are tagged as allowing MOC in dictionaries, such as the Dutch verbs *uitkloppen* (‘to beat out’), *uitkammen* (‘to comb’), *uitsnijden* (‘to cut out’), *wieden* (‘to weed’), *planten* (‘to plant’), *vegen* (‘to sweep’), *persen* (‘to press’), *tatoeëren* (‘to tattoo’), *toesluiten* (‘to close’), *ontknopen* (‘to unravel / to disentangle’), *ontsteken* (‘to open/to tap’ applied to casks or liquids), *aansteken* (‘to light’) or the tagged German ones such as *abwischen* (‘to wipe off’), *ausklopfen* (‘to beat out’), *ausschneiden* (‘to cut out’), *pflanzen* (‘to plant’), *außpressen* (‘to press (out)’), *auflechten* (‘to braid’), *loden* (‘to set alight’), *löschen* (‘to wipe’/‘to extinguish’), but he also gives some new examples. These verbs in particular belong to the area of producing, repairing, adding images and of opening and closing. Production verbs include *to cook, to bake, to thread, to milk*. Verbs denoting reparations include *to repair, to mend, to heal, to correct, to patch, to solder, to stuff, to stop, to caulk*. Examples of verbs denoting the addition to images are *to etch, to engrave/to inscribe, to embroider, to paint* and of the last category include *to open and to close*.

Last but not least, many new MOCs can be found on the basis of introspection.136

To conclude, the set of verbs found in Dutch and German dictionaries turns out to be very useful and extensive, but it is by no means exhaustive. In fact, the number of possible MOCs turns out to be almost infinite. In order to analyse the different types of relevant shifts in a representative way without getting lost in too much and too detailed data, a relevant set of verbs and contiguity shifts could be made on the basis of these three resources (i.e. the dictionary data, examples found in the literature and additional verbs thought of). Some of these examples of MOCs will be analysed in detail in the following chapters, but I will first examine some general properties of the dictionary examples.

---

135 On the basis of the 150 relevant German verbs (taken from dictionaries and linguistic literature), 36 new Dutch ones can be found. Out of the almost 500 Dutch verbs, only 80 translations into German did not allow MOCs (or had no direct German equivalent).
136 Cf. Honselaar & Sweep forthcoming 2012, where we discuss additional verbs, such as *behandelen* (‘to treat’) or *prikken* (‘to prick’/‘to sting’).
5. Presenting the data: Verbs and contiguity types

Data on MOCs can be presented in two different ways. One option is to cluster them according to the type of verbs involved in the object changes. Another option is to group them on the basis of the contiguity relation between both possible direct objects.

Although most accounts of these argument shifts do not analyse the phenomenon as involving metonymy and therefore do not explicitly recognise the contiguity types (cf. e.g. Iwata 2008; Levin 1993; Pinker 1989; Rappaport & Levin 1988, etc.), both ways of classifying MOC data are implicitly reflected in the existing literature: The alternations are referred to by prototypical verbs, such as, for instance, the ‘spray/load alternation’, as well as after their contiguity pattern, viz. ‘location-locatum shift’ or ‘locative alternation’. Famous in this respect is Levin’s work (Levin 1993), which discusses more and also different alternations than just MOCs (cf. §6 below). Her book systematically gives a two-fold classification of alternations: In the first part of her book she names some alternations, which are classified as MOCs by lexicographers, after properties of the object, whereas in the second part she classifies several instances of MOCs on the basis of verb classes.

In fact, the strategy of clustering verbs and the strategy of clustering contiguity relations both make sense. Since MOCs are instances of predicative metonymy, the metonymy affects the type of argument needed rather than the argument itself. Properties of the verb and the relation between possible objects are therefore dependent on one another: The argument shift becomes possible, because the contiguity relation between both objects dovetails with the meaning of the verb. Nonetheless, only the importance of the verb meaning seems to be acknowledged in most studies. The crucial significance of the relation between the objects only appears to be implicitly recognised. Before I discuss why the contiguity relation and the metonymy involved are crucial for a satisfactory explanation of MOCs in the following chapters, I will first present the examples: The relevant set of verbs and the shifts involved.

I will do this in the two ways suggested in this section: Section 6 will describe the types of verbs that allow MOCs and section 7 will present the types of objects that are involved in these shifts. Both are dependent on each other. Some specific contiguity relations between objects will lead to more instances of verbs that allow a certain type of predicative metonymies (viz. logical metonymies), which will be discussed at the end of section 7 (subsection 7.4).

137 Cf. also McIntyre who uses the term Objektsverschiebung in his analysis of particle verbs (cf. §6.3 and §6.4 below) and connects them to locative alternations in general (McIntyre 2001: 296). Instead of Objektsverschiebung, he also uses the term “landmark flexibility”.
6. Verbs allowing MOCs

6.1 Types of verbs

Although the set of verbs that allow MOC turns out to be fairly large and heterogeneous, the verbs involved nevertheless share certain characteristics. A first observation is that almost all of them describe everyday daily, practical actions ("tägliche Verrichtungen", cf. Carlberg 1948: 29). For instance, they often denote household activities, such as cleaning (cf. e.g. beat a carpet / dust (out of a carpet); clear the table / the dishes; iron clothes / creases; rinse or wash clothes / dirt (out); sweep out the tent / the sand), actions for producing food (e.g. pluck feathers / a chicken; sieve flour / lumps (out); squeeze orange juice / oranges (out); tap beer / a cask) or other practical tasks (e.g. light wood / a fire; darn holes / stockings; pack a suitcase / stuff; scrape the windshield / ice off, etc.). Another large group of verbs denotes actions relating to agriculture (e.g. cultivate land / crops; dig a ditch / sand out; plough the land / the ground (up); sow the land / seed). Yet another set denotes medical treatments and similar activities (e.g. heal a patient / a disease; inject a child / a medicine; wipe the blood / the wound).

Apart from classifying the verbs into semantic domains based on their conceptual content, most verbs allowing MOC can be divided into larger semantic classes.

For instance, many verbs allowing MOCs refer to an action of removing something or taking away something from something else. Some of these verbs denote the removal of objects or substances from a location, other verbs denote the removal of objects or substances from something else.

A prototypical example of the first type is to clear or to clear up, which can be combined with the things removed from a location (e.g. tableware or mess / objects) as well as with the location itself (e.g. the table or the room). The same goes for to unload a truck / boxes. An example of the second type is to sieve / sift (out). This verb is different from to clear in that it does not remove something from a location but from another substance, such as lumps from flour or the gold from the sand. The difference between these two types of removal is therefore caused by the relationship between the possible objects: They can be either two contiguous but autonomous entities or they are really incorporated into each other. It is not always clear how to distinguish between these two different subclasses: A verb such as uitkloppen / ausklopfen (to beat (out)), for instance, could be described as removing dust from a certain location (such as the carpet), although the carpet could also be said to physically contain the dust.

The opposites of verbs denoting removal, i.e. verbs denoting actions of attaching or putting something into or onto something else, also often allow MOC. Both categories of verbs, i.e. those denoting removal and those denoting adding something, express some kind of movement between the two possible direct objects. Thus, whereas the verb to unload can be classified as expressing that objects are taken from or taken out of a certain location, the verb load (or load up, cf. examples
on page 160) expresses the opposite movement. Both categories of verbs allow the same object change, i.e. to load / unload boxes (onto / from a lorry) or to load / unload a lorry (with / of boxes). Other examples of verbs that can be combined with the affected location or with the thing put into this location are to smear, to spread, to plant or to inject and their Dutch and German equivalents.

Yet another category of verbs are what can be referred to as creation verbs. They denote various actions of creating something out of something else or by means of something else. The set of examples of this kind that are tagged as MOCs is remarkably smaller than the other two. The possible objects can be either the source or the result or product.

Two different types of sources should be distinguished. The first is the material or ingredient out of which the product is made or result is produced. The second is an instrument or another means by which the result is brought about. The latter can be illustrated by the Van Dale-examples gitaar / lied tokkelen (‘to strum a guitar / a song’) or een toets / een noot aanslaan (‘to hit a key / a note’). Illustrative examples of the former type taken from Dutch dictionaries are koren / korenwijn branden (lit: burn grain / corn brandy, meaning ‘to distil corn brandy’), sinaasappels / sinaasappelsap persen (‘to squeeze oranges / orange juice’), riet / een dak vlechten (‘to weave reeds / a roof’). Adelung gives Eisen / Nageln schmieden (‘to forge iron / nails’), Leinwand / ein Kleid nähnen (‘to sew linen / a dress’), Holz / Bretter sägen (‘to saw wood / planks’)

Verbs roughly meaning ‘to repair’, such as to darn holes / stockings, can also be grouped within this category. These verbs do not refer to a new creation of something, but they nevertheless denote the bringing about of something by repairing it. They therefore allow a focus on the repaired object, which could be seen as the result of the action. The ‘repair’-sense and the shift between the damage and the object to be fixed could be extended to medical examples, such as to cure a disease / a patient.

In a comparable way, verbs that denote some motion can be extended to abstract removing or placing. The German example etwas / jemanden ausfragen (lit.: “something / someone out-ask”, meaning ‘ask something / interrogate someone’) and the Dutch example kennis / iemand bijspijken (lit.: “knowledge / someone at/by-nail”, meaning ‘to improve someone’s knowledge / to bring someone up to speed’) illustrate this. These examples could be seen as a metaphorical movement, removing or putting abstract content (knowledge/information) from or into an abstract container (a person).

In addition to the movement and creation verbs, some other examples shift between a concrete entity and an event. This can be illustrated by to continue writing / a book (cf. WNT entry continueren) and to interrupt a presentation / the speaker (cf. Van Dale 2005, entry onderbreken). We are not dealing with verbs of creation or movement in these examples, but with the category of so-called eventive verbs

---

138 Adelung tags these examples with “auf solche Art”.
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(Verspoor 1997a) or phase verbs (Honselaar 1980). I will come back to these and similar abstract shifts in section 7.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. movement between two objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 removing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 2 entities / 1 gestalt</td>
<td>unload goods / a ship; clear table / dishes; wipe the blood / wound; sieve flour / lumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. non-literal (metaphor)</td>
<td>etwas / jemanden ausfragen&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 putting/adding/attaching/filling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 2 entities / 1 gestalt</td>
<td>load goods / a ship; plant roses / a garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. non-literal (metaphor)</td>
<td>kennis / iemand bijspijkeren&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. material/ingredient - product</td>
<td>forge iron / nails; press oranges / orange juice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. means - result</td>
<td>strum a guitar / a song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. repair (damage/holes - object)</td>
<td>darn holes / stockings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. heal; cure (extended ‘repair’)</td>
<td>heal a disease / patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. eventive verbs (participant - activity)</td>
<td>interrupt a speaker / presentation; continue a book / writing (cf. §7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. other</td>
<td>touw / zeil vieren&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as / vuur uitkrakelen&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Coarse-grained classification of verbs

Table 4 gives a general classification of the different categories of verbs allowing MOC. The superscripts (<sup>D</sup>/<sup>G</sup>) indicate whether an example is Dutch or German. Apart from the three general categories (with their subdivisions), there is also a rest category of verbs allowing MOC and not belonging to any of the other categories. These examples will be discussed in more detail according to their contiguity relations in section 7. First, however, I will compare the three main classes described above with existing analyses made by other scholars.

6.2 Levin’s alternations and MOCs

In the previous subsection (§6.1), MOC-verbs were divided into verbs denoting removal, addition, creation verbs and verbs termed eventive. Verb classes that partly overlap with these categories can be found in existing studies. The work by Pinker (1989), which is based on Rappaport & Levin 1988, and Levin’s book (1993) are especially important in this respect.

Pinker (1989) discusses four alternations, with what he calls dativizable verbs (110-123), locativizable verbs (124-130), causativizable verbs (130-134) and
passivizable verbs (134-137). The only alternations relating to the direct object are
associated with the locativizable verbs. Locativizable verbs exhibit shifts which are
based on the contiguity relation LOCATION AND WHAT IS IN A LOCATION (THE
LOCATUM). They are discussed by Levin as locatum-location shifts of the direct
object, also called transitive locative alternations (1993: 51-53).

Verbs allowing the locative alternation include verbs denoting removal as well as
verbs denoting addition (i.e. putting, adding or attaching) (cf. Levin 1993: 51-53; cf.
Pinker 1989: 126-127 vs. 129-130). Examples of the latter class are *smear, pile, spray, scatter, cram or load* (cf. Pinker’s 6 semantic classes on pages 126-127;
Levin 1993: 51; cf. also Iwata 2008: 12-13). Examples of the former class are *clear
and empty* (Levin 1993: 51-52) or *wipe and rinse* (Levin 1993: 53). Not all of these
verbs can alternate as readily in Dutch or German as they do in English, as we will
see in more detail in the next chapter.

In addition to this, Levin describes shifts between direct objects called “image
this shift take a location or an image that is added on this location as their direct
object.

Some verbs which are tagged as metonymical in dictionaries belong to this class.
Adelung classifies *abdrucken* (lit.: “off-print”, i.e. ‘to print (off)’ / ‘to impress’) as
“metonymisch” and the WNT uses “verwisseling van object” for verbs such as
*afrukken* (lit.: “off-print’, i.e. ‘to print (off)’ / ‘to impress’), *afstempelen* (lit.: “off-
stamp”, ‘to stamp’) and *inwerken* (lit.: “in-work”, with MOC in the meaning ‘to
work in’ / ‘to inscribe’). Van Dale labels the verb *tatoëëren* (‘to tattoo’) as involving
metonymy (cf. Levin 1993: 66). All these verbs can be combined with an image
as well as with the object or the part of the object on which the image is printed,
pressed or inscribed. This alternation can therefore be considered to be a specific
type of LOCATUM-LOCATION shift. Such verbs are also related to creation verbs,
since the image is positioned on the location.\footnote{The tagged verb *afschrijven* (lit.: “off-write”) in Van Dale and in the WNT can also be
combined with the signs which are marked on an object, such as a piece of wood, as well as
the wood itself. This usage of the verb is technical jargon, only used in carpentry,
metalworking and architecture.}

The class of creation verbs, which are tagged as metonymy-driven by Apresjan
and a number of dictionaries, is also incorporated in Levin’s work. Levin terms them
transitive material/product alternations (Levin 1993: 56). This alternation includes
creation verbs allowing MOC, such as *forge, sew, squeeze*. An object shift from an
instrument-source to a result, such as *to strum a guitar / a song*, is, however, not
included by Levin.\footnote{For the relatedness of MOCs with locative verbs and creation verbs in general: compare
chapter VI, §4.3-4.4.} The fact that Levin uses the term “material-product

\footnote{139}
“alternation” is interesting, since MATERIAL–PRODUCT is a standard contiguity pattern. This alternation is therefore clearly connected to metonymy.

Levin includes many more alternations beyond the direct object, which seem to involve some well-known contiguity types. This can be illustrated by the “body-part possessor ascension” alternation. Levin exemplifies this alternation by *Selina touched the horse on the back / the horse’s back* (1993: 71). This ‘body-part possessor ascension’ shifts between a single direct object and a direct object with an additional prepositional phrase. Argument alternations between a body part and a possessor can, however, also occur without these prepositional phrases. Standard PART-WHOLE metonymies in the direct object shifting between body parts and possessors are sometimes tagged in dictionaries as instances of metonymy. Van Dale tags the example *daar is de kapper om u te scheren* (‘here comes the hairdresser, to shave you’) as metonymical (cf. Van Dale 2005: *scheren*). The ‘body-part possessor ascension’ is clearly related to these standard, nominal PART-WHOLE metonymies.

The ‘body-part possessor ascension’ is not the only complex shift which is related to metonymy in the direct object. An alternation which does not provide examples of shifted direct objects but which can be connected to some MOCs, is Levin’s ‘Possessor Attribute’ alternation (1993: 73-79). Although Levin does not give any transitive examples of these shifts, some object changes given in dictionaries seem to fit within the description of this category. An example in German is *etwas / jemanden ausfragen* and in Dutch *kennis / iemand bijspijkeren* (lit.: “knowledge / someone at/by-nail”, i.e. ‘bring someone up to standard’).

The ‘body-part possessor ascension’ and the ‘possessor attribute’ alternations clearly show that Levin discusses a much broader range of argument shifts than just metonymical direct objects and MOCs. Often, Levin’s alternations concern subjects instead of direct objects. The locative alternation, for instance, can also occur in subject position, described by Levin as the ‘swarm’-alternation (Levin 1993: 53) and the intransitive ‘clear’-alternation (Levin 1993: 55). Similarly, an intransitive material/product alternation is possible (Levin 1993: 57). Additional subject shifts are, for example, the middle alternation (Levin 1993: 25-26), all types of causative alternations (Levin 1993: 26-32), possessor subject alternations (Levin 1993: 76-77), all oblique subject alternations (Levin 1993: 79-83) and the reflexive diathesis alternations (Levin 1993: 84-85). Since these shifts do not affect the direct object, they are not of direct interest for MOCs. I will leave an analysis of parallels between predicative metonymies in subjects and comparable direct object shifts for future research.

---

transitive and an intransitive construction, it is by definition less relevant for the present research on MOCs.

142 The verb to tattoo also allows this alternation, cf. footnote 174.
143 An example of this is *The butcher cuts the meat versus The meat cuts easily*. Note again the relatedness with metonymy (AGENT–INSTRUMENT). Dictionaries sometimes even tag these shifts as instances of “subjectsverwisseling” (Metonymical Subject Change).
CHAPTER V

All other shifts between a transitive and an intransitive construction are also irrelevant for MOC. Examples of these are the substance/source alternation (Levin 1993: 32), unexpressed object alternations (Levin 1993: 33-40), the conative alternation (Levin 1993: 41-42),144 and the so-called cognate object or reaction object construction (Levin 1993: 95, 97-98).

In addition, alternations between two direct objects that are impossible in both Dutch and German need not be taken into further consideration here. An example of such an alternation is the ‘blame’ or the ‘search’ alternation (Levin 1993: 69-71, cf. Heyvaert 2000; Heyvaert 2005). Examples are Mira blamed the accident on Terry / Terry for the accident and Ida hunted the woods for deer / deer in the woods. Apart from being impossible in Dutch and German,145 the ‘blame’ and ‘search’ alternations differ from each other in one crucial respect: Whereas hunt the woods as well as hunt deer are both possible without any prepositional phrase, the object shift in the case of blame is only possible if both the accident and Terry are expressed simultaneously.

The same can be observed in the ‘fulfilling’ alternation (Levin 1993: 65-66). An example is The judge presented a prize to the winner / the winner with a prize. This alternation is only possible if all arguments are expressed, and it also appears only rarely in Dutch and German. Heyvaert’s work on Dutch alternations describes only one, somewhat dubious, example in Dutch, i.e. the equivalent of to provide food to him / him with food (i.e. (?!)proviand voorzien voor hem → hem van/met proviand voorzien, cf. Heyvaert 2000). The alternation is only possible, if all arguments are simultaneously shifted. Alternations in which both arguments need to be shifted simultaneously should not be considered real MOCs (or MSCs) (cf. also Carlberg 1948: 21).

There are other alternations that can only shift their direct object if the other possible object is realised as an oblique or if a new obligatory element is added. An example of the latter type is the resultative construction (cf. Levin 1993: 99-101). In these examples a shifted object only occurs if an additional adverb is added. Since the structure of the sentence must be changed in order to make this kind of shift possible, I will not discuss resultatives any further.

All arguments are also shifted simultaneously in the with/against alternation or the through/with alternation (Levin 1993: 67-69). They can only alternate their direct objects if the prepositional phrase is present. Examples are to pierce the cloth (with a needle) versus to pierce the needle *(through the cloth) and to hit the fence (with a stick) versus to hit a stick *(against the fence). The brackets preceded by an

144 Cf. footnote 141.
145 Adelung tags the example einen Teich fischen (‘to fish a pond/lake’) as “figürlich” (‘figurative’). Such examples can be found in the DeWac-corpus, but they refer to archaic language, compare “Über diesen Talwetter steht geschrieben: ’1427 an Mittwochen nach Lätare hat man den Weiher in dem Tal gefischt....’” (‘About the lake in the valley has been written: “In 1427 one has fished the lake in the valley on Wednesdays after Laetare Sunday...”’); and “und so hat jeder von euch von Mir Benannten das Recht, den vierten Teil des Teiches zu fischen,” (‘and so everyone of the persons who are assigned by me has the right to fish a fourth part of the pond’).
asterisk illustrate that in those cases the direct object is only possible with the additional PP. This alternation is therefore fundamentally different from most transitive locative alternations, image impression alternations and material/product alternations. Only in some transitive locative alternations can the prepositional phrase be made explicit, and where this is possible it is not necessary. This issue will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

In sum, if we compare the direct object examples tagged as instances of metonymy by dictionaries with Levin’s alternations, several of these turn out to be relevant. The transitive locative alternations (Levin 1993: 49-53, cf. also Pinker 1989: 124-130), the image impressing alternation (Levin 1993: 66-67) and the transitive material-product alternation (Levin 1993: 56) are reflected in the set of MOCs. Levin does not discuss the class of eventive shifts (i.e. logical metonymies). Other MOCs are not incorporated in Levin’s classification, but they are similar to some other alternation classes. For instance, some fairly standard metonymies, such as shifts between body-parts and possessors as direct objects, are related to Levin’s ‘body-part possessor ascension’ alternation. Similarly, Levin’s class of possessor-attribute alternations (1993: 73-79) describes shifts between direct objects and prepositional phrases, although comparable shifts occur in direct objects only.

### 6.3 Simplex verbs and complex verbs

Outside lexicography the term “Objektsvertauschung” has mainly been used in connection with morphologically complex verbs (cf. e.g. Hundsnurscher 1986: 125; McIntyre 2001: 17). These morphologically complex verbs consist of a verb stem and a prefix or prefix-like element. Before I will discuss the exact nature of such prefix-like elements (also called particles) in the next section, it should be noted that even literature on such prefix verbs often acknowledges that simplex verbs sometimes allow the same shifts (cf. e.g. Hundsnurscher 1986: 125).

Dictionary data reflect these facts: Although the vast majority of tagged verbs are morphologically complex, some simplex verbs are also tagged as allowing MOC. Table 5, which gives an overview of simplex and morphologically complex verbs which are tagged for allowing MOC, illustrates this.146

---

146 Van Dale’s 127 examples are all tagged with “objectsverwisseling” or “objectsverw”. The 397 WNT-verbs are the 388 instances tagged with “objectsverwisseling” and variants (cf. footnote 125 and the appendix) and seven additional verbs with the label “metonymisch” / “meton.” (afvlaggen ‘to flag down’, betegelen ‘to tile’, continueren ‘to continue’, evacueren ‘to evacuate’, onduleren ‘to crimp/perm’, onzilten ‘to desalinate’, toedammen ‘to dam up’) and two with other labels (toesluiten ‘to enclose’, lossen ‘to unload’). Since Table 5 is based on dictionary examples, some examples which were excluded from the realm of MOCs in section 4 are also taken into account. The only occurrence of open, for instance, is the verb opendoen in Van Dale, which was classified as a wrong example for MOC in the previous section.
Interestingly, the DWB uses the term *Objectverschiebung* or *meton.* primarily for simplex verbs with metonymical object shifts. Examples are *träufen* (‘to drip’), *impfen* (‘to inject’), *lösen* (in the meaning ‘to fire’), *mähen* (‘to mow’) and *pflanzen* (‘to plant’).

Adelung, in contrast, uses the word *metonymisch* almost solely for morphologically complex verbs. In one dictionary entry, however, Adelung refers to a similar shift with a simplex verb: The MOC associated with *ausladen* (‘to unload’) is also said to occur with *löschen* (‘to unload’ in combinations with ships and goods). The tag “ingleichen”, indicating MOC, is used in the dictionary entry for the simplex verb *löschen.*

Adelung also tags other simplex verbs allowing MOC with comparable labels, such as “auf solche Art” or “figürlich”. Examples are *fischen* (‘to fish’, cf. footnote 145), *flechten* (‘to braid / to weave’), *gießen* (‘to pour’), *graben* (‘to dig’), *heilen* (‘to heal’), *impfen* (‘to inject’), *kehren* (‘to sweep’), *lesen* (in the older meaning of ‘to

---

**Table 5: MOC tagged in dictionaries with complex verbs and simplex verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch prefix/particle</th>
<th>English translation</th>
<th>number WNT (397)</th>
<th>number Van Dale (127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aan-</td>
<td>‘on’/‘(on)to’/‘in’/‘at’</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>af-</td>
<td>‘off’/‘away’/‘down’</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be-</td>
<td>(be-)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bij-</td>
<td>‘at’/‘to’/‘by’/‘with’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-</td>
<td>‘in’/‘into’</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om-</td>
<td>‘re-’/(a)round’/‘under’</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onder-</td>
<td>‘sub-’/‘under’/‘inter-’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ont-</td>
<td>‘un-’/‘dis-’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op-</td>
<td>‘on’/‘onto’/‘up’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open-</td>
<td>‘open’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-</td>
<td>‘over’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rond-</td>
<td>‘(a)round’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toe-</td>
<td>‘towards’/‘to’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uit-</td>
<td>‘out’/‘off’/‘away’</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van-</td>
<td>‘from’/‘off’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ver-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weg-</td>
<td>‘away’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan prefix / verb</td>
<td>a(d)/con/-etc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplex verb</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German prefix/particle</th>
<th>English translation</th>
<th>number Adelung (102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab-</td>
<td>‘off’/‘away’/‘down’</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an-</td>
<td>‘on’/‘(on)to’/‘in’/‘at’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auf-</td>
<td>‘on’/‘onto’/‘up’</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aus-</td>
<td>‘out’/‘off’/‘away’</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be-</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplex verb</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

147 Grimm’s examples with *gichten* and *treiben* are obsolete in the intended meanings.
gather’/’to pick’), lodern (’to set alight’), lösen (in the meaning ’to fire / to shoot’), klauben (regional verb for ’to gather’), nähen (’to sew’/’to stitch’), packen (’to pack’), pflanzen (’to plant’), quetschen (’to squeeze’), sägen (’to saw’), schmieden (’to forge’), sieden (’to cook’), stopfen (’to stuff’/’to darn’), träufen (’to drip’).

The Dutch verbs retrieved from dictionaries show a comparable difference in the proportion of simplex verbs and prefix verbs. According to Van Dale, the simplex verbs allowing MOC are branden (’to burn’/’to distil’), enten (’to graft’), pakken (’to pack’), persen (’to press’/’to squeeze’), schenken (’to pour’), stouwen (’to cram’), stelpen (’to stem / to dab’),\(^{148}\) strijken (’to brush’/’to spread’), strippen (’to strip’), stropen (’to skin’), stroppen (’to tie up’), tappen (’to tap’), tatooëren (’to tattoo’), tokkelen (’to strum’), vegen (’to sweep’/’to wipe’), vieren (’to slacken’), vlechten (’to braid / to weave’), wieden (’to weed’). The WNT incorporates even more simplex verbs: Apart from some very specific or old-fashioned verbs, the WNT gives a further set of simplex verbs allowing MOC such as borstelen (’to brush’), kappen (’to chop (down)’), krabben (’to scrape’), lichten (’to empty’/’to unload’), ruimen (’to clear’), stampen (’to cram’), stuwen (’to stow’), trimmen (’to trim’), villen (’to skin’), vreten (’to eat (away)’), vullen (’to fill’), wassen (’to wash’), wissen (’to wipe’), wringen (’to wring’), ziften (’to sift’/’to sieve’), zuigen (’to suck’) and zwelgen (’to gulp’).

These lists of simplex verbs suggest that the prefixes themselves are not of crucial importance. Instead the meaning of the verb, which can be a simplex verb or a morphologically complex verb, must involve two related objects. There are several additional observations which support the view that these shifts are not merely caused by a prefix or particle.

The first observation supporting this is the fact that crosslinguistically, verbs in two languages with a comparable meaning but different morphological structure often both allow MOC. The English verb to clear can be used to illustrate this observation: In the context of tables and tableware, to clear must be translated into Dutch and German by the complex verbs afruimen or abräumen (’off-clear’). However, all these verbs allow MOC, i.e. the English simplex verb to clear as well as the Dutch and German particle verbs afruimen and abräumen. Rather than the prefix or particle, it is apparently the concept of the action itself, i.e. clearing a table of its tableware, and the relation between the table and the tableware within this action, that make MOC possible.

Secondly, a simplex verb which also occurs as part of a particle verb frequently also allows MOC (cf. Hundsurnscher 1986: 125). This can also be illustrated with to clear in Dutch and German. Although the verb to clear should be translated as afruimen or abräumen when they are used in the context of tables and their tableware, it can correspond to the simplex verbs ruimen or räumen in other contexts. In these cases the simplex verb also allows MOC, just as in English. Illustrative are the Dutch and German equivalents of to clear the road and to clear snow, where ‘snow’ and ‘road’ are in a contiguity relation of the form LOCATION-
LOCATUM (cf. also below chapter VI, example (37) on page 190 and §4.3 page 225).
Shifts following this contiguity pattern do not only occur with *ruimen / räumen and afruimen / abräumen*, but also with other relevant complex verbs, such as with *inruimen / einräumen* (*in-*), *uitruimen / ausräumen* (*out-*), and *opruimen / aufräumen* (*up-*).

This can lead to certain verb clusters with one similar shift. In German, for instance, the verb *packen* (*to pack*) as well as *einpacken* (*in-pack*) and *auspacken* (*out-pack*), which are tagged as allowing MOC, can be combined with either a container or its content. The same goes for the tagged Dutch verbs *laden* (*to load*), *afladen* (*off-load*), *inladen* (*in-load*), *omladen* (*re-load*), *ontladen* (*de-load*), *opladen* (*up-load*), and *uitladen* (*out-load*). I will discuss some of these MOC-allowing verb clusters in chapter VI, §4.

In fact, some pairs of simplex and complex verbs even have almost identical meanings. Both verbs then allow MOC. This can be illustrated in German by the pair *abmähen* (*to mow off*) and *mähen* (*to mow*). The verb *abmähen* is often considered a prototypical verb allowing MOC (cf. Adelung or Reichmann 1989: 110; Carlberg 1948: 27, 39). The same shift with *mähen* is tagged as “metonymisch” by Grimm. A similar Dutch pair is *villen* (*to skin*) and *afvillen* (*to skin off*). Both verbs can be combined with an animal as well as with its skin and in the entries for both verbs the WNT describes the latter object as an example of “objectverwisseling”. Pairs such as *villen - afvillen* clearly show that the metonymical relation between both direct objects and its relevance for the action expressed by the verb can already be present in the meaning of the simplex verb.

The same point can be illustrated with synonymous or nearly synonymous pairs. The verb *stropen* (*to skin*), for instance, which has a comparable meaning to *villen* and *afvillen*, also allows both types of direct objects. Similar observations can be made for *betten - afbetten* (*to dab (off)*) and the near-synonym *stelpen* (*to stem/to dab (off)*). The verbs can all be combined with, for instance, blood or the wound.149

149 These verbs are infrequent, but compare the ANW-examples for *betten* “hij haalde zijn huid open en bette het wondje aan het jasje van zijn pyjama.” (*he scraped his skin and dabbed the little wound on the jacket of his pyjamas*) versus “Ik blijf het opwellende bloed betten” (*I keep dabbing the blood that is welling up*). The internet examples “Zij legden hun heer in bed, betten de wond met natte doeken, maar vergeefs.” (*They laid their lord in bed, dabbed the wound with wet towels, but to no purpose.*), source: http://www.beleven.org/verhalen/over_de_dankbaarheid [June 2011]) versus “Kashmir bette een klein straaltje bloed op Mainyu’s hals.” (*Kashmir dabbed a little stain of blood on Mainyu’s neck*), via Google-books, LaHaye & Jenkins (2003): Armageddon, Kampen: Uitgeverij Kok).

The verb *stelpen* is often combined with *bloed* as the direct object, as in the ANW-example “Voorzichtig probeerde zij het bloed te stelpen” (*Carefully she tried to stem the blood*), but it also occurs with the wound, as in the ANW-example “Bloedende wonden werden gestelpt” (*Bleeding wounds were stemmed*) or in internet-examples, such as “Gelukkig kon ik ze helpen en de wond stelpen met een pleister” (*Luckily, I could help them and stem the wound with a plaster*), source: http://mariekewillemsen.waarbenijt.nl/Reisverslag/?page=message&id=3847000 [June 2011].
Another example are the Dutch synonyms *printen* and *afdrukken* (both ‘to print’), which can both occur with a page or piece of paper paper and the image or text as a direct object. All these examples show that it is the general action expressed by a verb, rather than the prefix, that contributes to the possibility of MOC.

### 6.4 Prefixes, particles, prepositions and small clauses

One of the topics that give rise to discussion of MOC-alternations in English are so-called phrasal verbs or particle verbs (cf. e.g. Levin & Sells 2007). The particle is then considered to be responsible for the MOC (cf. McIntyre 2007). The underlying assumption is that the particle syntactically functions as a small clause, which affects the argument structure.

Examples (1) and (2) illustrate this. The a1) sentence is paralleled by an example like a2). The b-sentences are assumed to contain “unpredicated” particles (cf. Levin/Sells 2007: 2), since the direct object of the particle (the semantic ‘ground’) and not its subject (the semantic ‘figure’) occurs as the direct object in the sentence.150 In other words, the particles are unpredicated in the b)-sentences, since the dirt is off or out, whereas one cannot say that the window is off or the cloth is out.

(1) a.1 he hosed the dirt off
   a.2 / he hosed the dirt off the window
   b. he hosed the window off

(2) a.1 he rinsed the dirt out
   a.2 / he rinsed the dirt out of the cloth
   b. he rinsed the cloth out

The same issue is illustrated in example (3) for Dutch and in (4) for German (cf. McIntyre 2007: 356; cf. also Oya 2009).

(3) a.1 hij schonk thee in
   a.2 / hij schonk thee in het glas
   b. hij schonk het glas in
   ‘he poured tea into the glass’

---

150 It is interesting that the notions ‘figure’ and ‘ground’ are used, since these two notions originally come from gestalt psychology. The notion of a gestalt is also more generally crucial to metonymies (cf. Chapter II or section 7.2 below). Some scholars use the comparable terms ‘trajector’ and ‘landmark’ (cf. Talmy 2000: 253).
The two possible direct objects in these examples are claimed to correspond to the subject (the figure) and the direct object (the ground) of the particle, such as thee in het glas ('tea in the glass') or Heu auf dem Wagen ('hay on the wagon'). The particle is therefore seen as a kind of secondary predication (a small clause). The particles of the b-sentences are called “unpredicated”, since they lack the expression of their figures.

There are some problems with this reasoning, however. First of all, it is not universally accepted that a particle should be analysed as a secondary predication when it comes to Dutch and German (cf. Dehé et al. 2002). There is a crucial difference in the structure of complex verbs in Dutch and German on the one hand and in English on the other. In Dutch and German, the particle is to a larger extent part of the verb: Whereas the English phrasal verb is always written as two separate words, in Dutch and German this is only the case in finite forms in main clauses. The verb to rinse off, for instance, corresponds to the Dutch and German infinitives afspoelen / abspülen and the infinitive pour in to Dutch and German inschenken / eingießen.

Traditionally, Dutch and German particle verbs have therefore been analysed as a specific kinds of prefixes. The prefixes are distinct from standard prefixes, in that they are separated from the verb stem in finite forms in main clauses (as also illustrated in (3)). Verbal prefixes that are never separated from their verb stem are the Dutch prefixes be-, er-, ont-, ver- and the German ones be-, ent-, er-, ver-, zer-. Morphological elements which are related to prepositions such as Dutch aan-, af-, bij-, in-, om-, onder-, op-, over-, uit- and German ab-, an-, auf-, aus-, bei-, ein-, um-, unter-, über- are separated from their verb stem in some cases but not in others.

Although the Dutch and German tradition of linguistic research therefore makes a distinction between so-called inseparable and separable prefixes, the possibility of separable prefixes has been considered a contradictio in terminis by others (cf. e.g. Maylor 2002: 4). These scholars prefer to call them particles. However, in Dutch and German the difference between a prefix and a particle is not as straightforward as has sometimes been suggested.

Dutch and German particle verbs are well-known for two properties that prefix verbs lack. The first is that, as I pointed out above, the particle is separated from its

---

151 Example (4) requires the accusative den Wagen, because the verb expresses some movement. The expression of a static figure-ground relation with auf requires the dative dem Wagen.

152 All preposition-related elements in Table 5 come from verbs which do split.
verb stem in finite forms in main clauses. This is illustrated in sentences (5)-(8):
In finite form in main clauses the prefix and verbal base are not adjacent and are not
written as a single word, as in (8).

(5) Dutch: Hij wilde het vuil afspoelen.
    German: Er wollte den Schmutz abspülen.
    he wanted the dirt off-rinse

(6) Dutch: ..., omdat hij het vuil afspoelde
    German: ..., weil er den Schmutz abspülte
    ..., because he the dirt off-rinsed

(7) Dutch: Hij heeft het vuil afgespoeld.
    German: Er hat den Schmutz abgespült
    he has the dirt off-rinsed

(8) Dutch: Hij spoelde het vuil af.
    German: Er spülte den Schmutz ab.
    he rinsed the dirt off

A second difference between prefix verbs and particle verbs manifests itself in the
way in which past particles are formed, i.e. with or without the inflectional prefix
ge-. Like Dutch and German simplex verbs but unlike Dutch and German prefix
verbs, particle verbs form their past participles with -ge- (cf. (7)). For instance,
Dutch werken and German arbeiten (both ‘to work’) have as their past particles
gewerkt / gearbeitet, the prefix verbs verwerken and verarbeiten (both ‘to process /
handle’) have verwerkt / verarbeitet, while the particle verbs inwerken and
einarbeiten (‘to work up / settle in’) have ingewerkt / eingearbeitet.

A third property is the differential stress patterns of prefix and particle verbs:
Whereas particles can receive stress, prefixes are always unstressed.

It is sometimes claimed that these three properties indicate that particle verbs
actually consist of two separate words. If a particle verb actually consists of two
words, the particle should not be regarded as a morphological prefix and it could
indeed syntactically be analysed as a small clause (cf. e.g. Bennis et al. 1995).

However, other observations contradict the assumption that a verb-particle
combination in Dutch and German corresponds to two different words. For instance,
particle verbs occur as a unit in derivational processes. This indicates that they must
be considered single, complex words.

Illustrative in this respect are Dutch words such as afgrenzing (‘demarcation’) and
afgrensbaar (‘demarcatable’) or aflatting (‘draining’/‘tapping’) and aftapbaar
(‘possible to drain / to tap’). The words afgrenzen or aflatpen are particle verbs:

153 In Dutch grammar, particle verbs are therefore called samenkoppelingen (lit.: “together-
couplings”, i.e. ‘coupled units’) instead of samenstellingen (i.e. compounds) (cf. ANS 12.2.2.1).
They split in finite form in main clauses and they form their past participles with ...-ge... (afgegrensd and afgetaapt). However, if afgrenzen and aftappen are two words, the derivations should also be analysed as the combination of af- and the derivations *grenzing / *grensbaar and -*tapping / *tapbaar. Given that these latter forms do not exist as such, afgrenzing and aftapping should be considered to be derivations from the verbs aften or afgrenzen. As a consequence, these verbs should be considered single words (cf. also Neeleman & Weerman 1993: 439ff).

This analysis is also semantically more adequate. Words such as aften and afgrenzing simply denote the process or the result of the verbal action expressed by the verbs aften and afgrenzen. Parallels such as that between the prefix verb begrenzen - begrenzing - begrensbaar (‘to bound / to limit’ - ‘boundary / limitation’ - ‘boundable / limitatable’) and the particle verb afgrenzen - afgrenzing - afgrensbaar (‘to demarcate’ - ‘demarcation’ - ‘demarcatable’) prove elucidating in this respect.

A German example that also illustrates that particle verbs are involved as units in morphological processes is the verb sich überanstrengen (‘to overstrain oneself’). This verb is formed by the combination of über- (‘over-’) and anstrengen (‘to do one’s best’ / ‘to make an effort’). The stress pattern (überanstrengen), the past participle (überanstrengt) and the fact that the particle is not separated from its verbal stem in its finite forms classifies über- as a prefix. Since prefixes are attached to words, the basis anstrengen (‘to do one’s best’ / ‘to make an effort’), which is a particle verb, must also be a single word.

The fact that a particle verb is a semantic unit is also supported from a cross-linguistic perspective. The comparable Dutch and German verbs overslaan and überschlagen illustrate this. Both verbs literally mean “over-strike” and both can be translated as “to pass over” or “to skip”. However, only the Dutch verb overslaan is a particle verb (over- is stressed, it can be separated from the verb stem and the past participle is overgeslagen). The German überschlagen is a prefix verb (the stress is on the first syllable, it cannot split and the past participle is überschlagen). The opposite also occurs: The German equivalent of the Dutch prefix verb aanbidden (lit.: “to-pray”, i.e. ‘to worship / to admire’) is the particle verb anbeten (lit.: “to-pray”). Clearly, a cross-linguistic perspective shows that prefix verbs and particle

---

154 One could say that the conclusion that particle verbs must be single words because they occur in derivational processes (cf. Neeleman & Weerman 1993: 439) is not straightforward solely on the basis of morphological form, given the fact that there are plenty of other groups of words to which suffixes are attached. In Dutch grammars, such examples are called samenstellende afleidingen, i.e. ‘compounding derivations’ (cf. ANS 12·1·1 number 1; 12·3·3; 12·4·4·2). Examples are, for instance, blauwogig (“blue-eye-D”), blondlokkiig (“blond-hair-ED”), ondermaans (“under-moon-S”), tweeiewiler (“two-wheel-ER”), etc. None of the examples can be analysed as a word attached to a derivation (cf. *ogig; *lokkiig; *maans; *wiler) and in each of these examples the part before the suffix is a word group rather than a word (cf. *blauwog; *blondlok; *ondermaan; *tweeiewiel). The additional problem with words such as afgrensbaar or afgrenzing is that it is awkward from a semantic point of view to analyse them as not derived from afgrenzen or aften (cf. also Neeleman & Weerman 1993: 440-441, example overgeefsel (‘vomit’)).
verbs need not be very different semantically. This also makes it implausible that different syntactic analyses should be applied, the one with and the other without a small clause.

In addition to this, particle verbs are syntactically more restricted than other small clauses. Particles cannot, for instance, be questioned or topicalised and focus markers cannot be placed in between the particle and the verb (cf. Neeleman & Weerman 1993: 438).

Two different analyses of Dutch particle verbs, therefore, have been made. Some syntacticians (such as Weerman) analyse (3)a as involving a complex verb (*in-schenken / ein-gießen) with a direct object. In bracket notation, this looks like (9). Others (such as Bennis) analyse the particle as a secondary predication (a small clause) in line with Levin & Sells or Oya, i.e. as in (10) (cf. Bennis et al. 1995).

(9)  \[ \text{V'} \ [\text{NP thee}] \ [\text{V [Prt in-]} \ [\text{V schenken}]] \]
(10)  \[ \text{V'} \ [\text{V schenken}] \ [\text{PrtP [NP thee][Prt in-]}] \]

Although a full discussion of this syntactic problem (cf. Dehé et al. 2002) is beyond the scope of this dissertation, the two existing analyses (cf. also Zeller 2002) clearly illustrate that an account in terms of secondary predication is problematic. Apart from the problem associated with the secondary predication analysis, there are several other reasons which cast doubt upon Levin and Sells’ view that particle verbs with different possible objects such as (1)a1 and (1)b or (2)a1 and (2)b can are comparable with a simplex verb and a PP, as in the a2)-sentences of (1) and (2) (cf. page 145).

First of all, it should be noted that a prepositional phrase with a location or a semantic ground cannot only be added to a sentences with a simplex verb; in Dutch and German, the same prepositional phrase is often found in combination with the particle verbs themselves. This is illustrated in (11) and (12).

155 A comparable discussion is ongoing concerning verbs with prepositional complements, such as begin on or long for. The traditional syntactic vision is that a verb selects the preposition and the preposition selects a complement (cf. Haslinger 2001). Within brackets, this would be, for example, long for: \[\text{VP [V long]} \ [\text{PP [P for]} \ [\text{comp something}]]\]. The problem is, however, that this analysis is not in line with the intuitions of language users. They consider the complement to be a verbal rather than particle complement, i.e. \[\text{VP [V long]} \ [\text{PP [P for]} \ [\text{comp something}]]\]. This clash between syntactic analyses and linguistic intuitions has also been called the “bracketing paradox” by Neeleman (1997). With particle verbs analysed as in (10), the same problem arises. One of the advantages of an analysis that analyses particle verbs as complex verbs (as in (9)) is that it avoids a bracketing paradox for particle verbs.

156 I did not find example (11) as such, but comparable examples can be found without any problems. Compare, for instance, the German examples “Diese Leichen sind aus 87 Grabstätten ausgegraben worden.” (“These bodies were dug up [lit. ‘out’] out of 87 graves”) [taken from the DWDS-corpus] or “Wenn der sibirische Salamander aus dem
These examples once again cast doubt upon the view that a particle verb is comparable with a simplex verb and a prepositional phrase.\textsuperscript{157}

Secondly, in some cases of MOC there is no simplex verb combined with a PP that is equivalent to particle verb with different possible objects. The sentences in (13) illustrate this.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{a._1 Dutch}: de kip broedde kuikens uit
  \textit{German}: das Huhn brütete Küken aus
  \textit{the chicken hatched chicks out}
  \item \textit{b. Dutch}: de kip broedde eieren uit
  \textit{German}: das Huhn brütete Eier aus
  \textit{the chicken hatched eggs out}
  \item \textit{a._2 Dutch}: *de kip broedde kuikens uit de eieren
  \textit{German}: *das Huhn brütete Küken aus den Eiern
  \textit{the chicken hatched chicks out the eggs}
\end{itemize}

According to Hundsnurscher (1986: 126), the particle in \textit{ausbrüten} has an aspectual meaning rather than a locative one. Sentences, such as (13) \textit{a._1}, \textit{a._2} and \textit{b}, are claimed to support the view that the prefix in \textit{ausbrüten} and presumably also in \textit{uitbroeden} have the aspectual meaning of hatching the eggs to emergence.\textsuperscript{158} The sentences in (13) show that this object change cannot be caused by a figure and a ground which are connected by the particle. But if this is not the case in (13), it can
durchgefahrenen Boden ausgegraben wird, krabbelt er bald munter herum.” (‘When he has been dug up [lit. ‘out’] out of the frozen ground, the Siberian salamander crawls around happily’) [taken from Müller/Frings (2009): Tier- Und Humanphysiologie: Eine Einführung, Springer Verlag, p. 616]. Comparable Dutch examples from the ANW-corpus are “die lieten ze eerst met de handen de mijnen uitgraven uit het veld” (‘they let them first dig up [lit. ‘out’] with their hands the mines out of the fields’) or “Ze waren naar de kapstok gelopen, hadden hun jassen uitgegraven uit de berg donkere wollen mannenmantels” (‘They had walked to the coat rack, they had dug up [lit. ‘out’] their coats out of the pile of dark woollen men’s coats’).\textsuperscript{157} Other scholars contrast sentences with a complex verb and an added PP, such as in (11) and (12), with comparable sentences with the other noun as a direct object (cf. McIntyre 2001: 5, 262). The problem with this analysis is, however, that the PPs in (11) and (12) are optional (cf. chapter VI, §2.1 and cf. also examples (14)-(21) below).

\textsuperscript{157} However, diachronically the aspectual meaning has probably been developed on the basis of the locative meaning. Furthermore, one could of course severely question whether, from a synchronic perspective, the locative meaning does not play any role.
be questioned why it would be the case in other examples. Furthermore, examples in which the locative and aspectual meanings overlap, as is the case with austrinken (lit.: “out-drink”; ‘to drink out / empty by drinking / finish by drinking’) (cf. McIntyre 2001: 17ff; Zeller 2001: 19-22) also become difficult to analyse.

In many examples, it is simply not entirely clear what the precise semantic contribution of the particle is (cf. also the discussion of op- / auf- and aan- / an- in footnote 163 and 164). This can be illustrated further by the Dutch verb insmeren. The verb insmeren with a locatum-object can combine with the location in a PP introduced by in, as was the case with inschenken in (11). However, different prepositions also occur in such PPs. They do not need to correspond to the particle in-. This is illustrated in the Dutch examples (14)-(17), which are taken from the internet.159

(14) Als [...], dan kan je de olie insmeren in je haar
if [...], then can you the oil in-rub in your hair.
‘If..., then you can rub the oil into your hair.’

(15) , de zalf goed insmeren tussen de haren.
, the ointment good in-rub between/amongst the hairs.
‘, rub the ointment in carefully between the hairs.’

(16) Er staat dat je het spul moet insmeren op de onbedekte huid.
there stands that you the stuff must in-rub on the uncovered skin
‘It says that one should rub the stuff on the uncovered skin.’

(17) Smeer nu uw tattoo in met zalf.
rub now your tattoo in with ointment

De zalf moet je goed op de tattoo insmeren, ...
the ointment must you good on the tattoo in-rub

‘Rub your tattoo with ointment. The ointment must be carefully rubbed into the tattoo’

In most cases the verb insmeren (lit.: “in-rub”, ‘to rub (in) / to put on’) is combined with a location as its direct object, as in je haar insmeren (‘to rub your hair’), je huid insmeren (‘to rub your skin’), iemand insmeren (‘to rub someone’), etc (cf. also (17)). Although what is put on the skin or hair, such as some oil or ointment, does not occur particularly frequently as the direct object of this particle verb, sentences (14)-(17) show that this construction is possible. However, in these cases the original location object, such as the skin or hair, can occur in a PP with several

---

different prepositions. Only in example (14) does the preposition used for the location correspond to the particle, i.e. *in*. Examples (15)-(17) use *tussen* and *op*. The fact that different prepositions occur in the location-PP shows once again that it is problematic to claim that a location is predicated by the particle. The specific semantic contribution of the particle remains vague: Rather, the verb is a semantic unit.

The fact that particle verbs are not equivalent to simplex verbs combined with a PP can also be illustrated by internet-examples, such as (18)-(21).160

(18) Aziatische dames smeren olie in hun haar
    Asian ladies rub oil in their hair
    ‘Asian ladies rub oil in their hair’

(19) Om je haar een echte boost te geven
    for your hair a real boost to give
    kan je je haren insmeren met olie
    can you your hairs in-rub with oil
    ‘In order to give your hair a real boost, you can rub your hair with oil’

(20) Hoe vaak moet ik nou die uierzalf op de tattoo smeren?
    how often should I again that udder-cream on the tattoo rub
    ‘How often should I rub that udder cream on the tattoo again?’

(21) Als de korstjes erop zitten
    if the scabs there-on [=on it] sit
    kun je de tattoo dun insmeren met uierzalf
    can you the tattoo thin in-rub with udder-cream
    ‘If there are scabs on the tattoo, you can rub it in with udder cream’

If sentences such as (14), (18) and (19) lead to the idea that we could treat the *b* sentence on a par with *a* in (22), then the internet-examples (17), (20) and (21) give rise to the idea that we could also compare the examples under (23).

(22) a.₁ olie **insmeren** (in je haar) [cf. example (14)]
    a.₂ olie **smeren** in je haar [cf. example (18)]
    b. je haar **insmeren** [cf. example (19)]

160 Sources: http://www.xead.nl/mooi-haar-zonder-kapper--10-tips-voor-de-gewone-vrouw;
http://girlintomakeup.blogspot.com/2010/10/haar-verzorgen.html;
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(23) a.₁ uierzalf insmeren (op de tattoo) [cf. example (17)]
    a.₂ uierzalf smeren op de tattoo [cf. example (20)]
    b. de tattoo insmeren [cf. example (21)]

This is clearly problematic and very implausible. The fact that these prepositional phrases have the same function whether they occur in combination with particle verbs or with simplex verbs shows that the location-direct object in (19) or (21) is nothing more than the direct object of the particle verb itself. The verb is a semantic unit, in which the exact contribution of the particle has become vague.

Last but not least, an analysis which assumes that sentences a₁), a₂) and b) are similar, as is shown in (1) and (2) (page 145), ignores the fact that sometimes there are formal differences between particles and prepositions. This is illustrated by Dutch inschenken and German eingießen in (24) and (25) (cf. example (3) on page 145).

(24) a.₁ thee inschenken
    a.₂ thee in het glas schenken
    b. het glas inschenken
(25) a.₁ Tee eingießen
    a.₂ Tee in das Glas gießen
    b. das Glas eingießen

In Dutch, the particle predication can be illustrated by thee in het glas (cf. page 145). It is questionable whether this is also possible in German, since the particle ein- cannot be used as a preposition. The only possibility is to paraphrase the ein-predication by Tee in das Glas.

This is crucial, since it once again points towards a problem in assuming that sentences like a₁), a₂) and b) are similar. In the German example (25), only the sentences under a₁ and b contain the same particle. Because of the difference between German in and ein, it is doubtful whether the particle verb can be compared with a simplex verb and a prepositional phrase, as is often done for English (as in (1) and (2), page 145). In other words, whereas Dutch resembles English, as in sentences (24) a₁), (24) a₂) and (24) b), a difference between the two constructions becomes visible in German.

This issue is not only relevant for Dutch and German. In fact, the same problem can be found in English. Levin and Sells compare hose the dirt off with hose the dirt off the window and rinse the dirt out with rinse the dirt out of the cloth (compare examples (1) and (2)). It is taken for granted that only in the latter case similar forms are compared (viz. off and off). The particle out is compared with the preposition out of. One might wonder why rinse the dirt out would be similar to rinse the dirt out of the cloth. This question is important, because it once again casts doubt on the view
that one could compare a particle verb with a simplex verb with a prepositional phrase.

Note also that some of the formal differences between prepositions and particles in Dutch and German are reversed in English. The examples under (26) and (27) illustrate this.

(26) a. **English:** he hosed the dirt off

   ((he hosed the dirt off the window)
   
   **Dutch:** hij spoelde het vuil af

   ((hij spoelde het vuil *af het raam / van het raam)

   **German:** er spülte den Schmutz ab

   ((/er spülte den Schmutz *ab dem Fenster / vom Fenster)

   b. **English:** he hosed the window off

   **Dutch:** hij spoelde het raam af

   **German:** er spülte das Fenster ab

(27) a. **English:** he rinsed the dirt out

   ((he rinsed the dirt *out the cloth / out of the cloth)

   **Dutch:** hij spoelde het vuil uit

   ((hij spoelde het vuil uit de kleding)

   **German:** er spülte den Schmutz aus

   ((/er spülte den Schmutz aus den Klamotten)

   b. **English:** he rinsed the cloth out

   **Dutch:** hij spoelde de kleding uit

   **German:** er spülte die Klamotten aus

In English the particle *off* corresponds to the preposition *off*, whereas the particle *out* corresponds to the preposition *out of*. In Dutch and German, these formal differences are reversed: The particles and prepositions have the same form for *uit* and *aus*, but differ for *off*-equivalents. It is impossible to add the Dutch *af*- or the German *ab*- to these sentences. In Dutch *af* only occurs as a postposition in fixed expressions (such as *fabriek af*, i.e. ‘ready from/in the factory’, Van Dale 2005) or in regional usage. Its status as a postposition is often unclear (cf. Beliën 2008). German *ab* is not a preposition either and hardly ever occurs as a postposition.

The preposition *van* / *von* is an alternative, but prepositional phrases introduced by these prepositions also occur freely with particle verbs, as illustrated in (28) or (29) (compare sentence (11)).

\[161\] Cf. for example from the ANW-corpus: “Ik spoel die rotzooi **van** me af.” (‘I rinse that dirt **from** me off/down’), “om het vele al kristalvormige zout **van** onze huid af te spoelen” (‘for rinsing off/down much already crystallized salt **off** our skin’), “De storm van het afgelopen weekend heeft alle jonge grijze zeehonden **van een zandplaat** ten zuiden van Vlieland afgespoeld.” (‘Last weekend’s storm has rinsed all the young grey seals **off**/down from a **sandbar** southwards of Vlieland’) or from the DWDS: “**daß wir mit Wasser und mit immer frischem Wasser das ewige Blut des Mordes **von der Diele** abspülen” (‘that we rinse the
(28)  hij spoelde het vuil van het raam af
(29)  er spülte den Schmutz von dem Fenster ab

Furthermore, the prepositional phrases are optional in actual instances of MOC. With afspoelen (‘to rinse off’), for instance, when the locatum is in direct object position the van-PP is absent in almost half the cases (100 - 55.6 = 44.4%). Although numbers are very small in the case of German abspülen (‘to rinse off’), the locatum also mostly occurs as a direct object without a von-phrase. 162 Table 6 and Table 7 give the exact numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>query</th>
<th>location object</th>
<th>locatum object</th>
<th>unclear/other (e.g. intrans)</th>
<th>total + van-PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spoelen &amp; af (0-10)</td>
<td>[73]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“af te spoelen”</td>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afgespoeld</td>
<td>[34]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANW</td>
<td>[130]</td>
<td>83 (63.8%)</td>
<td>27 (20.8%)</td>
<td>20 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Afspoelen with locatum and location objects in the ANW-corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>query</th>
<th>location object</th>
<th>locatum object</th>
<th>unclear/other (e.g. intrans)</th>
<th>total + von-PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spülen #7 ab with $p=PTKVZ16$</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abspülen / abgespült</td>
<td>[110]</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DWDS</td>
<td>[126]</td>
<td>87 (69.0%)</td>
<td>12 (9.5%)</td>
<td>27 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Abspülen with locatum and location objects in the DWDS-corpus

eternal blood of the murder off/down from the hallway with water, with endless fresh water’, ‘die alles von dir absprült’ (‘which rinses down/off all from you’).

162 Examples of ANW-sentences without a van-phrase are “Spoel bij het douchen het stof eerst af met water” (‘First rinse off the dust with water while showering’), “om het zand tussen zijn tenen af te spoelen” (‘for rinsing off the sand between his toes’), “omdat het vuil er regelmatig door de regen wordt afgespoeld.” (‘because the dirt gets regularly rinsed off by the rain.’), and DWDS-sentences without von are “den Sand des Strandes abspülen” (‘rinse the sand of the beach off’), “da das Öl durch das Wasser wieder abgespült wird” (‘while the oil is rinsed off by the water’), etc.
English is probably slightly different in this respect, because it allows a prepositional phrase less readily with a particle verb. I will come back to the use of additional PPs in the next chapter.

The observations in this section show that it is a simplification to treat particle verbs on a par with simplex verbs and a comparable prepositional phrase: There are formal differences between prepositions and particles; the same prepositional phrases can be added to the particle verb itself; sometimes it is even possible to use different prepositions; and the particle can have a different meaning. Therefore, it is also doubtful whether Dutch and German particles should be analysed as small clauses. The facts discussed in this section show that object changes cannot be triggered exclusively by particle predication, and that they should not be analysed as mere shifts in the realisation of a single underlying syntactic structure.

6.5 Particle verbs and the relation between both possible objects

Despite all these caveats, it cannot be denied that morphologically complex verbs often exhibit MOC. As illustrated in Table 5 on page 142, the dictionary data also clearly indicate this. This section will clarify how this positive correlation of MOCs and particles can be explained semantically. In fact, the observation that morphologically complex verbs often allow MOC perfectly fits the metonymical character of the object changes: The combination of verb and prefix helps in understanding the underlying contiguity relation between both direct objects (i.e. the gestalt).

This also explains why some particles or prefixes turn out to be more important than others. Of Adelung’s 101 morphologically complex verbs labelled “metonymisch” 38 are formed with *ab*- , 4 with *an*- , 13 with *auf*- , 45 with *aus*- , one with the prefix *be*- (cf. Table 5). The Dutch data also show that particular morphological elements are more important than others. Even though Table 5 does not represent all possible MOCs and also includes a number of specific combinations and some archaic verbs (as discussed in §3), the table clearly shows the tendency of the particles *af*- and *uit*- , like German *ab*- and *aus*- (cf. also Carlberg 1948: 27; McIntyre 2001: 276), to be of fundamental importance for MOCs.

These facts can be explained by the meaning of the particles. The contiguity relation between the two possible objects (i.e. being one gestalt) is corroborated by the meaning of the particles. Both *af*- and *uit*- or *ab*- and *aus*- make the metonymical shift easier to understand, because they reflect the fact that both possible objects are one gestalt: If something is taken off something else or out of something else, the verbal action applies to one single object and its parts (an object or a container with its content).

Particles with a meaning opposite to *af/-ab*- and *uit/-aus*- also occur with MOCs, although to a lesser extent. In German, for instance, verbs with the prefix *auf*- also sometimes allow MOC and the same goes for *ein-. Cases with the prefix *ein-* are be illustrated by examples that are not incorporated in Table 5, such as, among many
other verbs, Adelung’s *einschenken*, “in-pour” (tagged as “figürlich”) or Sanders’ *einlegen*, “in-lay” (tagged as “meton.”). The same applies to Dutch particles such as in- (cf. *inleggen*; “to inlay”, *inpakken*, “to pack”; *innuimen*, “to put in”; *inschenken* “to pour (in)”; etc.) and to a lesser extent to *op*. Furthermore, MOC with particle verbs with *aan- / an-* also occur in Dutch and German (cf. however McIntyre 2001: 276).

These facts also make sense from a metonymical perspective. These particles shape the context of a single gestalt involved in the verbal action. However, this gestalt only occurs as a result of the action. In contrast to particle verbs with *af-/lab- and uit-iaus-*, which act on a given single gestalt, particle verbs with *in-/ein, auf-/op- or aan-/an-* express an action applied to two separate entities, which are going to be connected as a result of the verbal action.

Simplex verbs exhibit the same character in this respect: Among MOC-tagged simplex verbs there are slightly more verbs which express that something is removed rather than that something is added. If we only look at locative shifts,

163 Some examples with *op*- and *auf*- cannot be analysed as the particle connecting a figure and a ground, but must be seen as the figure moving up with respect to its previous position. If MOC is possible in such cases, it is of a different kind, such as, for instance, with Adelung’s *Hefe / Bier aufrühren* (“to stir (up) yeast / beer”) or with the Dutch dictionary example *vaal / de vloer opdoen* (“to sweep (up) dirt / the floor”, lit.: “up-do”). Furthermore, in some tagged examples the particle has a non-locative meaning as in *opruimen* and *aufräumen* (“to clear up”) or in Adelung’s example *Feuer / Kohle aufblasen* (“to blow the fire / coal”). In addition, Adelung gives the nowadays old-fashioned or unusual examples: *Haare / Frau aufschleifen* (“to braid hair / a woman”), *Gürtel / Pferd aufgürten* (“to put a belt on a horse”), *Weste / sich aufknöpfen / aufschnüren / aufschürzen* (“to put a vest on”), *Hut / sich aufsetzen* (“to put a hat on”), *die Ärmel / sich aufstreifen* (“to roll up one’s sleeves”), *Kind / Windel aufwindeln* (“to take off a baby’s nappy”). Examples with the particle *op-* or *auf-* that connect a figure and a ground which can both occur as the direct object of the sentence are Dutch *opgieten* (“to pour (up)on”), *opladen* (“to load up”), *opschenken* (“to pour (up)on”), *opspuiten* (lit.: “up-spray”, i.e. “to raise ground-level (by adding soil, sand, etc.)”) and German *aufdecken* (“to cover”), *auffüllen* (“to fill up”), *aufgießen / aufschütteln* (“to pour (up)on”). Another possible example with locative *auf-* or *op-* could be German *Garn / einen Knäuel aufwickeln* (lit.: “yarn / a ball up-wind”) or Dutch *garen / klosje opdrukten* (lit.: “yarn / bobbin up-turn”).

164 Relevant examples in Adelung are Klamotten / *sich anziehen* (“to put on clothes / *oneself”) (cf. McIntyre 2001: 276) and die *Pferde / den Wagen anspannen* (“to unharness horses / *a cart”). German examples such as *jemanden / den Ball anspielen* (“to pass someone the ball”, lit: “at-play”) and examples in which the particle has a slightly different meaning are *das Feuer / den Ofen anschüren* (“to poke up the fire / stove”), *Holz / ein Feuer anzünden* (“to light wood / a fire”), *Wasser / Brunnen anzapfen* (“to tap water / sources”) also display MOC. Relevant Dutch dictionary examples are *cement / de muur aansmeren* (“to daub cement / the wall”, lit.: “on-smear”), *iemand / de bal aanspelen* (“to pass someone the ball”, lit: “at-play”), *aarde / een poot aanstamper* (“to tamp (down) soil / the crops”), and *de muur / gaten aanvullen* (“to fill up the wall / holes”) or slightly different examples such as *et vuur / de kachel aansteken* (“to light the fire / the heater”), *geld / de spaarpot aanspreken* (“to break into one’s capital / money box”, lit.: “on-speak”) and *een toets / een noot aan slaan* (“to strike a key / note”). Other dictionary examples from Table 5 (cf. the appendix) are old-fashioned or occur in very specific contexts only.
German dictionaries provide five simplex verbs expressing addition (träufen (‘to drip’), impfen (‘to inject’), packen (‘to pack’), pflanzen (‘to plant’), stopfen (‘to stuff’) and seven verbs expressing the removal of something (kehren (‘to sweep’), klauben (regional verb for ‘to gather’), lesen (‘to gather’/’to pick’), lösen (‘to unload’), lösen (in the meaning ‘to fire’), mähen (‘to mow’), quetschen (‘to squeeze’)). Only in the latter group is the action performed upon a single gestalt.

The same can be observed in Dutch. Among the simplex verbs tagged in dictionaries, there are ten examples of gestalts coming into being as a result of the action expressed by the verb and twenty-one verbs which express that an existing gestalt is changed or split. The first group consist of enten (‘to graft’), pakken (‘to pack’), stampen (‘to cram’), stouwen (‘to cram’), strijken (‘to brush’/’to spread’), schenken (‘to pour’), stroppen (‘to tie up’), tatoëëren (‘to tattoo’) and vullen (‘to fill’). The second group includes borstelen (‘to brush’), kappen (‘to chop (down)’), krabben (‘to scrape’), lichten (‘to empty’/’to unload’), persen (‘to press’/’to squeeze’), ruimen (‘to clear’), stelpen (‘to stem/to dab’), strippen (‘to strip’), stroppen (‘to skin’), tappen (‘to tap’), trimmen (‘to trim’), vegen (‘to sweep’/’to wipe’), villen (‘to skin’), vreten (‘to eat (away)’), wassen (‘to wash’), wieden (‘to weed’) wissen (‘to wipe’), wringen (‘to wring’), ziften (‘to sieve’), zuigen (‘to suck’) and zweigen (‘to gulp’).

This shows that the possibility of connecting a part of a gestalt to a verb makes most sense, if two objects are connected before the verbal action has taken place. This is especially the case with af-/ab- and uit-/aus-. In other words, particle verbs are involved in MOCs more often than simplex verbs, because the particle endorses and also specifies the conceptual closeness of the two possible objects (cf. Sweep 2009b: 109). This makes the metonymical shift possible and readily understandable.165

Interestingly, although Levin and Sells analyse MOC as being caused by predication of the particle as a small clause, and although they do not connect this phenomenon to metonymy, they have made partly comparable observations for English (cf. Levin & Sells 2007). Levin and Sells do not explicitly recognise the importance of the contiguity relation between the possible direct objects, but they do

165 On the basis of the WNT data in Table 5, one might think that the prefix om- plays a role with MOC. The problem is that this prefix has several different meanings. The locative meaning as in ‘(a)round’ does not seem to play a role for MOCs, but the meaning of om- as ‘re-’ or ‘from something into something’ does play an important role in such verbs. This can be illustrated by omgieten / omschenken (‘to pour into something else’/’to decant’), omploen / omloopen (‘to plough (up)’), omladen (‘reload’/’load into something else’) or ompakken (‘repack’/’pack into something else’). The equivalents of these verbs, such as repack or plough up, also show metonymical behaviour in English. Cf. internet examples such as “After breakfast, Brian and I begin to repack equipment into the van” (http://cerbyd.blogspot.com/2011/03/tuesday.html) versus “Then my dad would repack the van with our luggage” (http://www.freakbacon.com/archives/881) [April 2011] or the BNC-examples “The field is then ploughed up, fertilized, and resown to another crop.” versus “some growers in Bedfordshire have been so disappointed with the insect pollinators’ efforts that they have ploughed up their crops to put in linseed or leave fields fallow.”.
acknowledge the fact that the particle endorses this relation: They explicitly discuss how the particle determines the relation between the figure and the ground (i.e. between both possible objects). They state that “the particle by its nature relates a Figure (the material) to a Ground (the location)” (2007: 5), and that “out and off […] represent spatial relations between the Figure and the Ground that are compatible with the removing nature of the events” (2007: 16-17). The particle on hardly ever occurs with a shifted object, because the relation of the Figure and Ground in these cases is such that “the Ground does not impose any limitations on the spatial extent of the Figure” (2007: 17). From a metonymical perspective, Levin and Sells’ observations demonstrate that the contiguity relation between the two possible objects (i.e. being one gestalt) is more obvious in the context of English out or off than in the context of on.166 The particle on has no direct equivalent in Dutch and German. It is sometimes translated into Dutch and German with in-/ein- (‘in’) or op-/auf- (‘up’/‘on’), but it also occasionally corresponds with aan-/an- (‘at’/‘on’). Oya, for instance, discusses why German aufladen and Dutch opladen can be combined with both location and locatum in the direct object, while English to load on can only be combined with a location (Oya 2009). Oya claims that the difference is caused by different underlying structures corresponding to the particles in Dutch and German on the one hand and in English on the other. The problem with this explanation is that it is very doubtful whether the verbs aufladen and opladen should be translated as ‘to load on’.

Dictionaries do not consider the two verbs as equivalents of to load on, but rather of to load up (or just of to load (on x)) (cf. the German on-line dictionaries http://en.pons.eu/ or http://dict.leo.org/ and for Dutch Van Dale 2006 Engels-Nederlands).

In fact, like German aufladen and Dutch opladen, the verb to load up does allow MOC. It does not only combine with a location, but also with the locatum. The

166 In fact, Levin and Sells assume the same for English in, which explains why one cannot *pack a suitcase in or *rub your face in (cf., however, chapter VI, especially footnote 217). They recognise that there are exceptions to the idea that particle verbs with in do not alternate, such as to fill in (2007: 150). Although the fact that many particle verbs with in do not alternate in English is unexpected considering the present account, Levin and Sells explanation is highly problematic with respect to Dutch and German data. Dutch and German instead provide evidence for the analysis that the particles as such do not play a crucial role. In this respect, it should also be noted that English equivalents of Dutch and German particle verbs with in- and ein- do often alternate, but that these equivalents have totally different structures. Consider inleggen / einlegen which are translated as inlay (cf. gold inlaid into wood / wood inlaid with gold), inspuiten / einspritzen (‘in-spray’) which corresponds to the alternating to inject (or to to spray), inruimen / einräumen (‘in-clear’) which should be translated as to put into or even as to clear out and inschenken / eingießen (‘in-pour’) which is mostly translated with to pour (out) (for a discussion of the latter construction cf. chapter VI, §4.2).

167 Oya also uses his analysis to explain that inschenken in does not alternate, whereas Dutch and German inschenken and eingießen do. However, the verb to pour shows complicated behaviour in many respect, as I will explain in full detail in chapter VI, §4.2.
BNC-examples under (30)-(32) illustrate this. The a-sentences provide examples with locutums and the b-sentences have locations as direct objects.

(30)  
a. The following day I hired a van, loaded up my possessions and then handed over my keys to the landlord.  
b. Charlie loaded up the van, then climbed in.

(31)  
a. Before you load up your board on the car to go off in search of solitude, ...  
b. Just pack your bags and load up the car

(32)  
a. and it’s like all the good things you ever wanted are loaded up onto a train  
b. but somehow they always knew when the train was being loaded up with tanks

To summarise, although particles are not of fundamental importance for MOC, they often reflect a strong contiguity relation of the objects. Contiguity relations are endorsed most strongly by Dutch particles such as af- and uit- and in-, op-, and aan-and by German particles such as ab- and aus-, and auf-, ein- and an-. The particles which express a removal of something (i.e. af-/uit- and ab-/aus-) occur more readily with MOC, because the verbal action applies to a single gestalt from the start. With the particles that express the addition of something (in-/op-/aan- and auf-/ein-/an-) the action expressed by the verb results in a single gestalt. More restrictions on the possibility of MOC will be discussed in the analysis of actual usage of MOCs in chapter VI-VIII. First, I will examine in the next section the contiguity relations involved in all kinds of MOCs.

7. Metonymical Object Changes: Contiguity types

7.1 Problems with a division into verb classes

At the beginning of section 6, I divided verbs allowing MOC into semantic classes, such as verbs of movement (removal or adding), verbs of creation (or repair) and eventive verbs. Although the different classes are immediately evident when analysing the set of over 400 verbs, there are some problems with these three coarse-grained classes.

First of all, even though the division is coarse-grained, it is questionable whether the difference between verbs of removal and verbs of adding is really useful. Some semantically opposite verbs display exactly the same metonymical behaviour. An example is the verb pair to load - to unload, which can both (in English as well as in Dutch)\(^{168}\) be combined with the container that is loaded or unloaded or with the

---

\(^{168}\) The German verb *laden* allows this shift only according to some speakers, cf. chapter VI, §4.3.
contents that are loaded into or out of this container. These MOCs are so similar that it would be more adequate to place them together instead of classifying them into two different categories: The possible types of objects are similar and so is their relation, even with respect to the verbal action. This could be an indication that it is not the meaning of the verb, but rather the contiguity relation between both possible direct objects that is crucial.

Secondly, implicitly different types of contiguity relations between both possible objects have already been used within the presentation of the different types of verbs. The group of creation verbs was also shown to involve different types of shifts, such as between material and result/product (riet / een dak vlechten, ‘to weave reeds / a roof’), between ingredient and result/product (sinaasappels / sap persen and Orangen / Orangensaft (aus)pressen, ‘to squeeze orange juice / oranges’) or between the means and its result/product (gitaar / lied tokkelen and eine Gitarre / Melodie zupfen, ‘to strum a guitar / a song’). Interestingly, other SOURCE-RESULT shifts even occur within verbs that do not express a real creation activity. Illustrative are the Dutch and German verbs uitbroeden or ausbrüten (‘to hatch (out)’), which can be combined with eggs as well as with chicks. This shows that rather than the creation activity, the contiguity relation as such plays a role.169

A third problem is that some verbs cannot be clearly placed within one single class, but instead appear to belong to two different classes at the same time. Illustrative is the example to dig sand out (of a ditch/for a ditch) or to dig a ditch out (in the sand). Should this be considered a shift concerning a removal verb, like to clear, since the sand is taken away from the location where the ditch will be realised or should we classify this as a creation verb, since a ditch is made or re-made by digging out the sand? When thinking about such questions, it becomes clear that the result plays a role even within shifts such as with to clear: If one clears away the tableware from a table, one ends up with a cleared table. Such observations make it difficult to classify these verbs within the verb classes, although the objects involved and the general relations between them are the same.

Not only does an examination of the contiguity relations provide a better classification of similar shifts, but it also provides a more fine-grained analysis of some shifts. This can be illustrated with the verbs to squeeze and to squeeze out (or Dutch persen - uitpersen and German pressen - auspressen / keltern - auskeltern). These two different verbs allow the same two types of objects, such as oranges and orange juice. The two objects can be seen as one gestalt, existing in a locative PART-WHOLE relation. This explains the similarity of all MOCs, which cannot be seen if one only takes into account the meaning of the verb. On a more detailed level, however, the PART-WHOLE relation of the orange and the orange juice can be classified as a SOURCE/MATERIAL-RESULT relation in the case of to squeeze, whereas they display a CONTAINER-CONTENT relation in the case of to squeeze out. This

169 Implicitly, Levin also agrees with this view by making a distinction between locative alternations in general and alternations that shift between added images and their locations (cf. also Levin 1993: 66-67). All verbs can acquire the location as a direct object as well as something that is added to this location, which could be an added object or an image.
corresponds with the difference in verb classes, i.e. a removal verb (squeeze out) or a creation verb (squeeze). An examination of the contiguity relations involved at different levels of abstraction simultaneously shows both generalisations and differences between some shifts. The similarity of these shifts remains unnoticed, if only the verb semantics is taken into account.

The verb to dig out can be used to illustrate the same issue. If to dig out is categorised as a verb of removal, the contiguity relation between the ditch and the sand is LOCATION-LOCATUM, but if to dig out expresses the creation of a ditch, the relation between the sand and the ditch becomes SOURCE-RESULT. On a more abstract level, however, the ditch and the sand form one gestalt. Contiguity relations analysed on several levels of abstraction (cf. the next section) provide an equally detailed explanation, while at the same time accounting for the similarity and the difference of the shift. As said above, the parallel or even overlap between shifts with locative verbs and creation verbs remains unrevealed, if only the meaning of the verb is taken into account.

A fourth argument for focussing on the objects involved is the fact that some systematic shifts can primarily be classified by their types of objects. Object shifts occur fairly frequently between, for instance, ropes or wires and objects involved with these ropes, such as the knots or the objects that they tie up. Dutch dictionary examples such as korten (‘to shorten’), losgooien (‘to loose’), vieren (‘to slacken’), opbinden (‘to tie up’), ontknoppen (‘to unravel / to disentangle’), stroppen (‘to tie up’) illustrate this. Although they display similar MOCs, they cannot really be captured within one verbal group. The relation between the rope and the other object involved turns out to be crucial in making the similarity of shifts clear.

Another group of MOCs is based on the contiguity relation between fire or light and the objects involved. Illustrative are Dutch verbs such as aansteken (‘to light’), or Adelung’s example aufblasen (lit.: “up-blow”) or its synonym anblasen (lit.: “at-blow”) (‘to blow’), which can be combined with a fire or the coal.170 In fact, many more verbs that have to do with fire allow an object shift between the fire and the source of the fire, such as the Dutch blussen (‘to extinguish’), ontvlammen (‘to enflame’), ontsteken (‘to light’) or the German anzünden (‘to light’), anschüren (‘to poke up’), lodern (‘to set alight’), andlöschen (‘to extinguish’). These verbs can only be grouped on the basis of the two types of direct objects and the relation between them. Apparently, a fire and what is on fire are conceptually so strongly connected, that if the verb expresses a relation with the fire, it simultaneously takes on this same relation with the burning object.

In a similar way, MOCs often shift between holes and the objects in which these holes can be found. Different groups of verbs allow shifts between objects and the holes in them. The class of reparation verbs often occurs with such shifts. Examples are to repair the roof / the hole or to darn stockings / holes. However, verbs of the class that express some movement of attaching or filling (cf. Table 4: class I.2) also occur with the object and holes which are filled. This can be illustrated by a Dutch

---

170 Some of these verbs, such as aansteken, can also be combined with objects such as stoves and heaters. I will discuss this in full detail in the next section.
dictionary example such as *aanvullen* (‘to fill (up/in)’), or a German verb such as *stopfen* (‘to darn’ / lit.: “to stuff”). Note that these shifts cannot simply be classified as locative, given that a hole is not a locatum; that is to say, a hole is not an entity moved to or moved away from a location.

Even verbs which express the opposite to those above display this shift between holes and objects. Consider in this respect the Dutch dictionary example *uitboren* (‘to bore/to hollow out’), which can be combined with the physical object or with the hole made in it.\(^{171}\) The WNT also reports the same shift with verbs that express the opposite of repairing. The WNT classifies the verb *branden* (‘to burn’) with the holes that are burned into something as the direct object as an MOC. An example of this is *gaten in het tafelkleed branden* (‘to burn holes into the table-cloth’).\(^{172}\)

These coherent contiguity groups across different verb classes show that it is very important to take the relation between the possible objects into account. Only in this way does the similarity of the shifts discussed above become visible. Taking contiguity into account makes sense, since some objects are so closely related to each other that they can hardly be distinguished. Because a hole cannot be imagined without the object it is situated in or because a fire simultaneously evokes some burning material, these objects can be interchanged without necessarily shifting their literal interpretation. Both possible objects can be perceived literally exactly because they are so closely connected. The fact that the same contiguity plays a role across different verb classes clearly illustrates that it is not only the verb meaning that must be taken into account, but more particularly the contiguity relations between the shifted objects within the verbal context.

\(^{171}\) Cf. the ANW-examples: “en daarom moesten we het gat iedere keer weer opnieuw uitboren” (lit: “and therefore must we the hole every time once again out-bore”, i.e. ‘and therefore we had to bore the hole out over and over again’) vs. the nominal use in “Naar analogie van de menselijke tandheelkunde behoort endodontie (nl. uitboren en opvullen van tanden) ook tot de mogelijkheden.” (lit.: “by analogy with the human dental surgery belongs endodony (viz. hollowing out and filling up of teeth) also to the possibilities”, i.e. ‘By analogy with human dental surgery, the endodony (viz. hollowing teeth out and filling them up) also belongs to the possibilities.’). In addition to the **OBJECT-HOLE MOC**, the same verb allows a **LOCATION-LOCATUM MOC**, cf. “Boor de appels uit, schil ze en snijd ze in vieren.” (‘Bore the apples out, peel them and cut them into quarters’) versus “Was de appels, boor de klokhuizen uit” (‘Wash the apples, bore the cores out’), which were both found in recipes from supermarkets (sources: http://www.ah.nl/kookschrift/verzameld-recept?id=160955&userid=253964 and http://www.plus.nl/Recept/recept.cfm?ReceptenID=E8ED514D-E425-49DF-BDA22B50A708059C [November 2010]).

\(^{172}\) This shift is complicated in that the combination of the verb with the whole object, i.e. the table-cloth or something such as a coat, usually receives the interpretation of the object being totally burned. However, if the holes are added as some additional constituent (a resultative-like phrase), it seems possible to use the object as such, compare: “Ik zat gewoon in mijn badjas en dat ding is nu vol gaten gebrand” (“I was just sitting in my bathrobe/housecoat and that thing is now burned full of holes”) (source: http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:imgdOw9REtlJ:cosplaybelgie.meloen.n.be/viewtopic.php%3Fp%3D3%3D%3D7%26t%3D0%26s%3D2%26d%3D3%26d%3Da%26start%3D1185%2C%22vol%2Bgaten%2Bgebrand%22&cd=3&hl=nl&ct=clnk&gl=nl [November 2010]).
In fact, contiguity relations turn out to be more essential than just the meaning of the verb, given that some verbs do allow MOC, but not with all objects. Sentence (33) illustrates this: The location-object of \textit{wieden} / \textit{jäten} or even of \textit{to weed} can be a garden, but not, for instance, tiles. The combination “weeding a terrace” remains questionable.

(33) \textit{Dutch}: ze wiedde de tuin / ?het terras / *de tegels  
\textit{German}: sie jäte den Garten / ?die Terrasse / *die Platten

\textit{she weeded the garden} / ?the terrace / *the tiles

This shows that the MOC with \textit{wieden} or \textit{jäten} can only occur if both objects are clearly metonymically connected, or, in other words, if they form one gestalt. Whereas this is clearly the case for the weed in the garden, the connection between a terrace and weeds is not as strong, while tiles with weeds between their joints can hardly be conceptualised as a single gestalt.

The Dutch verb \textit{smeren} and the German verb \textit{schmieren} provide another example. The meaning of these verbs could be described as “adding substance x on location y by rubbing/smearing”. Often, this verb can be combined with substance x as well as with location y as a direct object. However, it depends on the type of location and the relation between the locatum and the location whether the location can occur as the direct object of this verb. Sentences (34)-(36) illustrate this. These sentences show that MOC is possible where buttered sandwiches or greased hinges are involved, but not when dealing with cream on the skin or face. In all contexts, however, the meaning of the verb can be described in the way explained above.

(34) a. \textit{Dutch}: hij smeerde boter (op een boterham)  
\textit{German}: er schmierte Butter (auf eine Scheibe Brot)  
‘he spread [lit.: smeared] butter (on a slice of bread)’

b. \textit{Dutch}: hij smeerde een boterham (met boter)  
\textit{German}: er schmierte eine Scheibe Brot (mit Butter)  
‘he spread [lit.: smeared] a slice of bread (with butter)’

(35) a. \textit{Dutch}: hij smeerde olie in de scharnieren  
\textit{German}: er schmierte Öl in die Scharniere  
‘he put [lit.: smeared] oil in the hinges’

b. \textit{Dutch}: hij smeerde de scharnieren met olie  
\textit{German}: er schmierte die Scharniere mit Öl  
‘he greased [lit.: smeared] the hinges with oil’
7.2 Metonymical chains

The metonymical character and the importance of contiguity relations are also evident for another reason: Sometimes a verb shows a cluster of several metonymical objects and MOCs within one general scene. This is because certain contiguity relations are often very closely connected to each other, especially when complex gestalts are involved. It is well-known that metonymy often occurs in such complex series. This phenomenon is also known as serial metonymy (Nerlich & Clarke 2001) or metonymical chain (cf. Barcelona 2005; Dölling 1999), i.e. a series of metonymical shifts.

Some examples with the LOCATION-IMAGE contiguity can be used to illustrate this. Consider MOCs such as to embroider a rose (on a pillow) and to embroider a pillow or to print the king (on coins) and to print coins. Strictly speaking the words rose and king do not denote an image, but in these examples they are metonymically used for the image of a king or a rose. Based on the contiguity OBJECT FOR ILLUSTRATION OF THAT OBJECT, a metonymical reinterpretation applies to the illustration-objects.

However, this particular shift should not be considered to be an MOC, given that the king or the rose are not literally conceptualised within the verbal action. Instead, a normal nominal metonymy seems to be involved: The meaning of a noun as an entity and as the representation of this entity is a normal, systematic polysemy in lexicographical practice.173 In this way, the metonymical chain shows the relatedness between nominal metonymies and MOCs. Because of the conceptual nature of metonymy, it is, as discussed above, often difficult to demarcate them from each other.

The same issue can be illustrated with the possible direct objects of the verb tatoeëren or to tattoo. The dictionary entry in Van Dale 2005 first provides the example zijn naam tatoeëren (“to tattoo his name”) and then gives the combination

---

173 Cf. e.g. the entries arend (‘eagle’), bloem (‘flower’), oog (‘eye’) zon (‘sun’) or zwaan (‘swan’) in Van Dale 2005.
een anker tatoëren (“to tattoo an anchor”). The latter is tagged as an instance of “objectswisseling”. Given that the anchor is not conceptualised literally, we probably should not consider this as a real instance of MOC but as a metonymical reinterpretation of the noun only. The comparable nominal reinterpretation can be clarified by **to tattoo one’s love** which means the name or a picture of one’s love.

However, the possible direct objects of **tatoëren** and **to tattoo** are even more multifaceted, in that additional shifts can take place. In addition to the shift between object and image, it is possible to use the location as a direct object. The combination **to tattoo an anchor (onto someone’s shoulder)** can also be expressed as **to tattoo someone’s shoulder (with an anchor)** or even with **to tattoo someone (on the shoulder) (with an anchor)**. The latter shift is a metonymy on the basis of **WHOLE FOR PART**. In other words, three contiguity relations determine the possible expressions of the direct object, i.e. **WHOLE-PART**, **OBJECT-ILLUSTRATION OF THAT OBJECT** and **ADDED IMAGE- LOCATION OF IMAGE**. Whereas the use of an object for an image and the use of **someone** instead of the actual tattooed body part could be a normal nominal metonymy, the **IMAGE-LOCATION** shift should definitely be considered an MOC: The direct object of **to tattoo an anchor** as well as the direct object in **to tattoo someone** both appear to be interpreted as such. This is because the image and the location to which this image is added are both essential to the action expressed by **to tattoo**. The verb takes a different type of object based on the contiguity relations between the participants involved in this action.

A comparable case is the verb **aansteken** (**‘to light’**). In Van Dale three different examples are given as object changes: **het vuur / de kachel / de lamp aansteken** (**‘to light the fire / the heater / the lamp’**). So, apart from the material, such as wood, coal or gas, two other types of entities can be used as a direct object: The result of the lighted fuel is expressed in **vuur aansteken** and the container or fuel containing object is expressed in **de kachel / de lamp aansteken** (cf. also Honselaar & Sweep forthcoming 2012). Again, the latter example could be considered to be a nominal metonymy: The ‘heater’, ‘stove’ or ‘lamp’ does not appear to be interpreted literally, given that this would mean that these objects as such are on fire.

Sometimes, however, the complex gestalt leads to several predicative metonymies. Illustrative in this respect are MOCs with guns. A verb such as the Dutch **afvuren** (**‘off-fire’**) and the German **lösen** (**‘to fire off’**) can be combined with three types of direct objects: With the instrument used, such as a gun, with the object moved out of this instrument (the projectile), but also with the result caused by the instrument, i.e. a shot. All possible objects appear to be interpreted literally. The three elements are all very closely related: A shot implies a weapon and a bullet, and the instrument used and the object moved can coincide, as is the case with fired rockets, for instance.

---

174 The former MOC is an example of Levin’s ‘image impressing alternation’ (1993: 66) and the latter alternation, i.e. **to tattoo someone’s shoulder versus to tattoo someone (on the shoulder)**, is related to Levin’s ‘body-part possessor ascension’ alternation (1993: 71-72) (cf. section 6.2 above).
Another verb which allows three types of direct objects is the Dutch verb *afgieten* ("off-poor"). This verb can be combined with water from a pan (*water afgieten*), with the pan itself (*de pan afgieten*) or with the things boiled in the water, such as potatoes or pasta (*aardappelen / spaghetti afgieten*). The same applies to German *abgießen*. The pan filled with water and food occurs as a single gestalt involved within this verbal action.

Such complex gestalts also often occur with holes that are created or filled up. The verb allowing the MOC often describes a movement of something into or out of a hole, but at the same time this hole cannot be visualised without the object in which it is situated. The WNT, for instance, points out that the verb *uitkrabben* ("out-scratch") can shift between a substance that is actually scratched out, such as cement or chalk, and with the metonymically affected entity in the scratching process, such as a wall. Within this MOC, the WNT also gives the combination *voegen uitkrabben* ("to scratch out joints"). Three types of direct objects are thus actually involved: The cement and the joints, which exhibit a LOCATUM-LOCATION contiguity, and the wall with the joint, which is in a WHOLE-PART relation.

Dictionaries do not always take into account such full metonymical chains of MOCs. Whereas the shift between a location and a locatum has often been illustrated by the verb *abmähen* or *afmaaien* (lit.: “off-mow”), Honselaar and Sweep (forthcoming 2012) discovered that another possible direct object could be the intended result of the mowing-activity, i.e. the hay. In such examples, all

---

175 All three objects can indeed be combined with *uitkrabben*, compare an example from the newspaper *Het Nieuwsblad* from 20-03-2004 “Een betere oplossing is de voegen uitkrabben” (‘A better solution is to scratch out the joints’) (cf. http://www.nieuwsblad.be/article/detail.aspx?articleid=GEEAC3EV); the ANW-examples “Na het metselen dient de specie zo diep te worden uitgekrabd dat...” (‘After the bricklaying, the cement must be scratched out so deeply that...’); “Alle gaten, loszittende bepleistering, barsten en scheuren worden voorafgaandelijk uitgekrabd” (‘All holes, loose plaster, cracks and gaps should be scratched out in advance’, cf. page 111); and the internet-example within the same context “Ik mocht de muur uitkrabben” (‘I was allowed to scratch out the wall’) (http://kampert.org/Kampert/Pagina/Zwembad/zwembad17.php [March 2011]).

176 Besides the combinations *Heu mähen* and *hooi maaien* ("to mow hay"), the particle verb also occurs with the hay. Cf. e.g. the German internet examples “an einem Feld vorbei zu laufen, wo gerade das Heu abgemäht wird” (i.e. ‘to walk past a field, where the hay just has been mown’, source: http://www.lauforum.de/back-on-the-road-ich-bin-wieder-da-9409-3.htm [March 2011]) or “Von einer 1,21 ha großen Wiese im Bereich "Grimmes Garten" haben Unbekannte zwischen Sonntag und Dienstag (13. bis 15.06.10) letzter Woche das gesamte Heu abgemäht und gestohlen.” (‘Last week, between Sunday and Tuesday (13 till 15-06-2010), unknown persons mowed and stole all the hay from a field of 1,21 hectares in the area of the “Grimmes Garten”’, source: http://www.presseportal.de/polizeipresse/pm/7452/1635450/polizeidirektion_goettingen [March 2011]). In Dutch, the combination occurs less frequently, but consider attributive uses, such as “Hier krijgen ze ons eigen afgemaaid hooi.” (‘Here they get our own mown hay’, source: http://www.bunnybunch.nl/community/voeding/30116-moet-voorzichtig-overstappen-op-nieuw-merk-hooi.html [March 2011]). The ANW-corpus does provide an example with the result ‘harvest’ as the direct object of *afmaaien*: “Men had namelijk
possibilities can be considered predicative metonymies: The verb expresses a single action and all objects appear to be interpreted literally.

Metonymical chains show that these alternations of the direct object are conceptual phenomena concerning a single gestalt. In the next section, the exact nature of these gestalts and the contiguity involved will be analysed in full detail.

7.3 Contiguity types and MOCs

It is generally recognised that it is difficult to provide a complete and precise list of all contiguity relations. In line with Blank or Ullmann, one could therefore try to make a distinction between co-present or successive contiguities, depending on the question of whether we are dealing with a static or a dynamic picture (cf. above chapter II, §3). However, this distinction introduces some complications. Some contiguities of MOCs which clearly do occur within a dynamic picture, still appear to be co-present rather than successive.

Illustrative is the relation between a product and its material (cf. Blank 1999: 181-182). This dynamic relation can be successive, but does not need to be so. Some MOC-verbs express the coming into existence of a product which means that only the material is present at the time of action. Furthermore, even if a product has been created, only some relations between the material and the product are truly successive. An example of a successive PRODUCT-MATERIAL contiguity is the relation between dough and bread: When one starts baking bread, there is only dough, but once the bread has been baked, it is questionable whether we can still say the dough is present. This contrasts, however, with PRODUCT-MATERIAL relations such as reeds and a basket. Of course there is no basket when one starts weaving the reeds, but when the basket is finished the reeds still exists.

Therefore, classifying contiguity relations as either co-present or successive has the unwelcome consequence of making it impossible to consider the relation between a product and its material to be a single contiguity relation. In some instances it should be classified as co-present (such as with wicker baskets) but in others as successive (such as with the bread). The abstraction of contiguity relations as successive and co-present suddenly divides a single contiguity into two different types. The idea that the direction of a single contiguity relation should lead to two different classifications of the contiguity type seems contradictory.

A comparable problem occurs in some instances of MOC that shift between a concrete entity and an event. They clearly refer to a dynamic picture, although sometimes the concrete object and the event can be co-present. For example, the WNT points out that the verb *continueren* (‘to continue’) can occur with a metonymically shifted direct object. In that case, the direct object denotes a concrete entity instead of the action which is actually continued. As an example, the WNT provides the combination of *continueren* with a specific type of text (a baptismal register). In this specific example, the event which is continued is writing the text (or

bindgaren nodig om de oogst, die door de pikmachines werd afgemaaid, samen te binden.”

(‘They needed yarn to bind the harvest together, which was mown by the reaping machines’).
more specifically: keeping it up to date). It is difficult to classify this relation either as successive or as dynamic. A register must be there in order to be continued, but at the same time it changes and grows while being continued. However, if the same metonymical combination occurred with to begin, the relation would be successive: If one begins keeping a baptismal register it did not, by definition, exist before.

This does not apply to all examples of the verb begin combined with a text. For example, to begin the book does not have to mean ‘begin writing the book’, it can also refer to ‘begin reading the book’. In contrast to writing the book, the relation between reading and a book is co-present, despite its dynamic nature. In other words, just as is the case with the PRODUCT-MATERIAL contiguity, one cannot classify the abstract pattern OBJECT INVOLVED-EVENT as either co-present or successive.

Such different general classifications of similar contiguity patterns are undesirable and cast doubt on the usefulness of a division into co-present and successive contingencies. The abstract division in successive and co-present contiguity relations suddenly splits a classical contiguity, such as PRODUCT-MATERIAL, into two different types. Rather than classifying contiguity relations as successive or co-present, it would be preferable to emphasize their close connection as a single gestalt or experiential whole.

Despite the problematic division into co-present and successive relations, it is very useful to use Blank’s different levels to characterise contiguity types. Instead of Blank’s three-layered analysis, I would propose to use four different levels to describe the contiguity relations. Because being contiguous means belonging to an “experiential togetherness” (Waltereit 1999: 234; cf. also Hilpert 2006: 127) or, in other words, belonging to one kind of gestalt (Talmy 2006: 98), the nature of this experience or the type of gestalt should be characterised at the most abstract level: Gestalts can have a spatial (local), causal or temporal nature. Temporal gestalts are events and their parts or events and elements connected to these and therefore I will classify them more precisely as temporal-eventive gestalts.

Naturally, a classification into these different types is not clear-cut: Rather than conforming to a rigid division into these categories, the gestalt-characters have flowing boundaries. Gestalts of a causal nature, for instance, are a hybrid category that resides in between spatial and temporal-eventive relations. This has also been illustrated above, since some MATERIAL-PRODUCT examples are successive in time, whereas others are spatially co-present. As a consequence, it can be very difficult to classify some gestalts as, for instance, either causal or spatial. Figure 4 is a representation of the fuzzy character of types of gestalts.
Because metonymically related entities belong to a single gestalt, all contiguity relations are roughly based on a WHOLE-PART (or PART-PART)\textsuperscript{177} relation. Lower levels of abstraction serve to specify these relations further, as illustrated in Figure 5. The second level of abstraction serves to specify the connection of the two entities within the gestalt. This level shows that the strength of WHOLE-PART relation varies and therefore the second level describes contiguity relations, such as spatial relations of the form ENTITY-ATTACHED ENTITY; CONTAINER-CONTENT; LOCATION-AUTONOMOUS LOCATUM;\textsuperscript{178} causal relations, such as AFFECTED ENTITY-EFFECTED ENTITY; OBJECT-DAMAGE, or part-whole relations of an eventive gestalt, such as ACTION-ENTITY INVOLVED, in which the involved entity could be seen as a part of the general event.\textsuperscript{179}

On the third level, these relations can in turn be split into more concrete patterns, which are still generalisations about concrete examples. Entities and connected entities, for instance, can be physical objects or locations which include another entity as a part of itself. Other connected entities, however, denote two different parts of a single spatial gestalt. An example for this is \textit{een bot / het vlees afknagen} (lit.: “a bone / the meat off-gnaw”). In such cases, none of the two entities includes the other.

\textsuperscript{177}For instance, if there is no direct lexical word for the gestalt as such (cf. below the example \textit{een bot / het vlees afknagen} or \textit{Knochen / Fleisch abnagen} (“to gnaw on a bone / to gnaw meat off”)).

\textsuperscript{178}Waltereit also noticed that a PART-WHOLE relation can be considered a kind of stronger version of a CONTAINER-CONTENT contiguity (Waltereit 1998: 25).

\textsuperscript{179}Although this contiguity relation is based upon an eventive gestalt, it is difficult to classify ACTION-ENTITY INVOLVED as spatial, causal or temporal (cf. Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 289, 292, 301); It is clearly not spatial, different from the other causal relations, but it is also no stereotypical temporal relation (cf. Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 275; cf. also Geeraerts 2010: 219). Stoeva-Holm (2010) analyses metonymy examples which could be classified as being based on temporal contiguity relations, such as GENERAL ACTION-INCLUDED (SUB)ACTION. Such temporal relations do not play any role for MOCs and I will further classify ACTION-ENTITY INVOLVED as an eventive type of contiguity relation.
CONTAINER-CONTENT relations can also be classified more specifically. The exact nature of the spatial relation between a container and its content, for instance, depends on the type of content: Fluid contents are connected with their containers in a different way than objects in a container, given that it is difficult to conceptualise liquids without their container. A particular type of container can also cause a
classification of a specific contiguity relation, as is for instance the case for the relation between an instrument and the projectile it contains. Similar divisions can be made concerning locations and locatums: Locations can be surfaces, objects or even persons.

The two causal contiguity relations of the second level, i.e. AFFECT-EFFECT and OBJECT-DAMAGE, are different in that the damage is not an effect. In most cases it is not created but actually resolved. On the third level, both patterns can once again be specified. The damage to an object can be some specific defect or a hole in an object. There are also different types of affected entities and effected ones. Examples are locations to which a certain image is added (e.g. to print an envelope / an address); means or instruments and their effect (e.g. strum a guitar / song, hit a key / note or turn off the radio / music); sources and their results (e.g. hatch eggs / chicks; light wood / fire); or materials and their products (e.g. bake dough / bread or thread beads / string). As discussed above, materials can be affected in different ways: They can be modified into a certain product or merely used to create a product. The relation could be classified as co-present only in the latter case.

Last but not least, contiguity relations concerning eventive gestalts which are relevant for MOCs can be divided into an EVENT-AGENT or EVENT-PATIENT relation (cf. chapter VIII, section §4.5). Figure 5 provides an overview of the different levels of contiguity which occur in MOCs.

The lowest level of contiguity is the actual example. The four different levels of abstraction thus correspond to a type of gestalt, a general contiguity relation (based on WHOLE-PART), a subrelation and a concrete example. Table 8 provides concrete examples for the above subrelations. Because it is often difficult to translate the dictionary examples and the MOCs into English, the different relations are illustrated with Dutch and German examples. The superscripts (D/G) indicate whether an example is Dutch or German.

The examples and the classification of contiguity relations occurring in MOCs are as complete as possible. This taxonomy of contiguity relations shows that the traditional solution, which classifies all metonymies under the three types of spatial, causal and temporal/eventive gestalts, actually works pretty well: In cases of MOC, there does not seem to be a rest-group (cf. Blank 1999: 177). It is helpful to keep in mind, however, that such classifications never truly reflect reality, because divisions into such categories makes the borders sharper than they actually are (cf. Figure 4).

Table 8 also shows that the contiguity relations form a kind of continuum rather than clear categories. For instance, the distinction between causal relations (EFFECTED-AFFECTED) and locative relations (LOCATUM-LOCATION) cannot always be made. This can be illustrated with to squeeze (out) juice / oranges: The oranges and their juice clearly form one gestalt, an experiential whole, which can be considered from a spatial as well as from a causal perspective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contiguity relations</th>
<th>Metonymical object changes (MOCs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole entity - included part</td>
<td>de hond / haar van de hond trimmen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schoenen / schoenzolen afslijten*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haas / hazenvel villen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hasen / Hasenhaut abziehen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location - part of location</td>
<td>tuin / onkruid wieden*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nek / nekhaar uitscheren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garten / Gewächse pflanzen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiese / Gras abmähen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part - connected part</td>
<td>Knochen / Fleisch abnagen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>container – liquid</td>
<td>kopje / thee bijschenken*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gracht / grachtwater aftappen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weinfass / Wein abfüllen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunnen / Wasser ausschöpfen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>container – objects</td>
<td>mand / appels uitschudden*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>koffer / spullen pakken*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schiff / Waare ausladen / löschen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pfeife / Tabak stopfen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument – projectile</td>
<td>pistool / kogels afruimen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pistole / Kugel lösen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface - what is on surface</td>
<td>tafel / kopjes afruimen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tekst / bord uitvegen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tisch / Tischluch aufdecken*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object - adjacent object (e.g. rope - object)</td>
<td>zeil / touw vieren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person - attribute</td>
<td>voetballer / voetbal aanspelen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sich / Klamotten anziehen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Causal relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object - hole (= whole - part)</td>
<td>sokken / gaten stoppen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schip / kier (af)dichter*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entity - defect/state (= whole - part)</td>
<td>boot / lek dichten*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dictee / fouten verbeteren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hek / roest akrabberen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kranke / Krankheit heilen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material - product</td>
<td>deeg / brood bakken*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kraalen / ketting rijgen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinn / Figuren gießen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means – result</td>
<td>gitaar / lied tokkeleren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toets / toon aanslaar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>radio / muziek afzetten*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>telefoonlijn / telefoongesprek aftappen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source - result (e.g. fuel - fire)</td>
<td>Eier / Junge ausbrüten*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hout / vuur ansteken*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kohle / Feuer aufblasen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location - image (= location - locatum)</td>
<td>roos / kussen borduren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person – knowledge</td>
<td>iemand / kennis bijspijkeren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jemanden / etwas ausfragen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eventive relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent - activity</td>
<td>coureurs / wedstrijd afvlaggen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iemand / praatje onderbreken*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moordenaar / moord bestraffen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object - activity</td>
<td>boek / schrijven continueren*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buch / lesen anfangen*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Examples of MOCs divided according to different contiguity relations
The same applies to the example of the sand and the ditch, which could be dug out (cf. section 7.1). Similarly, concerning clear locative relations, it is sometimes difficult to analyse whether two objects should be classified as having contact or merely as being adjacent to each other.

However, such flowing boundaries are not much of a problem, given that we are dealing with a conceptual phenomenon. Conceptual phenomena often belong to a continuous category rather than clear-cut classes. It is known that contiguity relations should be seen as a kind or prototypical category (cf. Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 280). Peirsman and Geeraerts (2006) have analysed contiguity as a prototypical category. The dimensions which they have revealed also turn out to be essential for MOC-contiguities.

Peirsman and Geeraerts analyse metonymy as involving contiguity, which is prototypically a spatial PART-WHOLE relation. The prototypical PART-WHOLE relations can be plotted against three dimensions, which are 'strength of contact', 'boundedness' and the 'domain involved'. The importance of spatial PART-WHOLE and their extension along these three dimensions can be clearly recognised on the basis of Figure 4, Figure 5 and Table 8: The gestalts in Figure 4 present the wholes and their parts. The lower levels in the taxonomy in Figure 5 can be considered an extension of the PART-WHOLE relation along the three dimensions.

The domain involved tells us that spatial or material PART-WHOLE relations can be extended to the temporal domain (Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 286ff), and it is even possible that contiguity relations combine spatial en temporal properties (Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 289ff). Such an extension of locative and temporal WHOLE-PART or CONTAINER-CONTENT relations can be illustrated by the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relation (cf. Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 289, 292, 301). The extension is also visible within the categories of causal relations: Although Peirsman and Geeraerts consider a relation such as MATERIAL-PRODUCT as primarily spatial (cf. 2006: 283-284), I have argued that a temporal dimension is included as well. The domain involved thus becomes visible in the type of gestalt, as illustrated by Figure 4 and by the main categories in Figure 5.

Concerning the spatial/material domain, two important dimensions are involved. These are 'strength of contact' and the dimension of 'boundedness' (Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 278-279). Boundedness reflects different ways of conceptualising spatial/material relations and of causal ones. Being bounded has to do with being countable. Mass nouns denote materials or substances, which are always unbounded since their referent is boundless. However, this is somewhat complicated for MOCs. Some of the spatial and causal relations and their objects could at first sight be considered unbounded. An example of this would be to load hay or to bake dough. In fact, these unbounded objects refer to some concrete amount of hay or dough in the context of the verb. Instead of referring to hay in general, the loading-context evokes some concrete amount or concrete bales of hay. Similarly, one never bakes dough in general, but only a certain ball of dough, which results in, for instance, a loaf of bread.

The dimension of strength of contact is directly reflected within the general relation of the locative domain, as the second level of spatial or locative relations
clearly illustrates. The spatial relations under ENTITY-ATTACHED ENTITY are most strongly connected, whereas the latter group of LOCATUM-LOCATIONS only gives examples of things that are in close contact or which are even merely adjacent to each other. The CONTAINER-CONTENT group is in-between these categories: It is difficult to conceptualise a liquid content without its container, although at the same time the content and the container denote two different entities which are not necessarily connected. The relations belonging to the locative ones thus directly correspond to the relations that Peirsman and Geeraerts suggest among their strength of contact dimension (cf. Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 279).

The same distinction in strength of contact can be made within the causal relations on the third level: Whereas MATERIAL-PRODUCT, LOCATION-IMAGE and PERSON-KNOWLEDGE are very tightly connected, this is the case to a lesser extent for SOURCE-RESULT and INSTRUMENT-PRODUCT. Similarly, one could argue that in the case of the eventive gestalts the relation between an object and an event is stronger than that between an agent and an event.

In the discussion on the group of verbs that express some kind of removal, I also touched upon differences in strength of contact. I distinguished between two separate objects and objects where one object includes the other. An example of the former is to load a ship / goods, where both direct objects express an autonomous entity which exists in a certain relation to the other. An example of the latter is to wipe the blood / the wound, because the blood is a part of the wound. The same can be illustrated with to sieve flour / lumps, in which there is a difference between the flour that goes into the sieve and the flour that comes out of it (without lumps). The flour that goes into the sieve contains the lumps and the lumps themselves consist of flour. This example clearly differs from an example such as the golddigger was sifting the sand which can alternatively be expressed by the golddigger was sifting gold. In contrast to the flour-example, the latter direct object expresses what remains in the sieve and the former what goes through it. It is difficult to mention the object that goes into the sieve as such, i.e. the sand including the pieces of gold. Such differences are reflected in the subrelations in Figure 5, which distinguishes between autonomous, attached and included parts within the contiguity ENTITY-ATTACHED ENTITY.

In line with this, some examples tagged in dictionaries are more difficult to understand than others. This can be nicely illustrated with some tagged shifts with afkluiven versus afknagen in Van Dale. Both literally express something like “off-gnaw”, both can be translated as ‘to gnaw on / off (/to eat away)’. For the verb afkluiven, Van Dale gives the two alternative direct objects vlees (van het been) afkluiven (lit: “meat (from the bone) off-gnaw”, i.e. ‘gnaw meat off (a bone)’) and het been afkluiven (‘to gnaw on a bone’ / ‘to pick a bone’). This shift is easy to understand, since bones and the meat on them are two different entities, even though they are tightly connected.

For the verb afknagen, however, Van Dale classifies de muizen hebben die kaas afgeknaagd (lit.: “the mice have that cheese off-gnawed”) as an instance of “objectverwisseling”. Given that the mice have indeed only literally bitten off the edges of the cheese, this can be seen as an MOC with respect to de muizen hebben
de rand van de kaas afgeknaagd (lit.: “the mice have the edge of/from the cheese off-gnawed”). Because a part of cheese consists of its edges, this MOC (i.e. the difference between the two types of direct objects) is less clear than the bone-meat example. The meat and the bone also form one gestalt, but they can be conceptualised separately from each other much more easily than the cheese and its edges.

The possibility of MOCs and the single gestalt involved can thus be seen as a kind of trade-off. On the one hand, MOCs only occur with objects that can be conceptualised as a single gestalt. MOC cannot occur if the strength of contact between two entities is so low, that they cannot be conceptualised as one entity. On the other hand, no MOC is involved, if only a single object is involved in the verbal action, which cannot be expressed by naming two different parts.

In sum, an analysis of the contiguity relations involved in MOCs gives a very interesting result. The contiguity of MOCs turns out to be prototypical. The relations involved can be traditionally classified as relating to spatial, causal and temporal-eventive gestalts. They can all be analysed as based on a PART-WHOLE relation, which can be characterised by strength of contact and which is extended from the spatial to the temporal domain. The contiguity involved supports the metonymical character of MOCs.

The connection with Peirsman and Geeraerts’ findings is especially interesting, because they revealed the dimensions of their prototypically structured category without taking into account contiguity relations of grammatical metonymies (2006: 292, 310). Therefore, both results mutually support each other: Given that Peirsman and Geeraerts’ dimensions were not based upon grammatical metonymies, the appropriateness with respect to MOCs confirms the correctness of these dimensions. At the same time the fact that the relations between alternative direct objects fit perfectly into Peirsman and Geeraerts’ conceptual category supports the idea that contiguity plays an important role for MOCs.

7.4 Additional examples of MOCs with EVENT-PARTICIPANT shifts

Within the domain of eventive contingencies, one finds specific instances of predicative metonymies, which are also called logical metonymies. In chapter III (§5.2), I discussed several reasons why this type of metonymy is called logical: Firstly, it is claimed to be logical because the metonymy is triggered by type requirements of the verb (cf. also Verspoor 1997b); secondly, because the metonymy is of a very systematic nature (Pustejovsky 1995: 54, cf. also Horacek 1996: 120); or thirdly, because the metonymy is paired with a logical shift between a concrete object and an event (cf. Verspoor 1997a: 166). One might question, however, whether the first two characteristics are specific to logical metonymies only: All instances of predicative metonymies discussed so far are systematically triggered by the main verb and shift the type of their argument (cf. also Asher 2011). Logical metonymy could therefore be considered a predicative metonymy or metonymical object change (MOC), which is special in the sense that it is based on
an eventive gestalt. The temporal-eventive contiguity relations\textsuperscript{180} cause the type shift.

Dutch dictionaries provide examples of contiguity shifts concerning the direct object slot that display a shift between an event and a concrete object or individual, viz. *afvlagen* (‘to flag down’), *bestraffen* (‘to punish’), *continueren* (‘to continue’) or *onderbreken* (‘to interrupt’).\textsuperscript{181} If logical metonymy is called logical because of the type shift between an event and a concrete entity, then the above cases neatly fit within the category. The MOCs with *afvlagen*, *bestraffen* and *onderbreken* are different, however, from the logical metonymies which are normally discussed (such as *continueren*), in that they do not follow the contiguity pattern OBJECT FOR ACTION IN WHICH THE OBJECT IS INVOLVED (cf. Ruiz de Mendoza & Pérez 2001) but rather PARTICIPANT (AGENT) FOR ACTION. Although these combinations of verbs and direct objects are labelled by dictionaries as instances of metonymy, and although they involve a shift in type, they have never been taken into account in previous studies on logical metonymy. This can probably be explained by the fact that AGENT-ACTION shifts cannot be handled by these theories. I will provide a uniform analysis in chapter VIII, which will account for both types of logical metonymy and for non-eventive metonymies in exactly the same way (cf. also Sweep 2010a).

The prototypical verbs that display logical metonymy following the contiguity pattern OBJECT FOR ACTION IN WHICH THE OBJECT IS INVOLVED are *begin*, *finish* and *enjoy*. They may be the prototypical examples of logical metonymy, but they are not the only verbs that seem to behave in this way. Studies on logical metonymy differ, however, in the number of verbs that are mentioned as examples of logical metonymy. Briscoe et al. (1990) state that they found twenty-four verbs that appeared with logically metonymical objects, but they only mention seven of them explicitly, viz. *begin*, *enjoy*, *finish*, *miss*, *prefer*, *regret* and *start* (Briscoe et al. 1990: 44-45). The two studies in which I found the largest number of verbs only included fourteen or seventeen verbs explicitly (McElree et al. 2001: *attempt*, *begin*, *endure*, *enjoy*, *expect*, *fear*, *finish*, *master*, *prefer*, *resist*, *savour*, *start*, *survive*, *try*, *want*; Lapata & Lascarides 2003: the same set plus *complete*, *postpone*, *want*).\textsuperscript{182} Sets do

\textsuperscript{180} Because it is difficult to label the nature of contiguity relations between an event and its participants (cf. footnote 179), it may be preferable to classify them as functional instead of temporal-eventive (Moerdijk p.c., cf. also Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006: 292, 312).

\textsuperscript{181} Maybe the verb *afkussen* or *afzoenen* (lit.: “aspectual particle + kiss”) could also be added to these verbs. Both *afkussen* and *afzoenen* can be combined with an event as their direct object, such as a row, quarrel or fight, but also with the other person involved in this argument. These verbs are, however, very infrequent in the ANW-corpus (the entry *afkussen* / *kussen*...*af* gives only one relevant hit with a person and the entry *afzoenen* / *zoenen*...*af* only three, all with an event-object). Furthermore, it is arguable that the verb has different senses in each case, although this would be extremely difficult to test. The combination with the argument can, however, be paraphrased as ‘to kiss something away’, whereas with a person as a direct object, it means ‘make up with someone by kissing him/her’. Because of these difficulties and their infrequency, I will not take these two verbs into account any further.

\textsuperscript{182} One might wonder why certain synonymous verbs are not incorporated on the lists: If *to want a beer* should be considered metonymical for *to want to drink a beer*, the same should probably hold for *to long for a beer* or even for *to need a beer.*
The verbs *miss* and *regret* (cf. Briscoe et al. 1990: 44-45) are, for instance, not included in the examples of the latter two articles. Furthermore, some verbs are only mentioned by a very few authors, such as *choose* (Ruiz de Mendoza & Pérez 2001), *continue* (Choma 2003), *fail* (Egg 2003) or *veto* (Pustejovsky 1991; Verspoor 1997a). Since the latter two verbs do not seem to occur very regularly in metonymical constructions and are not as easily translated by a single verb in Dutch and German, I will not take them into account in this study.

The verbs that seem to allow logically metonymical complements based on PARTICIPANT-ACTION according to the literature can be divided into three general groups. The first group consists of aspectual verbs, sometimes also called eventive verbs (Verspoor 1997a) or phase verbs (Honselaar 1980). Verbs like *begin*, *complete*, *continue*, *finish*, *postpone*, and *start* belong in this group. The verb *onderbreken* (‘to interrupt’) and *afvlaggen* (‘to flag down’, i.e. ‘to stop/finish by flagging’) can also be added to this group.

The second group consists of verbs that may be called evaluative or emotive, since they give information about the agent’s mental state or feelings towards an event. Typical verbs are *choose*, *endure*, *enjoy*, *expect*, *fear*, *prefer*, *regret*, *savour* and *want*. The verb *bestraffen* (‘to punish’) also belongs to this group.

The third group is an in-between category, as the verbs in this group give some aspectual as well as some evaluative information: They tell us in which sense or in which way the agent has dealt with an event. The group includes verbs such as *attempt*, *master*, *miss*, *resist*, *survive*, and *try*.

8. Summary: Verbs and their shifted objects

Dictionaries can be used to extract data on metonymy, because they tag many phenomena as metonymy-driven. In this chapter, I have explained how Van Dale 2005, WNT, DWB and Adelung’s dictionary can be used to find Dutch and German examples of MOCs. On the basis of this search and the extracted dictionary data, I have made some observations concerning MOCs.

First of all, at least two general conditions need to be fulfilled in real examples of MOC, which excluded some of the Dutch examples tagged as real MOCs. The object change must concern a qualitative valency shift of the direct object without a shift in the general verb meaning. In other words, we can only speak of MOC, if a verb that refers to a single general scene can be combined with two different direct objects which cannot be simultaneously expressed as such. Examples with metonymically interpreted verbs, examples with indirect objects and examples with two direct objects which can be realised simultaneously should therefore be excluded from the realm of MOC.

Secondly, I have discussed the fact that MOCs occur with simplex verbs and with morphologically complex verbs. I have argued that prefixes or particles are not

---

183 Cf. for this description also Ruiz de Mendoza & Pérez 2001: 342, who make a slightly different categorization, or Brdar 2007: 148.
of fundamental importance because of their morphological-syntactic structure, but that they only occur frequently with MOC because of their semantic impact. It is the relation between the two direct objects within the verbal action that is of crucial importance. Because of this, some particles occur with MOCs very frequently. The particle reflects an underlying contiguity relation and helps in the understanding of a shifted verb-object combination. If, for example, something is taken off from something else, both things must exist in a PART-WHOLE or close contact relation. Similarly, if something can be taken out of something, a CONTAINER-CONTENT relation is presupposed by the particle. This also explains why some particles occur more frequently in MOCs than others. However, if a simplex verb reflects the underlying relation to the same extent, it allows MOC with similar ease. The latter can be illustrated with semantic synonyms within one language. The contiguity relation between the goods and the ship is, for instance, equally important in the German examples *Waare / Schiff ausladen* or *Waare / Schiff löschten* (*’to unload the goods / the ship’*). Contiguity relations are also equally important in the Dutch examples *tekst / pagina’s afdrukken* or *tekst / pagina’s printen* (*’to print text / pages’*) or in *een haas / zijn huid villen; een haas / zijn huid afvellen* or *een haas / zijn huid stropen* (*’to skin a hare / his skin’*). The same can also be supported with semantic pairs across languages such as *to clear tableware / the table*, which corresponds to the particle verbs *afruimen* and *abräumen* in Dutch and German.

I have also classified the contiguity relations found in MOC examples. Although I have shown that Blank’s distinction between co-present and successive relations is problematic, his idea of classifying contiguity relations on different levels of abstraction turned out to be very useful. On the highest level, we find the classical division of spatial, temporal and causal gestalts. These correspond to a more general relation, which in turn can be divided into classical contiguous subrelations. By means of this incremental abstraction, I have provided an overview of the contiguity involved in MOCs. These contiguity relations form a continuum rather than rigid categories. In addition to this, I have shown that the contiguity relations involved in MOCs correspond to important characteristics found by Peirsman and Geeraerts.

On the basis of the verbs presented in this chapter, I will employ the rest of this dissertation to work out the characteristics of MOCs in detail. This concerns the actual usage of MOCs, pragmatic requirements, constraints caused by contiguity, the metonymy involved (modelled with frame semantics) and the continuum with other types of metonymy.