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VI. NON-EVENTIVE MOCs IN DUTCH AND GERMAN

1. Non-eventive MOCs

Most linguistic studies that analyse alternations in the direct object share two methodological properties. First of all, they are often based on introspective data and do not present or analyse real examples (cf. Pinker 1989; Levin 1993; Pustejovsky 1995). Secondly, most theoretic accounts on non-eventive shifts contrast examples with the full set of arguments, such as to load hay onto the wagon with to load a wagon with hay, to clear snow from the road with to clear the road of snow or to wipe fingerprints from the wall with to wipe the wall (*of fingerprints).

Dutch and German dictionaries are different in this respect. Dictionaries often only focus on verb-direct object pairs, even if a simultaneous realisation of both arguments is possible. They contrast, for instance, Last ausladen (‘to unload cargo’) with ein Schiff ausladen (‘to unload a ship’) (cf. Adelung), hooi opladen (‘to load up hay’) with een wagen opladen (‘to load up a wagon’) (cf. Van Dale) or de baan ruimen (‘to clear the path’) with sneeuw ruimen (‘to clear snow’) (cf. WNT). One of the reasons for comparing verb-direct object pairs is of course the difference in perspective: Dictionaries consider these shifts as being possible on the basis of a metonymical relation (see also Waltereit 1998; Waltereit 1999). In addition to this, dictionaries support syntactic patterns with real examples.

In this chapter, alternations in the direct object, i.e. Metonymical Object Changes (MOCs), will be analysed in line with the dictionary method. This means that only necessary arguments will be taken into account, the role of the contiguity relation between both possible direct objects will be examined and observations will be based on corpus data. As will be demonstrated, this will reveal some interesting insights into the nature of MOCs. The focus of the examples will be on non-eventive

184 Sections 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, section 3 and sections 4.3 and 4.4 have been discussed as a paper at the Doktoranden- und Habilitantenkolloquium in Oldenburg (DoHa 2010). I would especially like to thank Heinz Eickmans, Jack Hoeksema, Matthias Hüning and Esther Ruigendijk for their useful comments.

185 Sometimes this leads to interesting claims. The verb to squeeze, for instance, is discussed by Levin as non-alternating in the x from y-form (Levin 1993: 56). This analysis is questionable, given some BNC-examples with liquids, such as “squeeze the juice from both oranges”, “especially not the orange juice for breakfast, which had to be freshly squeezed from three kilos of oranges” or “squeeze all moisture from the petals before discarding them” (cf. also Google-hits for squeeze oranges/grapes/lemons/fruit into juice). The alleged into-alternation, on the other hand, does occur but not very frequently (compare BNC-example “When do I get to squeeze a lump of coal into a diamond?”, “He stopped, squeezing two balls of bread into a pancake between his giant fingers.”). In a comparable way, the verb to encrust is presented by Pinker (1989: 127) as well as by Levin (1993: 51) as non-alternating. This is not true for the attributive use of the verb at least, as illustrated by the BNC-examples “and played ping-pong on the white encrusted table” versus “Beneath each window were long encrusted brown stains” or “bodies encrusted with mud” versus “A thin rim of encrusted mud”.
shifts, i.e. on verbs applying to spatial and causal gestalts (i.e. on transitive locative alternations and material-product shifts).

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 2 will clarify which alternative sentences should be compared to each other. I will argue that the wrong alternatives are often compared, and that differences between certain alternations are overlooked, if one always takes all possible arguments into account. Verbs such as *lossen* - *löschen* ('to unload') and *to wipe*-*wissen* - *wischen* will be used to clarify some of these issues. In addition, I will illustrate that the few Dutch and German studies on such different argument realisations deviate from English analyses in a strange way. The verbs *(be)smeren* / *(be)schmieren* and *(af)ruimen* / *(ab)räumen* will be used to demonstrate that this difference is actually a mistake. After this, section 3 will clarify that some linguistic data can only be explained if the contiguity relation between both possible direct objects is taken into account. This section will demonstrate that the object changes must be analysed as instances of predicative metonymy. Section 4 will discuss some constraints and specific characteristics of MOCs. These will be illustrated by the behaviour of certain verbs and related particle verbs, such as *to fill* - *vullen* - *füllen* in section 4.1; *to pour* - *schenken* / *gießen* in section 4.2; *to clear* - *ruimen* - *räumen*, *laden* - *laden* ('to load') and *pakken* - *packen* ('to pack') in section 4.3; and *(be)smeren* - *schmieren* ('to rub'/'to spread') and *(be)persen* - *(be)pressen* / *(be)kernern* ('to press'/'to squeeze') in section 4.4. Section 5 will present the conclusions of this chapter.

2. Transitive locative alternations: Comparing sentences

The shift of an argument type only is visible in a contrast between two expressions. If an analysis of alternations is made, one therefore has to compare different sentences with each other. This is, as I explained in chapter II (cf. Sweep 2012), an onomasiological stance. It has always been assumed that it is evident which pair of sentences has to be contrasted. In this section, however, I will show that this is in fact not always that straightforward.

2.1 Primarily shifting the direct object

The first problem is the fact that traditional linguistic literature always compares sentences that express all arguments. In other words, not only the type of the direct object has been analysed, but the expression of the other participant in a prepositional phrase is always taken into account as well. Based on this, Levin (1993) divides transitive locative alternations into the *spray/load*-group, the *clear*-group and the *wipe*-group. These verbs differ syntactically in their use of locatums in prepositional phrases: For the *wipe*-group this is impossible, the *clear*-group uses *of* and the *spray/load*-group uses *with*. The b-sentences in (1)-(3) illustrate alternations with *to load*, *to clear* and *to wipe.*
(1) a. The dockworker loaded coal onto the ship
   b. The dockworker loaded the ship with coal

(2) a. The waiter cleared dishes from the table
   b. The waiter cleared the table of dishes

(3) a. The teacher wiped the sentences from the whiteboard
   b. The teacher wiped the whiteboard (*of the sentences)

One may question, however, to what extent the added prepositional phrase (PP) is actually relevant. Apart from the fact that the addition of a PP is not always possible (cf. examples of the *wipe*-group, Levin 1993: 53), the PPs are optional. The following English examples taken from the British National Corpus (BNC) illustrate this. In these examples only one participant (i.e. the locatum or the location) is expressed, realised as a direct object (DO). Examples (4)-(7) show examples with *load*, (8)-(11) with *clear* and (12)-(15) with *wipe*. For every verb, the first two examples have the locatum as a DO, the second two have the location as a DO.

(4) Up behind the engine, two baggage handlers were loading a small pile of boxes.
(5) Tony’s all right about drivin’ the lorry as long as we load the stuff ourselves.
(6) When they load or unload a ship they can understand what’s wanted.
(7) They loaded the car and then Fosdyke offered to take the children for a coke in the café opposite the petrol pumps.
(8) Emily cleared the soup plates and Heinrich and Algernon were bringing out individual plates of lobster salad.
(9) when Newcastle council called in workmen to clear the rubbish as part of a scheme to upgrade houses in the area.
(10) There was a chorus of agreement as the maid cleared the table.
(11) so he went into the wardrobe and cleared a shelf and said put it in there.
(12) He shifted uncomfortably on the chair and wiped a bead of sweat that ran down the side of his face.
(13) Don’t expect me to wipe your tears.
(14) ‘Blimmin’ heat,’ he grumbled, wiping his forehead with a handkerchief.
(15) Lucy wept, her hand against her face, wiped her eyes as more tears came.
These examples show that both types of PPs, that is location-PPs (with *to load*, with *to clear* and with *to wipe*) as well as locatum-PPs (as for *to load* and *to clear*), can be left out.\footnote{These examples also show that the idea that particles are of fundamental importance for MOCs is questionable (cf. chapter V, §6.3-6.5). In English, none of the verbs involved is a particle verb. In Dutch and German, however, some of these examples must be translated with particle verbs. Consider, for instance, the pairs (8)-(10) or (9)-(11): the verb ‘clear’ in (8) and (10) should be translated as *afruimen* or *abräumen* (‘off-clear’) and in (9) and (11) as *opruimen* or *aufräumen* (‘up-clear’). However, the Dutch verb *ruimen* or the German verb *räumen* itself sometimes also alternates (cf. the examples under (37) on page 193).}

Some optional PPs are, however, more important than others. Their presence may be required from a semantic-pragmatic point of view, in order to convey the message clearly. This can be illustrated with examples of *load something*. In the context of example (7) (which is preceded by a sentence about a bag) it is obvious that it is not the car itself that is loaded onto something else but that the car is loaded with luggage. However, given that a car could be loaded onto something else, a *with*-phrase can be very useful to avoid this conflicting interpretation. This also explains why *to load a ship* can be found without a *with*-phrase more often than cars: The latter can easily be loaded as a locatum-object onto something (onto a ship for instance), whereas in the context of the ship it is more obvious that this is the location-object.

These facts are clearly attested in the BNC. I searched for the verb *load* combined with the entries *car* or *ship* within a range of five words before or after the verb (which can be done with the help of the SketchEngine, option ‘filter’) and classified these examples by hand. Out of the ten examples with *car* as a direct object of location, there are only three instances (33\%) in which no *with*-phrase has been added. For *ship* this is fundamentally different: Out of the 31 uses of *ship* as a direct object of location, 22 examples (71\%) are used without a *with*-phrase. No examples can be found of loading a ship onto something, whereas cars are loaded onto something else in four examples.

Similarly, *to load a gun / bullets* are found without PPs. If one searches for the verb *load* combined with the entry *gun* in the BNC and again manually selects direct objects, one finds 18 examples, all without a *with*-phrase. *Bullets* occur once as a direct object, also without a PP. These are once again cases in which no confusion can arise; if one object is used as the direct object, the other is clear by default. They are perfect examples of a direct object change (cf. also restrictions on German *laden* in section 4.3).

The same is even more evident in MATERIAL-PRODUCT shifts, as in (16)-(19) (taken from the BNC). In such cases, examples without PPs are very common.

(16) When sufficient yarn has been spun on spindle or wheel, ...
(17) hamlets where old ladies sit on their doorsteps spinning wool, ...
(18) slabs of rich bread dough baked with herbs and olive oil
The observation that the PPs are optional is relevant, because it reveals that in this respect locative alternations and material/product alternations differ from, for instance, Levin’s *with/against* alternation or *through/with* alternation (cf. Levin 1993: 67-69). The latter alternations can be illustrated by *hit the fence with a stick / hit the stick against the fence* and *pierce the cloth with a needle / pierce the needle through the cloth* (cf. chapter V, §6.2). These alternations cannot be considered a real change of the direct object slot, since they only shift their direct object if the original one is expressed as a prepositional phrase.

In addition to the optionality of PPs, they can often be realised with different prepositions, especially with locations.\(^{187}\) Consider, for instance, the BNC-examples (20)-(23) with the verb *to clear*.

(20) Have they cleared that chicken off the roundabout?

(21) He flicked the corner of his cloak at Izzie to clear her off the table - as if to touch her would dirty his hands.

(22) In the past, it was commonplace to clear the lymph glands out of the armpit at the same time as performing the mastectomy (removing the whole breast).

(23) The only thing left to do is to sort through that pile of things we cleared out of the cupboards

The sentences show that the location-PP cannot only be formed with *from* but also with *off* (as in (20) and (21)) or with *out of* (as in (22) and (23)).

Although both participants do play a crucial role within the verbal action, the fact that their literally interpreted preposition can be realised in several ways, and that they can be left out, as in examples (4)-(19), makes it questionable whether we are really dealing with complements in the case of location-PPs (cf. Honselaar 1980: 11-12).

For the locatums in PPs with *with or of*, as in (1)b and (2)b, it is more difficult to use an alternative preposition.\(^{188}\) A simple reason could be that there are not many

---

\(^{187}\) Cf. also sentences (14)-(17) in chapter V, which illustrate that different prepositions of the location also occur with particle verbs.

\(^{188}\) A possible alternative for *with* in this sense could be *full of* (cf. also §4.1 below). This phrase can indeed be found with locatums, cf. BNC-examples with *to load*: “RAIDERS smashed their way into a furniture store and calmly loaded a van full of three-piece suites.”; with *to pack*: “he was surprised to see her packing a suitcase full of clothes.”; with *to plant*: “He’s planted fields full of sunflowers”; with *to cram*: “It’s an awful building really, architecturally. [...] Milligan has crammed it so full of Victorian antiques, paintings and illustrations that the cement is hidden by memorabilia.”; with *to stuff*: “And he and his man would take a black bin-liner and carry it upstairs and stuff it full of cash from the safe.”, etc.
different ways to paraphrase the meaning of with or of: Whereas locations can be accompanied by different prepositions, this is generally problematic for all kinds of arguments with of or with. The same is true for, for instance, instrumental with, as in to load hay with a fork. Instrumental with-phrases, such as with a fork, do not play a crucial role within the verbal action and are definitely considered an adjunct.

Furthermore, syntactic tests, which can be used to determine the syntactic status of with-locatums, are not as conclusive as sometimes suggested (cf. e.g. Iwata 2008: 46-48). Iwata even explicitly concludes that “while the locatum with is indeed distinct from the instrumental with, they are nevertheless both adjuncts.” (Iwata 2008: 48). The same line of reasoning can be applied to locatum phrases with of.

Given that location and locatum PPs are optional constituents, which are in all probability adjuncts, they should not necessarily be taken into account in an analysis of locatum-location and material-product shifts. Rather than the shifting of all arguments simultaneously, only the direct object slot (DO-slot) is crucially involved in the shift. Therefore, only the combination of verb and DO should be directly compared to each other. The optional PPs are only useful to illustrate that the examples are paraphrases of each other. The next section will present additional reasons for leaving PPs out of consideration from a crosslinguistic perspective.

2.2 Crosslinguistic differences in the analysis and usage of PPs

The previous subsection has shown that in cases of MOC PPs are not necessary and sometimes even impossible, and that their syntactic status as a complement may be questionable. In addition, the syntactic status of the PP can be unclear because the PP is often syntactically ambiguous in actual sentences. In many examples, it remains unclear whether the PP should be analysed as an autonomous constituent within the sentence or as an attribute of the direct object. This problem especially emerges in Dutch and German, because of some structural differences between these languages compared to English.

This can be illustrated by the clear parallel between the German examples (24) and (25) on the one hand and (26) and (27) on the other.189

---

189 These examples have all been found with the help of the internet: Example (24) has been found via the internet-based DeWac-corpus, the sources of (25) and (27) are http://www.tis-gdv.de/tis/misc/becker.htm [August 2010] and http://www.rheinhafen.de/rheinhafen-karlsruhe/aktuelles/hafenmagazin-hafen-aktuell.html; 02/2008 [July 2011] and example (26) is taken from Gushterov, Savin (2011): Der Revers im Seefrachtgeschäft. Münster: LIT Verlag, page 235 (via Google-books).
(24) die syrische Hafenstadt  Tyrus,  
   the Syrian seaport town  Tyrus  
    wo die Ladung des Schiffes gelöscht wurde,  
    where the cargo of the ship-GEN unloaded got  
   ‘the Syrian seaport town Tyrus, where the cargo of the ship got unloaded.’

(25) Die erhitzte Ladung aus dem Schiff kann gelöscht werden in: -...  
   the hot cargo out (of) the ship can unloaded got/be in: -...  
   ‘The ship’s hot cargo can be unloaded in: -...’

(26) Wollen Ablader und Verfrachter [...]  
    want unloader and shipper  
    die ganze Ladung aus dem Schiff löschen,  
    the whole cargo out the ship unload  
    ‘If unloader and shipper want to unload the whole cargo out of the ship,’

(27) die beiden Kräne, die [...] den Brennstoff aus den Schiffen löschen,  
    the both cranes, which the fuel out the ships unload,  
    ‘both cranes, which unload fuel out of the ships’

The genitive phrase “des Schiffes” in (24) can only be interpreted as an attribute belonging to “die Ladung”. The same is also true, however, for the PP in example (25), since German allows only one sentential constituent (in this case the subject) before the finite verb in main clauses. Therefore, the subject must be “die erhitzte Ladung aus dem Schiff” as such, meaning that the PP of (25) can only be analysed as an attribute belonging to “die erhitzte Ladung”.

Examples (26) and (27) differ in this respect, since the locatum-object and location-PP occur within an infinitive construction or within a subordinate clause. In subordinate clauses all constituents occur before the finite verb, so word order does not discriminate whether the PP is an attributive or sentential constituent. Although German prefers genitives as attributive phrases in such cases, the parallel between (25) and (26) or (27) demonstrates that in the latter two examples the PP also could be an attributive phrase belonging to the direct object.

In other words, for many examples which include a shifted object and a PP, the syntactic analysis of the PP is ambiguous. The two possibilities are shown in bracket notation in (28). Structure i) shows a non-attributive PP, structure ii) an attributive one. The closing brackets of the NP and of the VP are aligned.

(28)  
   i)  [VP  [NP [N ] ]  ]  [PP [NP] ]  ]  
   ii)  [VP  [NP [N ] [PP [NP] ] ]  ]  [PP [NP] ]  ]
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This problem can also be illustrated for Dutch. The ANW-examples (29) and (30) show that besides the combination ‘to wash clothes’ one can sometimes also use ‘to wash stains’. Example (29) shows that the stains can occur as a direct object of *wassen* without an additional PP.190

(29) Oude vlekken eventueel meerdere malen [...] wassen
old stains if necessary more times wash
‘If necessary, old stains should be washed several times.’

(30) De vlekken uit mijn regenjas waste ze [...] eruit.
the stains out of my rain coat washed she there-out/out of it
‘She washed the stains out/in my rain coat out of it.’

Example (30) contains two prepositional phrases: *uit mijn regenjas* as well as *eruit*. Given these two simultaneously realised phrases and because of the fact that it is only possible to place one argument before the finite verb, the phrase *uit mijn regenjas* can only be analysed as an attributive phrase, belonging to *de vlekken*. The fact that an analysis of the PP as an attribute of *de vlekken* must apply in example (30) demonstrates that this analysis can also apply to more common structures such as (31). Although it is more plausible in such examples to analyse *de vlekken* instead of *de vlekken uit mijn laken* as the direct object, the latter is theoretically possible.

(31) om de vlekken uit mijn laken te wassen
for/to the stains out of my sheet to wash
‘for washing the stains out of my sheet / the stains in my sheet’

This problem is more evident in Dutch and German than in English because of differences in the use of prepositions. First of all, English prepositions which play a crucial role in these alternations, such as *of* and *from* and even some instances of *off*, are all translated with *van* / *von* in Dutch and German. In Dutch, this preposition is also a default preposition for attributes, corresponding to English *of* and to the

190 Cf. also the internet examples “Ik heb mijn broek uitgetrokken en heb de vlek gewassen” (*I have taken off my pants and have washed the stain*)
(http://www.waarmaarraar.nl/blog/670/ID/86951/GO/0/WMR_blog:_WMR_blog:_Stront.htm l); “We adviseren om deze vlekken te wassen met een voorwas met een wasmiddel dat enzymen bevat, en een hoofdwas met zuurstofbleekmiddel.” (*We advise to wash these stains with a prewash with a detergent containing enzymes*)
(http://www.pgprof.com/belgium_nl/index.php?page=search-results&flt=1&all=1&sc=) or
“Om de vlek echt weg te krijgen is het zaak om direct na het knoeien de vlek te wassen met [...] een vlekkenmiddel.” (*To really get rid of the stain, it is necessary to wash the stain with [...] a stain remover directly after spilling*)
(http://www.besteproduct.nl/Artikelen/Onderzoek_verwijderen_wijnvlekken_samenvatting.htm ml) [all retrieved in October 2011].
German genitive (which is sometimes also analytically paraphrased by a von-attribute). Consider in this respect a Dutch internet-example such as (32).\textsuperscript{191}

(32) Ze veegde het wassop van haar handen af aan haar schort.
she wiped the washing suds of/from her hands off on her apron
‘She wiped the washing suds on her hands off on her apron.’
‘She wiped the washing suds off from her hands on her apron.’

The phrase *het wassop van haar handen* in example (32) cannot only be translated into a non-attributive PP (i.e. ‘the suds from her hands’) but also into a PP that can be interpreted attributively (i.e. ‘the suds of her hands’ = ‘the suds on her hands’). Although it is possible that both PPs (*van haar handen* as well as *aan haar schort*) are non-attributively used, it also makes sense to analyse the first PP as an attribute belonging to *het wassop*. The positions of both PPs with respect to *af* even point towards this interpretation.

However, if this is plausible in an example such as (32) the same ambiguity arises for other *van*-phrases, as in the ANW-example (33).

(33) Hoe krijg ik die plekken van mijn broek gewassen?
how get I those stains off/from/of my pants washed
‘How can I wash (away) the stains in my pants / wash the stains from my pants?’

The preposition *van* plays a crucial role, because it is often used with particle verbs with *af*.

Apart from the problematic status of the prepositional phrase as an attribute, which is endorsed by the use of *van* in Dutch, there is an additional problem from a cross-linguistic point of view: Even if the same object alternations as in English are allowed in Dutch and German, not all of them are equally possible with a prepositional phrase (PP) in both variants. Examples (34)-(35) illustrate this.\textsuperscript{192} Just as in English, the alternations in (34) and (35) are possible with PPs in both variants.

\textsuperscript{191} Source: http://www.real site.nl/omamargot/BouterDeel2/Hoofdstuk%2012.pdf [August 2010].

\textsuperscript{192} Although these examples are abstractions, I tested all combinations by checking for real examples in the Dutch ANW-corpus, the German DWDS-corpus or the deWac-corpus.
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(34) a. Dutch: zijn spullen pakken (in een koffer)
   German: seine Sachen packen (in einen Koffer)
   his stuff pack in a suitcase
b. Dutch: een koffer pakken (met zijn spullen)
   German: einen Koffer packen (mit seinen Sachen)
   a suitcase pack with his stuff

(35) a. Dutch: tin gieten (in bepaalde vormen)
   German: Zinn gießen (in gewissen Formen)
   tin cast in certain forms
b. Dutch: vormen gieten (in tin / uit tin)
   German: Formen gießen (aus Zinn)
   forms cast in tin / from (lit. out) tin

An example such as (36)b, however, which is quite possible with English to clear,
does not allow the location in a PP in Dutch and German.

(36) a. Dutch: de borden afruimen (van de tafel)
   German: die Teller abräumen (vom Tisch)
   the plates off-clear off/from the table
b. Dutch: de tafel afruimen (*van borden)
   German: der Tisch abräumen (*von Tellern)
   the table off-clear of plates

Similar observations can be illustrated with simplex verbs. The simplex verb ruimen / räumen,
which can be used, for instance, in combination with snow and roads,
displays different behaviour in English and German than in Dutch. Example (37)
shows that the locatum-PP is only possible in German, and not in Dutch.

(37) a. Dutch: sneeuw ruimen (van het dak / parkeerplaats)
   German: Schnee räumen (vom Dach / Parkplatz)
   snow clear off/from the roof/parking place
b. Dutch: het dak / de parkeerplaats ruimen (*van sneeuw)\(^{193}\)
   German: das Dach/ den Parkplatz räumen (von Schnee)\(^{194}\)
   the roof / the parking place clear of snow

\(^{193}\) Dutch does allow the location as the direct object, cf. the ANW-example in (147) or
internet examples, such as “Ik sta speciaal vroeger op om sneeuw te ruimen […] In onze
straat zijn er slechts een handvol mensen die hun stoep ruimen” (“I get up especially early to
clear snow […] In our street, there are only a couple of people who clear their pavement”) [http://nl.yunomi.be/artikel/voetpaden-sneeuwvrij-maken] or “Even later kwam ook de
sneeuwschuiver de weg en parkeerplaats ruimen.” (“The snow plough came a moment later
to clear the road and the parking place”) [http://groen828.hyves.nl/blog/] (all retrieved in April
2011). Examples with a PP cannot be found for Dutch.

\(^{194}\) Many instances of these combination can be found on the internet: “Wann soll das Dach
vom Schnee geräumt werden?” (“when has the roof to be cleared of snow”)
The difference between Dutch and German would force Levin to consider only German *räumen* as a verb similar to *to clear*, whereas Dutch *ruimen* should instead be classified as comparable to *to wipe*. In my view, this makes a division between verbs based on the use of PPs unreliable.

There are also other simplex verbs that do not allow one variant in Dutch and German. The Dutch simplex verb *lossen* and German *löschen*, for instance, do not allow PPs with similar ease as the composed English equivalent *unload*. The verb *to unload* allows prepositional phrases with locations and locatums. In Dutch, the use of a location-PP appears to be impossible and in German it is problematic (cf. the German examples (26)-(27) above). Both Dutch and German thus prefer not to add the location in a PP. Locatum-PPs are clearly impossible in Dutch and German, as illustrated in (38).

(38) Dutch: het schip *lossen* (*van goederen*)
    German: das Schiff *löschen* (*von Ware*)
    *the ship* *unload* *of goods*
    English: *to unload the ship* *of goods*

Things are even more complicated when it comes to the simplex verbs *wissen* and *wischen* (*‘to wipe’*). Example (39)b shows that the locatum-PP with *wissen* / *wischen* is, as in English, impossible. In contrast to English, a locatum such as ‘sweat’ is only allowed as a direct object, if the corresponding location-PP is added. In other words, the location-PP is not optional in Dutch and German. This is illustrated in (39)a. Examples (12) and (13) above show that the PP is optional in English.\(^{195}\)

\(^{195}\)With other verbs, such constructions with obligatory location-PPs also occur in English: Compare, for instance, *to wash the car; to wash the mud off the car; *to wash the mud.*

Langacker (1995) discusses sentences such as *to wash mud off the car* as related to raising constructions (1995: 22) with a shift in the meaning of the verb (1995: 23). Although I do not consider such examples as clear MOCs and although I strongly doubt whether verbal polysemy should be assumed in such cases, it is interesting that Langacker considers such construction as involving a complex kind of metonymy (1995: 1, 57) and a “highlighting effect” with a “focal prominence of trajector or landmark status” (1995: 38).
The situation with \textit{wissen} and \textit{wischen} is even more complicated, since these observations do not apply to every object. In combination with ‘tears’ and ‘eyes’, for instance, the location as a direct object is only allowed in German and not in Dutch (= \textit{sich den Augen wischen} / *\textit{zijn ogen wissen}). This is illustrated in (40)b. Furthermore, if the tears are used as a direct object (as in (40)a), the location is, in contrast to (39)a, optional.

(40) a. Dutch: \textit{tranen wissen} (\textit{uit je ogen})
\textit{trenen} \quad \textit{wissen} \quad (\textit{uit je ogen})
\textit{Tränen} \quad \textit{wischen} \quad (\textit{aus den Augen})
\textit{tears} \quad \textit{wipe} \quad (\textit{out of your eyes})^{197}

b. Dutch: *\textit{je/haar/zijn ogen wissen} (\textit{van tranen})
\textit{Augen} \quad \textit{wischen} \quad (\textit{von Tränen})^{198}
\textit{your/her/his eyes} \quad \textit{wipe} \quad (\textit{of tears})

All these examples show that whereas \textit{to wipe} easily displays MOC in English (as illustrated in (12)-(15)): German \textit{wischen} allows MOC only in some cases (as with ‘tears’ and ‘eyes’) and with Dutch \textit{wissen} comparable shifts occur even less frequently (compare some examples in the WNT).

\footnote{196}{In most examples, German adds the possessive dative \textit{sich} (himself/herself) to this object-verb combination. The word \textit{sich} is not necessarily added, however, cf. in the DWDS-corpus \textit{und von dem Wirbel des Geschehens benommen, die Stirn wischte,} (= ‘and dazed by the fuss, he wiped his [lit: the] forehead’). Footnote 198 also provides examples without a possessive dative.}

\footnote{197}{As in the ANW-examples ‘Nadat ze haar tranen had gewist, Wilde ze een sigaret opsteken.’ (‘After she had wiped her tears, she wanted to light a cigarette’) or ‘Ze wiste haar tranen met de volle hand en herstelde zich.’ (‘She wiped her tears with her whole hand and pulled herself together’) and in the German deWac-examples, such as ‘Wisch ihnen die Tränen, wenn ihr Vater getötet wird.’ (‘Wipe their tears, when their father gets killed’) or ‘aber dabei sieht sie zu Boden und wischt verstohlen ihre Tränen’ (‘but with that she is looking at the floor and stealthy wiping her tears’).}

\footnote{198}{Cf. DWDS-examples such as ‘Er wischte die Augen mit dem Handrücken und lächelte’ (‘he wiped his [lit: the] eyes with the back of his hand and smiled’); ‘Adalbert, der dann nichts mehr sagte, aber im Umdrehen die Augen wischte mit dem großen gelben Taschentuch’ (= ‘Adalbert, who then said nothing further, just wiped his [lit: the] eyes with the large yellow handkerchief while turning around’); ‘Sie wischte mit dem Handrücken die wunden Augen’ (‘she wiped with the back of her hand the injured eyes’).}
On the basis of these considerations it emerges that, even in MOCs where the PPs are acceptable, they should be left out of consideration. The syntactic status of a PP is not entirely clear, it can even be ambiguous, and the PP is an optional constituent. In addition to this, the use of PPs differs cross-linguistically, even if the same MOCs are possible. In such cases, possible PPs do not give much information on the object change as such. The addition of PPs seems to bring in new complexities of its own, which do not necessarily have to be connected with the object shift as such.

On the other hand, PPs can provide much information on the demarcation of alternations that are seemingly MOCs but actually display different structures. Examples in this respect are the English with/against alternation or through/with alternation and probably some Dutch and German examples with wissen and wischen (cf. also footnote 195). Differences between such alternations and real object shifts are only visible if PPs are not automatically taken into account.

2.3 Morphological marking in Dutch and German?
Research on locative alternations in Dutch (cf. de Groot 1998; Laffut 1998) and German (Brinkmann 1995; Sauerland 1994; Frense/Bennet 1996) deviates in a strange way from research on English. This is caused by the fact that Dutch and German have different restrictions upon some alternations as compared to English and because the former two languages have a richer morphology. As a consequence, whereas examples of an English alternation always contain the same verb, it is alleged that Dutch and German alternations occur with two different verbs, viz. a simplex verb and a morphologically marked one. In this subsection, I will show that this in fact is a misrepresentation.

The different analyses for Dutch and German as compared to English can be explained on the basis of examples in (41)-(47). Examples (41)-(43) show locative alternations in English.

(41)  a. The farmer sprayed pesticide (onto the fields)  
     b. The farmer sprayed the fields (with pesticide)
(42)  a. The lorry spattered mud (onto my clothes)  
     b. The lorry spattered my clothes (with mud)
(43)  a. John heaped/piled/stacked books (on the shelves)  
     b. John heaped/piled/stacked the shelves (with books)

These prototypical examples of locative alternations in English are not equally felicitous in Dutch and German. An analysis of a balanced sample of 200 examples of the ANW-corpus with the Dutch verb spuiten (‘to spray’) revealed only 5 locations as the direct object (2.5%). All examples were things that were painted, such as sprayed cars, sprayed furniture or sprayed easter eggs. German behaves...
similarly: Among a sample of 200 sentences with spritzen in the deWaC-corpus only 3 location-DOS were found (1.5%). These were locations that were sprayed with paint or plants that were sprayed with pesticide. The latter combination is also possible in Dutch to a limited degree.

The German loan word sprayen behaves the same way: Again, among all 230 occurrences in the deWaC-corpus only 3 examples with locations as the direct object could be extracted (1.3%). Although the verb sprayen is infrequent in Dutch (14 examples in the ANW-corpus), the only locations as the direct object reflect the above patterns: In these cases the locations are sprayed with a remedy against fleas. The location-DO thus only seems to be possible, if the locatum is some kind of paint or varnish or a type of poison, such as pesticide or a remedy against fleas. Furthermore, in all corpus examples the locations are three-dimensional.

The Dutch verb sproeien (‘to spray’/ ‘to sprinkle’) also occurs with locations to which some water is added. The verb sproeien occurs 135 times as a verb in the ANW-corpus,199 with seven examples with location-objects (5.8%). These locations are a race circuit which is sprayed against the dust, a terrarium and gardens (three examples) which are sprayed with water, plants and a field which is sprayed with poison.

Mostly, both languages express equivalents of the b-sentences of (41)-(43) with morphologically marked verbs, as illustrated in (44)-(46).

(44) Dutch: ?? De boer spruide de akker (met pesticide)200
De boer bespruit de akker (met pesticide)

German: ?? Der Bauer spritzte den Acker (mit Pestizid)
Der Bauer bespritzte den Acker (mit Pestizid)
‘the farmer [be-]sprayed the field (with pesticide)’

(45) Dutch: * De vrachtwagen spatte mijn kleren (met modder)
De vrachtwagen bespatte mijn kleren (met modder)

German: * Der Lastwagen spritzte meine Klamotten (mit Dreck)
Der Lastwagen bespritzte meine Klamotten (mit Dreck)
‘the lorrey [be-]spattered my clothes (with mud)’

---

199 The SketchEngine provides 139 examples with four double sentences.
200 On the internet, only one elliptical example could be found, in the head of a newspaper article, i.e. “Milieubewust een akker spuiten met gps” (‘To spray the field in an environmentally responsible way with gps’) [http://www.volkskrant.nl/binnenland/article1195695.ece/Milieubewust_een_aker_spuiten_met_gps] [July 2010]. Possibly, the verb sproeien (‘to spray’) is preferred in this context, as in the single ANW-example “De landbouwer moet maar eenmaal zijn akker sproeien met een herbicide” (‘With a herbicide, the cultivator has to spay his field only once’). The intuition of some native speakers (e.g. Honselaar p.c.) that the combination de tuin spuiten (‘to spray the garden’), in the meaning of ‘to water the garden’, is much better than de akker spuiten (‘to spray the field’, i.e. with pesticide) is questionable: The combination de tuin spuiten does not occur in the ANW-corpus and it is also infrequent on the internet.
Based on such equivalents of prototypical examples, scholars often consider locative alternations in Dutch and German as involving morphological markers such as be-/be- or vol-/voll-. It has only occasionally been noticed that in Dutch and German locative alternations can in fact occur without any morphological marking (Brinkmann 1995: 50, 55-56; Laffut 1998: 158; Olsen 1994: 212). Most studies that investigate locative alternations in Dutch and German primarily take into account different verbs and analyse the morphemes used (cf. Brinkmann 1995; Frense/Bennet 1996: 313; de Groot 1998; Laffut 1998; Sauerland 1994: 54-55; cf., however, Dewell 2004: 18).

Thus, whereas in English two different syntactic patterns with a single verb are analysed, in Dutch and German the same two syntactic patterns with different verbs have been taken into account. This is strange, especially since sometimes similar alternatives can be found in English, as illustrated in (47).

(47) a. A stone flew through the air, striking a rain pool and spattering mud on Ashe’s boots
   b. heavy vehicles passing close by spattered his shoes and trousers with filth
   c. his elegant shoes and trousers bespattered with mud

The location as a direct object occurs with spatter ((47)b) as well as with bespatter ((47)c). However, only the pair spatter with a locatum-DO and spatter with the location-DO are considered to be relevant for the locative alternation.

Although the prefix be- is unproductive in English, spatter - bespatter is not the only pair of verbs corresponding in this way. Other examples are strew - bestrew; smear - besmear/besmirch; sprinkle - besprinkle. None of the be-verbs are, however, taken into account as the alternating counterpart of the simplex verb. They are simply treated as two different verbs with their own syntactic patterns (cf. for instance strew versus bestrew Levin 1993: 50 vs. 51).

This makes sense, because if a language uses specific morphology, such as with bespatter, bespritzen or bespetteren, we could not, strictly speaking, analyse the location-direct object as an alternation or shift. Pure or real locative alternations, such as the ones in English, occur without any morphological marking on the verb. Given that some morphologically simple verbs in Dutch and German, as in English, do in fact allow the locatum as well as location as a DO, one should primarily

201 The a-sentence comes from The Time Traders by Andre Norton (page 56, 2008 re-published by BiblioBazaar) and the b- and c-sentences are taken from the BNC-corpus.
consider the same verb occurring with (or without) type shifts concerning the direct objects.

Honselaar has also stated that real alternations are patterns of a single verb (1980: 63). He points out that one should not confuse diathesis (i.e. alternation) with conversions. In the case of conversions two different, morphologically related verbs are compared (as in (41)-(43)), which only shows a lexical-syntactic relation between two sentences. Alternations or diatheses, on the other hand, involve different syntactic patterns for one invariant verb.

Some linguistic data also show clearly why one should not compare simplex verb with be-verbs: There are verb-object combinations which allow the locative alternation without the option of using a be-verb. Consider in this respect the contrast between the Dutch and German examples in (48)-(49)\textsuperscript{202} smeren or besmeren and schmieren or beschmieren (cf. also examples with Dutch beladen in footnote 221).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{a. Dutch:} hij smeerde boter op een boterham\textsuperscript{203}  
    \textit{German:} er schmierte Butter auf eine Scheibe Brot
    \begin{itemize}
      \item ‘he spread [lit.: smeared] butter on a slice of bread’
    \end{itemize}
  \item \textbf{b. Dutch:} hij smeerde een boterham met boter  
    \textit{German:} er schmierte eine Scheibe Brot mit Butter
    \begin{itemize}
      \item ‘he spread [lit.: smeared] a slice of bread with butter’
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{202} Real examples for (48)a and b are ANW-examples, such as “Voor Ewa's aanrecht smeerde ze een boterham met boter en legde er een plak jonge kaas op,” ('She spread a slice of bread with butter at Ewa’s kitchen counter and put a piece of young cheese on it’) and “Olga smeerde boter op een stuk geaderd brood,” ('Olga spread butter on a piece of grainy bread’) or deWac-examples, such as “Du sollst aber ein Brot mit Butter schmieren” (‘You should just spread a slice of bread with butter’) and “Ob er lieber Butter oder Margarine aufs Brot schmiert...” (‘Whether he prefers to spread butter or margarine on his bread’).

Real examples for (49)a and b are the Dutch internet examples “Een piepende deur gaat u te lijf door een paar druppels olie in de scharniere te smeren.” (‘You can repair a creaking door by greasing the hinges with a few drops of oil [lit.: ‘by smearing a few drops of oil in the hinges’]) (http://www.ah.nl/huishouden/nijme?lp_sortReverted=true&lp_sortProperty=dateInserted&filter=applicableRooms%3DStudeerkamer) and “Maak alle onderdelen schoon en smeer het scharnier met olie” (‘Clean all parts and grease the hinge with oil’) (http://www.aazet.nl/pages/kozijnen/afstelling-kozijnen.php) or the German internet examples, such as “Die hatten [...] ein bisschen Fett in die Scharniere geschmiert.” (‘They had greased the hinges with a bit of grease [lit.: ‘a bit grease in the hinges smeared’].’)

\textsuperscript{203} It is useful to point out that the Dutch compound boterham does not, from a synchronic point of view, involve any butter: It simply refers to ‘a slice of bread’. In German, a slice of bread is called Scheibe Brot. The German word Butterbrot denotes ‘a slice of bread with butter’.
c. Dutch: hij besmeerde een boterham met boter
German: er beschmierte eine Scheibe Brot mit Butter
‘he spread [lit.: smeared] a slice of bread with butter’

(49) a. Dutch: hij smeerde oli in de scharnieren
German: er schmierte Öl in die Scharnieren
‘he put [lit.: smeared] oil in the hinges’
b. Dutch: hij smeerde de scharnieren met olie
German: er schmierte die Scharniere mit Öl
‘he greased [lit.: smeared] the hinges’
c. Dutch: *hij besmeerde de scharnieren met olie
German: *er beschmierte die Scharniere mit Öl

These examples under (48) as compared to (49) clearly show that a simplex verb and a corresponding be-verb are two different verbs with their own behaviour. They should therefore not be compared as if they were the same. In other words, we should discard “the habit of thinking of be-verb constructions as “The Locative Alternative in German”” and Dutch (Dewell 2004: 18).

The occurrence of simplex verbs with shifted direct objects is not the only reason to compare sentences involving the same verb. The confusion of comparing two different verbs is even more problematic for the clear-group and wipe-group. Since all verbs in these groups express some kind of removal, they can never be combined with the prefix be-. The prefix be- is semantically connected to an “applicative meaning” applied to a location which is preferably a surface (cf. Laffut 1998: 157, 142-143). Occasionally scholars have proposed that German examples with removal verbs use the particle ab- for the location-DO (cf. Frense/Bennet 1996: 315). Dutch has a similar construction with af-.

The translation of (50) into Dutch and German (illustrated in (51) and (52)) does indeed seem to suggest that af- or ab- marks the location-variant. The use of PPs differs from English: For the Dutch and German a-sentences the location-PP is obligatory and for the Dutch and German b-sentences, a location-PP is impossible.

(50) a. The waiter has cleared dishes (from the table)
   b. The waiter has cleared the table (of dishes)

(51) a. De ober heeft de borden van de tafel geruimd
   b. De ober heeft de tafel *geruimd / afgeruimd

204 Intuitively, (49)c is infelicitous because be-verbs are often used with respect to surfaces. Therefore, example (49)c is maybe possible, but not under the same interpretation as in (49)a and b. I will not discuss the semantics of be-verbs in Dutch and German in further detail (which has been done by Dewell 2004 and Laffut 1998: 157, 142-143).
205 Real Dutch and German examples will be provided below (Cf. examples (53) and (54) and the corresponding footnotes).
The sentences under (51) and (52) illustrate that, in the context of clearing tables, the morphologically simple verb *ruimen* or *räumen* can only be used with the locatum (including location-PP), and not with the location as a direct object. The location-DO can be expressed with *afruimen* / *abräumen*.

However, these verbs themselves also occur with the locatum as a direct object. In other words, apart from the combination *tafel* *afruimen* / *Tisch* *abräumen* (as in (51)b) and (52)b one could also use *borden* *afruimen* / *Teller* *abräumen*. Translations (51) and (52) are thus misrepresentative: The full, correct comparison is displayed in (53) and (54). The a-sentences are examples with a locatum as the DO, the b-sentences contain a location-DO. The sentences with subscript 1 show morphologically simple verbs, the sentences with 2 as a subscript contain a morphologically complex verb. The behaviour of the PPs has been included in these examples: An asterisk before a bracket indicates that the phrase within brackets is obligatory, whereas an asterisk after a bracket indicates that the prepositional phrase cannot be added to the sentence.

(53)  
\[a_1. \text{ De ober heeft de borden } *(\text{van de tafel}) \text{ geruimd} \]  
\[a_2. \text{ De ober heeft de borden } (\text{van de tafel}) \text{ afgeruimd} \]  
\[b_1. *\text{De ober heeft de tafel geruimd} \]  
\[b_2. \text{ De ober heeft de tafel } *(\text{van de borden}) \text{ afgeruimd} \]

(54)  
\[a_1. \text{ Der Ober hat die Teller } *(\text{vom Tisch}) \text{ geräumt} \]  
\[a_2. \text{ Der Ober hat die Teller } (\text{vom Tisch}) \text{ abgeräumt} \]

---

206 This is not the case in all contexts, as illustrated in the Dutch and German examples (146) and (147). An explanation for this will be provided in subsection 4.1.

207 Real examples are ANW-sentences such as “De kantinejuffrouw ruimde met veel kabaal kopjes van de tafels.” (‘With a lot of noise, the canteen lady cleared cups from the tables.’) or, without the determiner, “terwijl Rosalie de soepkommen en de vuile glazen van tafel ruimde.” (‘while Rosalie cleared the soup bowls and dirty glasses from the table [lit.: “from table”].’).

208 Cf. internet examples, such as “heb nu alles van de tafel afgeruimd” (![lit: ‘off-cleared’] everything from the table”) (http://forum.viva.nl/forum/list_message/2514436) “...en ik ruimde de glazen van de tafel af.” (‘...and I cleared [lit.: ‘cleared...off’] the glasses from the table”) (http://forum.ellegirl.nl/showthread.php?t=579465&page=42) or, in a passive construction without the determiner, “Ook worden de vuile borden en de glazen regelmatig afgeruimd van tafel” (‘The dirty plates and the glasses are also regularly cleared [lit.: ‘off-cleared’] from the table.”) (http://passie.horeca.nl/fav/Distributietechnieken.pdf) [all retrieved in October 2011].

209 Cf., among many others, the ANW-sentence “Ze ruimt snel de tafel af” (‘She is quickly clearing [lit.: ‘cleans...off’] the table”).

210 A real sentence is the DWDS-Zeitcorpus example “Wir haben einfach irgendwann die Rotweinflaschen vom Tisch geräumt” (‘At a certain moment, we simply cleared the bottles of red wine from the table’) or the internet example “Die Kellnerinnen haben die Teller vom Tisch geräumt,” (‘The waitresses have cleared the plates from the table’).
b₁. *Der Ober hat den Tisch geräumt
b₂. Der Ober hat den Tisch (*von den Tellern) abgeräumt²¹²

These examples lead us to the conclusion that *ruimen* and *räumen* do not allow direct object shifts within this context, whereas *afruimen* and *abräumen* do: The latter verbs are the only verbs which allow both types of direct objects, without needing to add a PP in any of the variants. This shows that comparing two different verbs such as a₁-examples with b₂-examples (as in (51) and (52)) is misleading.

In sum, several reasons can thus be revealed why one should only compare sentences with a single verb when analysing alternations. First of all, the invariant verb is the crucial factor which distinguishes alternations from conversions. Secondly, research on English alternations also takes into account a single verb, even if similar comparisons between simplex and complex verbs can be made in English. Thirdly, simplex verbs and morphologically complex verbs sometimes display differing behaviour. In some cases, as with Dutch (be)smeren or German (be)schmieren, some location-objects can only occur with the simplex verb and not with the morphologically complex verb. This fact demonstrates that the complex verb cannot be a marker for the alternation. The same can also be proven by a fourth argument why single verbs should be taken into account: Morphologically complex verbs themselves can often also be combined with both types of direct objects, as has been illustrated using *afruimen* and *abräumen*.

2.4 Concluding remarks: Comparing the right sentences

This section has shown that, if one investigates alternations, such as transitive locative alternations or material/product alternations, one should be very careful about which alternatives are compared. First of all, real alternations occur with a single verb. Secondly, one should keep the comparison as simple as possible and only take into account essential parts of the sentence, such as subjects and direct objects which cannot be left out. In addition to this, it is very important to use language data, since some objects are more appropriate than others and intuitions sometimes seem to differ. I will discuss this in more detail in the following sections.
3. Metonymy as the mechanism underlying object changes

Before I will analyse some specific verbs in detail, I will first demonstrate that metonymy must be taken into account in order to understand the above alternations (cf. also chapter V, §7.1). The following sentences clearly show the conceptual closeness of material and product or location and locatum.

(55) Sie schmierte Butterbrot
     she smeared  butter-bread
     ‘she spread a slice of bread with butter’

(56) De jongen bakte een spiegelei
     the guy    baked a    mirror-egg
     ‘The guy fried an egg sunny side up’ / ‘The guy cooked a fried egg’

(57) She planted a rose garden.

(58) Der Bauer hat einen Sonnenblumenfeld angebaut213
     the farmer has a     sun flower field    on-build
     ‘The farmer planted a sun flower field’

The German word Butterbrot in (55) refers to ‘a slice of bread with butter’ (cf. footnote 203). Although the morphological head (i.e. -brot) refers to a location, the locatum is also directly included. In a comparable way, the word spiegelei in (56) literally denotes an egg reflecting light, which refers to a fried egg (with the yolk whole). Because the egg is morphologically included in this word, it cannot be added to the sentence. In other words, the material and the product coincide in these examples.

Sentences (57) and (58) illustrate the same issue for a location and a locatum. A rose garden is a type of garden, but it simultaneously refers to plants in this garden. Similarly, a Sonnenblumenfeld is a certain field which lexically includes the flowers. It therefore remains unclear whether we should consider such direct objects as a locatum or a location. This problem is also reflected by the fact that if some PP has been added to such examples, it is often another location. This is illustrated in the deWac-example in (59).

(59) Er pflanzte Rosengärten zwischen die gigantischen Redwood-Bäume in Browns Valley.
     ‘He planted rose gardens between the huge redwood trees in Browns Valley’

213 Cf. the deWaC-example “Dank einer großzügigen Spende […] konnte im Juni 2003 das erste organische Sonnenblumen Feld im Pine Ridge Reservat angebaut werden” (unfortunately with an incorrect space between Sonneblumen and Feld).
The fact that one could add the location where the direct object has been planted, suggests that, despite morphological properties, the direct object is the locatum and not the location.

Such problems also occur for Dutch (and similar German) phrases such as *een kopje thee* (‘a cup tea’), *een emmer water* (‘a bucket water’) or *een fles wijn* (‘a bottle wine’). Although their morphological head is the container, they clearly differ from real compounds, such as *een theekopje* (‘a tea-cup’), *een wateremmer* (‘a water-bucket’) or *een wijnfles* (‘a wine-bottle’). The examples *een kopje thee, een emmer water* or *een fles wijn* thus simply simultaneously denote container and content.

This fact can be illustrated by the commonly used examples (60) and (61). The verb *schenken* (and *inschenken / uitschenken*) is mostly combined with content-objects, whereas *vullen* likes to be combined with a container in its DO-position.

(60)    *hij schonk een kopje thee (in) / (uit)*  
        he poured a cup tea (in) / (out)  
        ‘he poured (out) a cup of tea’

(61)    *ze vulde een emmer water*  
        she filled a bucket water  
        ‘she filled a water-bucket / bucket of water’

The phrases *een kopje thee* or *een emmer water* make it difficult to determine whether examples (60)-(61) display a variant with a location-DO or locatum-DO.

The same problem applies to examples with words that do not morphologically but rather semantically include the material or the locatum. Such examples are illustrated in (62)-(63).

(62)    *Zeef de bouillon*  
        sieve the broth  
        ‘Sieve the broth’

(63)    *Sie zupfte sich die Augenbrauen*  
        she plucked herself the eyebrows  
        ‘she depilated her eyebrows’

The alternation as in *sieve gold (out of sand)* versus *sieve sand (for gold)* is not so clear in the Dutch example (62): The sieved broth simultaneously denotes the substance that went through a sieve as well as the substance that is obtained after the

---

214 The head of such phrases could be determined by the plural form and grammatical gender. The plural of *emmer water*, for instance, is *emmers water* (and similarly *kopjes thee, flessen wijn*). The singular word *emmer* has masculine gender (*de emmer*), whereas *water* is neuter (*het water*), but the phrase *emmer water* could only be preceded by the determiner *de*. 
sieving process. A comparable problem arises for German (63): Do eyebrows denote the location that is depilated or does it refer to the hairs that are pulled out?

Examples (55)-(63) all illustrate that the direct object refers to the conceptual unity of locatum and location or to the conceptual unity of material and product, i.e. to a single gestalt (cf. chapter IV, §7.3). Because most of these examples cannot clearly be classified as a single variant of the alternation, they pose a problem for investigations that do not take into account the metonymical relation between both possible arguments. These examples therefore support the analysis that in alternations a type of metonymy of the direct objects has to be involved.

The important role of the metonymical relation between the two possible objects can also be recognised if one compares possible alternations with impossible ones. A single verb often only allows object change with some objects (cf. also Brinkmann 1995: 55-57). Consider, for instance, the contrast between examples (64) and (65).215

(64) a. Dutch: ze wiedde onkruid in de tuin
German: sie jätete Unkraut im Garten
‘she weeded weeds in the garden’
b. Dutch: ze wiedde de tuin
German: sie jätete den Garten
‘she weeded the garden’

(65) a. Dutch: ze wiedde onkruid op het terras / tussen de tegels
German: sie jätete Unkraut auf der Terrasse / zwischen Platten
‘she weeded weeds on the terrace / between tiles’
b. Dutch: ze wiedde ?het terras / *de tegels
German: sie jätete ?die Terrasse / *die Platten
‘she weeded ?the terrace / *the tiles’

215 Although Levin mentions to weed as an alternating verb (1993: 53), the English translation of the (33)a is somewhat infelicitous in English, because the direct object weeds is already incorporated within the denominal verb. In Dutch and German the verb and the locatum-DO differ, which does not make the direct object ‘weeds’/ ‘onkruid’/ ‘Unkraut’ redundant. However, one does find examples in the BNC such as: “The idea is that recruits from the towns will weed the crops.”; “I have spent over £500 in shrubs plants and bulbs, and put in a great deal of time collecting rocks and weeding and feeding the plants”. Strictly speaking, however, these shifts are different, since it is not the plants taken out of the garden which are denoted, but rather the plants from between which the weeds are removed. The question emerges whether these crops and plants should be classified as locations or locatums: They denote the objects connected to the location, but they are not the locatum removed from a garden or a field. This example shows that we are dealing with a metonymical chain, caused by the complex gestalt of a location, such as a garden or a field, with weeds that should be removed from that location (the removed locatum) and the plants that are supposed to be there (another locatum).
The location-variant is felicitous in (64) but not in (65). The relation between weeds and a garden is obviously stronger than that between weeds and a terrace or tiles. The word *garden* strictly refers to a location, but simultaneously denotes the plants belonging to this location. Terraces do not evoke the idea of plants in the same way that gardens do. Tiles do not semantically or pragmatically include any plants.

This is reflected in language use. In corpora and on the internet, one can find many instances of gardens in DO-position, whereas *tegels wieden* or *Platten jäten* cannot be found at all. The terrace-example is in between the garden and the tiles: I found one internet example of German *Terrasse jäten* and two examples for Dutch.

The ANW-corpus also gives examples with another type of location-DO, as illustrated in (66).

\[(66)\] De hele dag heb ik een onzettend rotwerkje moeten doen: de straat om de boerderij wieden.

‘I had to do a very tiresome job the whole day: weeding the street around the farm.’

Although terraces are semantically closer to gardens than streets are, this example shows that even the street as a DO can be possible. The context probably helps to make the street as a direct object acceptable: The use of *boerderij* (‘farm’) evokes some rural picture that encourages the relation between a primitive street and the weeds in them.

The important issue is that differences between (64) and (65) cannot be explained by verb semantics. Apparently, the relation between the direct objects plays a crucial role. Weeds can grow in several locations, but the contiguity relation between such plants and the relevant locations differ. The examples show that contiguity is not only spatial proximity, but rather the evocation of a single gestalt (an experiential unit). Gardens and plants form such an gestalt, whereas tiles and weed are spatially close but conceptualised as two separate entities.\(^{216}\) Therefore, the contiguity relation (i.e. the metonymical relation) between weeds and a garden is very strong, whereas it is very weak between weeds and tiles. This is directly reflected in the locative alternation.

One can illustrate the same issue with the possible alternations for *smeren* / *schmieren* (‘to spread’/ ‘to smear’/’to rub’). Examples (48) and (49) and the real examples in footnote 202 above show that combinations such as *boter smeren* / *Butter schmieren* alternate with a location-DO in Dutch and German. However, a locative alternation with *smeren* / *schmieren* as in (67) is not allowed.

\(^{216}\) It would be very interesting to test this by psychological research, but this is beyond the limits of the present research.
Although the skin is, in a similar way as a slice of bread or a chain, the location of some kind of grease (i.e. butter, oil or ointment), the buttered bread and the greased chain can be more easily visualised as one conceptual entity within the context of this verb. A crucial difference is, for instance, that the cream will go into the skin and not be visible on the face anymore, whereas one can see whether a hinge is oiled or whether there is butter on a sandwich.

In the same way, it can even explained why insmeren or einschmieren (‘to rub in’)\(^\text{217}\) can occur with locatums, such as cream, as well as with locations, such as faces or persons, as its direct object. Whereas cream and a face, for instance, are less easily visualised as a conceptual unity within the context of smeren or schmieren than a buttered sandwich or a greased chain, visibility does not play an important role for the verb insmeren or einschmieren: The semantics of these verbs implies that the cream goes into the skin. In this way, the particle verb endorses the relation between cream and a location in a stronger way than the simplex verb.

A comparable difference as with schmieren can be found with streichen (cf. also Dewell 2004: 17) which could be used in combination with a wall that is painted (eine Wand streichen), but not with a wound on which some ointment is applied (*eine Wunde streichen). Alternating verbs, such as smeren / schmieren (‘to spread’/‘to smear’/‘to rub’) or wieden / jäten (‘to weed’) do occur with some instances of locatum-location objects, but not with others. Such differences can only be explained in terms of the different contiguity relations between the objects involved and their relevance within the context of the verb.

\(^\text{217}\) The verb to rub has a slightly different meaning than smeren / schmieren. This could be the reason that to rub in hardly alternates (cf. also chapter V, footnote 166), although some examples can be found on British internet pages, such as “Another one of those "great" advices: "Rub your face in with lemon".”[^lemon] [http://www.ciao.co.uk/Dianette__Review_5437352]; “I rub her in with Johnson & Johnson baby oil gel twice a day but it is still flaky.”[^babyoil] [http://www.netmums.com/coffeeshouse/children-parenting-190/drop-clinic-652/574916-flaky-skin-itch.html] or “It is time to start a new historical chapter, the sequel to Classic Age: The Medieval times. Rub yourself in with some anti-plague lotion”[^medieval] [taken from the magazine “PC Gameplay”, cf. http://forums.totalwar.org/vb/showthread.php?60307-Preview-and-Interview-in-PC-Gameplay] and via Google-books, such as “The child must be washed. [...] The old mother will rub her in with fat” [Sleigh, Dan (2004): Island. Secker & Warburg, page 158]; “Please, girl, rub your husband in with oil and massage his arms and legs, and you too stay there with him.” (American anthropologist, 1930 vol. 32, Washington: American Anthropological Association, page 680) [all retrieved in August 2011].
The German verb *abziehen* illustrates the same issue. Whereas the locatum and location can be used in (68)a and (68)b and also in (69)a and (69)b, this is different for (70)a and (70)b.

(68) a. Das Zimmermädchen hat den Bettwäsche abgezogen
    the chambermaid has the bed linen off-pulled
    ‘The chambermaid changed the bed linen’

    b. Das Zimmermädchen hat das Bett abgezogen\textsuperscript{218}
    the chambermaid has the bed off-pulled
    ‘The chambermaid changed the bed’

(69) a. Der Jäger hat das Hasenfell abgezogen
    the hunter has the hare-skin off-pulled
    ‘The hunter took off the hare’s skin’

    b. Der Jäger hat den Hasen abgezogen\textsuperscript{219}
    the hunter has the hare off-pulled
    ‘The hunter skinned the hare’

(70) a. Die Diva hat ihre Handschuhe abgezogen
    the diva has her gloves off-pulled
    ‘The diva took off her gloves’

    b. *Die Diva hat sich die Hände abgezogen\textsuperscript{220}
    the diva has POSS-DAT the hands off-pulled
    *‘The diva took off her hands’

For Dutch, the same difference applies to *load*. The verb *laden* does allow the shift between locatum and location, but again only for certain types of objects. The contrast between (71) and (72) illustrates this.

\textsuperscript{218} Cf. deWac-examples such as “Sie hat die Bettwäsche abgezogen” (‘She had changed the sheets’) vs. “die Nachbarinnen hatten das Bett abgezogen” (‘the neighbours had changed the bed’).

\textsuperscript{219} Cf. deWac-examples such as “Junge Hasen und Wildkaninchen, die noch nicht abgezogen sind,” (‘young hares and wild rabbits, which are not yet skinned,’); “doch erst nach fünf Minuten ist das Tier schließlich tot. Während es abgezogen wird,” (‘but only after five minutes the animal finally dies. While it is being skinned,’) versus “Nun zog ich dem Hasen das Fell ab,” (‘now I took the skin off of the hare [lit.: ‘the hare-dative the skin’]’) or “als Sävehof das Zebrafell schon abgezogen hatte.” (‘when Sävehof had taken off the zebra skin’).

\textsuperscript{220} Cf. for (70)a deWac-examples such as “denn er hatte die Handschuhe abgezogen” (‘because he had taken off the glove’) (or even with Hand in a prepositional phrase: “warum er niemals den Handschuh von der linken Hand abzog” (‘why he never took the glove off of the left hand’)). An additional problem for (70)b is that this sentence could be interpreted as meaning that the diva skinned her hand. This shows that the skin is more closely connected to a hand than a glove. Furthermore, in (70)b there is the possible interpretation that the direct object may be interpreted as a locatum instead of as a location, which means that the diva took off her hand (cf. below, section 4.3).
a. Hij laadde zijn spullen (op de aanhangwagen)  
he loaded his stuff onto the trailer
b. Hij laadde de aanhangwagen (met zijn spullen)  
he loaded the trailer with his stuff

(72)  a. Hij laadde zijn spullen (op de ezel)  
he loaded his stuff onto the donkey
b. *Hij laadde de ezel (met zijn spullen)  
he loaded the donkey with his stuff

Whereas one can use *een auto laden* ('load a car') or *een aanhangwagen laden* ('load a trailer') as locatum-objects in Dutch, one cannot use *een ezel laden* ('load a donkey'). Apparently, only three-dimensional, hollow locations can occur as a direct object of Dutch *laden* (cf. also Oya 2009: 281). To put this differently, whereas the contiguity relation container-content does allow the metonymical shift in Dutch, surface-locatum does not. Vehicles with luggage are to a larger extent one conceptualised entity (one gestalt) as compared to donkeys with luggage.

On the basis of this example, one might wonder why some of these impossible alternations in Dutch and German do occur in English, such as, for instance, to load a donkey with bags. Although most alternations in English, Dutch and German are fairly similar, metonymical shifts can be restricted in different ways across languages. The fact that metonymical mechanisms are constrained differently across languages is well-known (cf. e.g. Brdar 2009; Brdar & Brdar-Szabó 2003; Kleiber 1995: 130; Kleiber 2007: 177; Koch 1999: 158; Panther & Thornburg 2003b; Panther & Thornburg 1999; Peters 2003). The metonymical shift with English to load, German laden and Dutch laden illustrates this: English is very flexible, allowing all kinds of locatum and location in the alternation, while German is less flexible than Dutch or English. The metonymy is constrained on the basis of pragmatic reasons, which are applied differently in different languages and which therefore lead to different restrictions. In the next section, I will examine some cross-linguistics differences of locative alternations by investigating semantic differences and pragmatic constraints. This will bring me back to German laden in section 4.3.

---

221 The verb *beladen* can be used with both, which again illustrates that *beladen* and *laden* should not be directly compared to each other. The fact that the combination *een ezel beladen* is perfectly acceptable, whereas *een ezel laden* is impossible, demonstrates that the former verb cannot be just a morphologically marked alternative of the latter.

222 Cf. BNC-examples such as "Two girls are loading the donkeys with water containers and sacks"; "stepping back from a mule loaded with carpets"; "I saddled my horse, loaded a sumpter pony,"; "His family were shown outside, loading a donkey and preparing with sad looks for their journey into exile.", etc.
4. Some characteristics and constraints of MOC

The previous section has shown that the possibility of a transitive alternation is determined by the relation between the two participants. The combination of a verb and its direct object, or more precisely the direct object slot of the predicate, can only be changed on the basis of a close contiguity relation between two entities. It is therefore better to call such alternations “metonymical object changes” (MOCs). This section will discuss some semantic and pragmatic characteristics of verbs and objects involved in MOCs. These characteristics will be used to clarify some restrictions on the felicity of MOCs and to analyse some cross-linguistic differences.

Broadly speaking, I will discuss three issues. First of all, I will show that MOCs depend on a contiguity relation of the direct object within the conceptual structure evoked by the verb. Secondly, I will show that pragmatics play a crucial role: There can be general pragmatic reasons which make MOCs infelicitous. Finally, I will demonstrate that, although they are not instances of prototypical metonymies, MOCs belong to a clear continuum of different types of metonymical effects.

The section is structured as follows. Subsection 4.1 will demonstrate that cross-linguistic variation nicely illustrates the interplay of verb semantics and contiguity relations. By taking the semantic properties of the verb into account, I will analyse why English *to fill* and Dutch *vullen* do not alternate, whereas German *füllen* does. Subsection 4.2 will discuss the verb *to pour*, which is also said not to alternate. It will become clear that the alternation of *to pour* is restricted because of a semantic-pragmatic reason: I will demonstrated that two different gestalts are involved. In subsection 4.3, I will discuss another semantic-pragmatic property that limits the possibility of using different types of contiguous objects. This property will be illustrated by the verbs *to load* - *laden* - *laden* and *to clear* - *ruimen* / *afruimen* – *räumen* / *abräumen*. The fact that MOCs are not only pragmatically constrained, but also used for a pragmatic reason, will be illustrated in subsection 4.4 with the verbs *pakken* or *packen* (“to pack”) and *smeren* and *schmieren* (“to spread”/“to smear”/“to rub”). On the basis of such pragmatic properties, several additional metonymical effects will be disentangled. This will bring me back to the metonymical character of MOCs: I will show that different metonymical effects can be interwoven with each other. The continuum will be illustrated by means of the examples *wijn persen* and *Wein pressen* (“to press wine”). These examples will also illustrate that the locative alternation and the material-product alternation can be closely related to each other.

4.1 Crosslinguistic differences: *to fill* / *vullen* / *füllen* and related particle verbs

A verb that, surprisingly, cannot alternate is the verb *to fill*. Although some content is conceptually involved in the activity of filling, the verb is combined with a container as its direct object. In this section, I will show that this is caused by semantic characteristics of the verb in combination with the gestalts involved.

The verb *to fill* expresses “to cause a container to become full” (cf. Iwata 2008: 82). Due to this semantics, the focus is upon the container which becomes filled or
full. Although some content is conceptually involved in the process of filling, the use of some content as a direct object is hardly ever allowed in English. Dutch also does not like the verb *vullen* (*to fill*) with a clear content-DO. The ANW-corpus only provides a very few exceptional examples, as illustrated in (73) and (74).

(73) ... en stoomolie vullen zodat dit reeds gedaan is voor de volgende rit.
    ‘...and to refill oil for the steam engine, so that this has been done for the following ride.’

(74) ieder om beurt vulde water in een peilglas
    everyone in turn filled water in a gauge glass
    of goot er een hoeveelheid uit.
    or poured there a quantity out
    ‘everyone in turn put water in a gauge glass or poured a quantity out of it’

German, however, behaves differently. In German, it is fairly normal to use the simplex verb *füllen* with the content instead of the container. Examples (75)-(80) (taken from the COSMAS II-corpus) illustrate this. One can easily find many more examples of this kind.

(75) Füllt man Tee in eine normale Teekanne, ...
    ‘If one puts tea into a normal teapot,...’

(76) Die Kinder füllten Hirsekörner, Reis oder Sand in Jogurtbecher
    ‘The children put barley kernels, rice or sand in yoghurt cups’

(77) Also füllen die Schüler brav Wasser in die Schüsseln,
    so fill the pupils obedient water in the dishes
    ‘The students therefore obediently put water in the dishes’

Examples in the BNC-corpus (cf. also Iwata 2008: 82ff) are ‘the new spirit is filled into oak casks and stored in cool, dark warehouses’; ‘And mango, exotic mango sorbet filled into a half mango skin.’; ‘...it is quite certain that ore being produced at Coniston, was machine and hand dressed to as great a concentration as possible, before filling into strong saddle bags for the 20 mile pack-horse journey, over the mountain tops, to the Brigham smelters.’. Some other examples can be found on the internet (for instance via Google books: “to fill sand into hydraulically induced horizontal fractures in low permeability strata”), but in general they are few.
(78) Er füllt ein wenig Brei auf den Löffel,
he fills a little porridge on the spoon
‘He is putting some porridge on his spoon’

(79) Am Ende filtern sie das Bier, füllen es in Flaschen, Fässer oder Dosen.
in-the end filter they the beer fill it in bottles casks or cans
‘In the end they filter the beer and put it into bottles, casks and cans.’

(80) Nun ist dieser neue Wein in Flaschen gefüllt
now is this new wine in bottles filled
‘Now the “neuer Wein” [= ‘wine which is almost grape juice’] has been bottled’

The examples show that the container which is actually filled is almost always simultaneously expressed as a PP. Sometimes however, only a content-DO occurs, as illustrated in (81) and (82).

(81) Alexandra S. [...] hat [...] begonnen [...] einen eigenen Wein zu füllen.
Alexandra S. has begun a own wine to fill
‘Alexandra Schmedes has started to bottle her own wine.’

(82) ..., der mit viel Aufwand technisch polierte Weine füllt,
..., that/the with much effort technically polished wine fills,
‘..., who bottles technically refined wine with great effort,’

In this context, the containers are not crucially relevant and automatically interpreted as bottles. The focus is therefore upon the content. The verb *füllen* in these sentences can best be translated into English as “to bottle”, as in (79) and (80). Dutch has a similar verb for such contexts, viz. *bottelen*. Sentences (81) and (82) resemble the use of *abfüllen*, which is the most direct German translation for *to bottle*. This verb consists of an aspectual particle *ab-* (‘off/done’) and the verb *füllen* and therefore expresses something like “finish something by putting it into a container”. Consider some examples with the content in (83) and with the container in (84). A similar verb can also be found in Dutch, viz. *afvullen*, as illustrated in (85) and (86).

(83) Da in Braunschweig nur noch Bier gebraut und abgefüllt wurde,
because in Braunschweig just so far beer brewed and off-filled was
‘Because they were in Braunschweig now just brewing and bottling the beer.’

(84) ..., weil wir die Flaschen nicht selber abfüllen können.
because we the bottles not selves off-fill can.
‘..., because we cannot fill the bottles ourselves.’
Het bier wordt in vaten of flessen afgevuld.  
the beer is in casks or bottles off-filled  
‘The beer is put in casks or bottles.’

Dat is vooral merkbaar als de flessen niet direct worden afgevuld.  
that is especially noticeable if the bottles not directly are off-filled  
‘That is especially noticeable, if the bottles are not filled immediately.’

The fact that German has no equivalent for *to bottle* other than *füllen* (or *abfüllen*) probably helps to allow the use of *füllen* with some content, but it cannot be the primary reason for accommodating the content object. The reason that *füllen* can occur with container or content is simply caused by its semantics: The verb *füllen* does not express “to cause a container to become full” but should rather be paraphrased as “to put some substance into a container”. This fact can not only be supported by examples such as (75)-(79), but is also reflected in some morphological processes. German dictionaries provide many morphologically complex verbs with *füllen*, including *vollfüllen* (*’to fill full’*). As is also the case with English *to fill* and Dutch *vullen*, the verb *vollfüllen* can only occur with containers as direct objects, as illustrated in (87)-(90).

Autofahrer, die [...] ihre Tanks alle ein bis zwei Wochen vollfüllen müssen,  
car-drivers, those their tanks all one till two weeks full-fill must  
‘car-drivers, who had to fill their tanks every one to two weeks,’

Die Jordan-Techniker füllten aber auch den Tank voll,...  
the Jordan-engineers filled but also the tank full,...  
‘And so the Jordan engineers filled the tank,...’

der seinen Pkw oder Kombi mit Bierkisten vollfüllen kann  
who can load his passenger car or station wagon with beer-boxes full-fill can  ‘who can load his passenger car or station wagon with boxes of beer.’

die [...] einen Einkaufswagen voll gefüllt mit Ware nach Hause brachten  
those a shopping trolley full filled with goods to house brought  ‘who brought home a shopping trolley filled with goods’

Apparently the added *voll* is not considered redundant in German, which shows that *füllen* cannot be paraphrased as ‘to cause a container to become full’. Examples with *full / vol* in the meaning ‘totally full’, as in the German sentences (87)-(90), cannot be found in Dutch or English. The Dutch ANW-corpus provides not a single

---

224 The combination *vollfüllen* is incorporated in some dictionaries, because it was spelled as a single word (i.e. *vollfüllen*) under the older German orthographical rules from before 1996. In finite form in main clauses the parts *voll* and *füllen* are always separated (cf. example (88)), as is the case with all particle verbs in German and in Dutch.
example with \((\text{half})\text{vol} \text{ and } \text{vullen (or volvullen)}\). The English BNC-corpus only provides slightly different examples with \textit{to fill} and \textit{full(y)}. In a few cases (seven BNC-examples in total) a modifier with \textit{full} is added to express that a container is not totally filled (\textit{to fill a container half full} / \textit{a quarter full}, etc.). In addition, one finds the combination of \textit{to fill something full of something}. However, such examples could be considered a kind of prepositional phrase (an alternative for \textit{with something}, cf. also footnote 188).

Examples with \textit{full} in the meaning ‘totally full’ seem to be infelicitous in English, as is also the case for Dutch. These facts reflect that \textit{to fill} and \textit{vullen} can be analysed as ‘to make something full’, which makes an additional \textit{full} or \textit{vol} redundant. Given that the verbs \textit{to fill} and \textit{vullen} have the meaning “to make full”, no content can be combined as a direct object.

These observations also predict that if this particular meaning of \textit{to fill} or \textit{vullen} is changed or lost, both types of objects, i.e. containers as well as contents, should be possible. This prediction is indeed born out. Some morphologically complex verbs can have a semantics in which the “cause to become full”-meaning has been lost. Such verbs can therefore accommodate object change. We already encountered such examples in (85) and (86) with Dutch \textit{afvullen}. This verb expresses a finishing activity with some content and a container and can therefore be combined with both types of direct objects.

Sentences (91)-(92) show examples with \textit{bijvullen} (‘to-fill’/ ‘add-fill’). This verb expresses that some content is added into a container. Because the ‘cause a container to become full’-aspect is lost, it can also be combined with both types of direct objects.

(91) ... en de brandstoftank werd bijgevuld.
    ... and the fuel-tank was at/to-filled
    ‘... and the fuel tank was replenished.’

(92) Nochtans heb ik niemand een motor zien starten of benzine zien bijvullen
    however have I no-one a motor see start or gasoline see at/to-fill
    ‘However, I have seen no one starting a car of replenishing gasoline.’

\[2^{25}\] The following ANW-example suggests that Dutch does not even like to combine \textit{vullen} and \textit{halfvol}: ‘Eerst de tank halfvol doen, dan petroleum ingieten en daarna de tank vullen.’ (lit.: ‘First the tank half full do, then petroleum in-pour and afterwards the tank fill”).

\[2^{26}\] The English verb \textit{to fulfill} does not have to be taken into account, because it can only be used in a totally different, non-literal way, which has nothing much to do with literal filling. The same goes for Dutch \textit{vervullen}. 

\[2^{26}\] The following ANW-example suggests that Dutch does not even like to combine \textit{vullen} and \textit{halfvol}: ‘Eerst de tank halfvol doen, dan petroleum ingieten en daarna de tank vullen.’ (lit.: ‘First the tank half full do, then petroleum in-pour and afterwards the tank fill”).
In (93)-(96) the same is illustrated for English with *to fill out* and *to fill in* (cf. Levin & Sells 2007: 15ff). These verbs can be combined with abstract containers and contents, such as information on a form. Similar examples can be found for the Dutch equivalent *invullen* and German *ausfüllen*.

(93) ... he has been accustomed to collect statements from informants, write down stories, and fill out sheets of paper with savage texts

(94) ..., when he fills out C of E on a form,

(95) Fill in the form opposite with the same details as on the label.

(96) ..., he would then be able to fill in the details on the form and ...

However, a particle or prefix does not always automatically accommodate the content as a direct object. The Dutch verbs *hervullen* (‘to refill’) and *navullen* (‘to fill again’) could be paraphrased as “to cause a container to become full again”, which are therefore still container-oriented. Comparably, Dutch verbs such as *opvullen* or the English verb *fill up* (“to cause a container to become totally full”) need to be combined with a container-DO, just as *vullen* does.

The mechanism that some Dutch and English particles or prefixes can either suppress the meaning of the container becoming full, and therefore defocus the container participant, or endorse the focus upon the container participant, also applies to German. We already saw this with *voll füllen*. This verb has a meaning such as ‘to cause a container to become full by putting something into it’ which has a focus upon the container. A verb as *verfüllen* (‘to fill’ / ‘to make totally full’) or *überfüllen* (‘to overfill’) has the same effect. The German equivalent of *opvullen* / ‘to fill up’, i.e. *anfüllen*, also expresses that a container is filled, which therefore also only allows the container as its direct object. The prefixes add to the verb *füllen* that the container becomes full, totally full, overfull or filled up, which makes these particle verbs only container-oriented.

Similar to English and Dutch, not all German particles cause such a shift in focus. Consider examples (97) and (98).
Given that *füllen* can be paraphrased as “to put some substance into a container”, *nachfüllen* (lit.: ‘after-fill’, i.e ‘to refill’) should be paraphrased as “to put again some substance into a container”. As expected, the verb *nachfüllen* can therefore occur with containers and contents in a similar way as *füllen*. Similar to the Dutch verb *navullen*, a particle such as *na/-nach-* (‘re-/again’) does not fundamentally alter the focus of the simplex verb to which it is combined. Both types of direct objects are therefore allowed in German, in contrast with Dutch. ²²⁷

Table 9 provides an overview of all morphologically complex verbs, which are based on *vullen* or *füllen* and the types of direct objects that they can be combined with. I generated this list of verbs from the ANW-corpus and the deWac-corpus by extracting all words that include *füllen* or *vullen* with the help of the SketchEngine (http://the.sketchengine.co.uk, option: wordlist). ²²⁸ Which types of objects can occur with each verb has been carefully checked in dictionaries and corpora (ANW and Cosmas II).

---

²²⁷ The German verb *einfüllen* (lit.: ‘in-fill’) also has a shifting effect: It should be paraphrased in English as ‘to put into’ and can only be used with content (cf. Table 9). Unfortunately, I cannot explain this clearly.

²²⁸ The Dutch verb *vervullen* (‘to fulfill’) is not taken into account, because it does not refer to a literal filling-action (cf. footnote 226). The German verb *erfüllen* (‘to fulfill’/‘to fill’) is also left out, because its filling-meaning has a different construction with the content as a subject (as in e.g. ‘smoke filled the room’). The German verb *beifüllen* is a little obscure, because it only occurred as a noun in the deWac-corpus and cannot be found in dictionaries. However, some examples of *beifüllen* as a verb could be found in the COSMAS II-corpus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Literally</th>
<th>Translation into English</th>
<th>into Dutch or German</th>
<th>possible types of DOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dutch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vullen</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>to fill</td>
<td>füllen</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aanvullen</td>
<td>on-fill</td>
<td>to complete / to fill</td>
<td>auffüllen</td>
<td>- hole &amp; object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to fill up / to fill in / to replenish</td>
<td></td>
<td>- supply / stock &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- object &amp; loss of object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- container &amp; ?content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afvullen</td>
<td>off/done-fill</td>
<td>to bottle / to fill up</td>
<td>abfüllen / füllen</td>
<td>- container &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bijvullen</td>
<td>up/on-fill</td>
<td>to fill up / to fill in</td>
<td>auffüllen / nachfüllen</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to fill out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hervullen</td>
<td>re-/again-fill</td>
<td>to refill</td>
<td>nachfüllen</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invullen</td>
<td>in-fill</td>
<td>to fill in / to fill out</td>
<td>ausfüllen</td>
<td>- abstract: form &amp; data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navullen</td>
<td>re-/after-fill</td>
<td>to refill</td>
<td>nachfüllen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opvullen</td>
<td>up-fill</td>
<td>to fill up / to stuff</td>
<td>füllen / anfüllen</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- hole – object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitvullen</td>
<td>out-fill</td>
<td>to justify</td>
<td>ausschließen</td>
<td>- space on page (container)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[texts/lines]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>füllen</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>to fill / to put into</td>
<td>vullen / doen in</td>
<td>- container &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abfüllen</td>
<td>off/done-fill</td>
<td>to bottle / to fill up</td>
<td>abfüllen / bottelen</td>
<td>- container &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anfüllen</td>
<td>on-fill</td>
<td>to fill up / to fill</td>
<td>vullen / opvullen / volstorten</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auffüllen</td>
<td>up-fill</td>
<td>to complete / to fill</td>
<td>aanvullen / bijvullen</td>
<td>- hole &amp; object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to fill up / to fill in / to replenish</td>
<td></td>
<td>- supply / stock &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- object &amp; loss of object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- container &amp; ?content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ausfüllen</td>
<td>out-fill</td>
<td>to fill in / to fill out</td>
<td>invullen</td>
<td>- abstract: form &amp; data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>befüllen</td>
<td>be-fill</td>
<td>to fill</td>
<td>vullen</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beifüllen</td>
<td>up/on-fill</td>
<td>to fill up / to fill in</td>
<td>aanvullen / bijvullen</td>
<td>- container &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>einfüllen</td>
<td>in-fill</td>
<td>to pour in / to shovel into</td>
<td>ingießen / inscheppen</td>
<td>- content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nachfüllen</td>
<td>re-/after-fill</td>
<td>to refill</td>
<td>hervullen / bijvullen</td>
<td>- container &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>überfüllen</td>
<td>over-fill</td>
<td>to overfill</td>
<td>übervol maken</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umfüllen</td>
<td>around-fill</td>
<td>to pour into / to load into</td>
<td>overgieten / omladen</td>
<td>- container &amp; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verfüllen</td>
<td>ver-fill</td>
<td>to fill (totally) / to fill up</td>
<td>volladen-gieten / vullen / volstorten</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voll füllen</td>
<td>full fill</td>
<td>to fill (totally)</td>
<td>(geheel) vullen</td>
<td>- container</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Verbs with *vullen* & *füllen*
Besides the shift between container and content, some verbs exhibit other object changes. Verbs, such as German *auffüllen* or Dutch *opvullen* and *aanvullen*, can also denote some kind of repairing. Many verbs of reparation can be combined with the object which is repaired as well as with the damage. For some filling-verbs this means that they can be combined with the object as such or with the holes in the object. The English examples (99)-(102) also illustrate this. A cavity in a wall and the cavity wall itself can be filled. The same goes for cavities in teeth and the teeth themselves. As explained in the previous chapter, MOCs with holes and their objects often occur, because a hole cannot be conceptualised without an object.

(99) If your house has cavity walls [...], you can have the cavity filled with approved insulation material by a professional contractor.

(100) If the home has cavity walls, they can be filled with an injected cellular compound.

(101) The company is also developing two new materials which it hopes will be strong enough to fill cavities in the back teeth.

(102) …, if fewer teeth were filled to begin with, and more worn fillings were repaired,…

Other shifts can also be found with *aanvullen* and *auffüllen* in the meaning that a supply is replenished. In such contexts, the verbs display complex object patterns, shifting between stocks or supplies (*een voorraad aanvullen* / *den Vorrat auffüllen*) or some content or material which makes up the stock or content level. Consider in this respect the deWac-examples (103)-(104) and the ANW-examples (105)-(106).

(103) ob dort Sand ersetzt oder aufgefüllt werden musste
whether there sand replaced or up-filled be should
‘whether the sand should be replaced or replenished’

(104) Für die Crème den Saft der Ananaskonserve auf ¼ Liter auffüllen,
for the cream the juice the pineapple-preserve up to ¼ litre up-fill
‘For the cream, add the juice of the canned pineapple up to ¼ litre,’

(105) Indicatie Zout geeft aan dat het zout dient aangevuld te worden.
indicationSalt gives on that the salt must on-filled to be
‘Indication Salt shows that the salt should be replenished.’

(106) Daarna heb ik [...] het water aangevuld tot het juiste niveau
there-after have I the water on-filled till the right level
‘After that, I replenished the water up to the right level’

229 Because examples (100) and (102) are in the passive voice, the subjects are shifted instead of the direct objects, but the subjects of the passive show that the verb allows MOC.
The following ANW-examples also show a shift between some content used to undo a loss (example (107)), the loss that is undone (example (108)) and the content deficiency (example (109)).

(107) zorg ervoor dat je tijdens sportieve inspanningen het vocht aanvult
take care that-for that you during sporty exertions the fluid on-fill
‘make sure that you replenish your fluids during physical exertions’

(108) De eerste maatregel is het vochtverlies aanvullen.
the first measure is the fluid-loss on-fill
‘The first measure is replenishing the lost fluids.’

(109) Gelukkig [...] kunnen onze organen heel wat vocht missen,
luckily can our organs quite a lot fluid lack,
zodat dit tekort aangevuld kan worden.
so that this shortage on-filled can be
‘Luckily, our organs can get along without fluid, so that the shortage can be replenished.’

Content-objects as in (103)-(107) are not really connected to a ‘filling’-action, because the sentences do not express that some container is filled with something but rather that the content itself is replenished. This possible semantic aspect complicates any analysis of whether the verb *aanvullen* can be used with container and content, because it is problematic which content-DO examples can be taken into account as evidence for container-content shifts.

The internet-example (110)\(^{230}\), which is an advice about the maintenance of an aquarium, clearly illustrates this problem. Should the sand be analysed as an MOC with respect to the spaces between the stones which are filled, or is the level of sand in the aquarium replenished?

(110) En dit is ook een gemakkelijke manier
and this is also an easy way
om tussen de stenen zand aan te vullen.
for between the stones sand on to fill / replenish
‘and this is also an easy way to replenish the sand between the stones/ to fill up the spaces between the stones with sand’

To summarise, the data discussed in this subsection show that the possibility of an MOC is simultaneously dependent on the contiguity relation between two objects and on the semantics of a verb. A verb must create the context in which the close connection between both direct objects becomes relevant. MOCs are clearly brought into being by an interplay of the contiguity relation between two participants (cf. section 3) and by the role that they play within the concept evoked by the verb. The verb evokes the relevant frame for the metonymical change (cf. chapter VIII).

In this subsection, I have noted that the concepts of Dutch *vullen* and English *to fill* differ from the one expressed by German *füllen*. The former two do not express an action in general with a container and content involved, rather they express a modification of a container (i.e. ‘to make full’). Because of this meaning, the verb can only be applied to a container. The fact that this meaning applies to *vullen* and *to fill* is reflected by the fact that, in contrast to German, no additional *vol* or *full* can be added. German *füllen* is different, as can be illustrated by the frequent occurrence of German *voll füllen*. This clearly shows that a paraphrase such as “to cause to become full” does not apply to *füllen*. Therefore, *füllen* can occur with content as a direct object.

Only if some German prefix or particle shifts the verb meaning to “to make full” (as with *anfüllen*, *befüllen*, *überfüllen*, *verfüllen* or *voll füllen*), the content can no longer be used as a direct object. Such effects by morphological elements upon focus within the verbal action can also be observed in Dutch. As soon as the container modifying meaning aspect is lost, container and content can occur in the direct object slot. This is, for instance, the case with *afvullen* and *bijvullen*.

### 4.2 Verbs involving more than one container, such as *to pour*

The verb *to pour* is traditionally analysed as a non-alternating verb, just as *to fill*. However, the behaviour of *to pour* is exactly opposite to that of *to fill*, in that the verb *to pour* is combined with some content (a liquid) as a direct object. In this section, I will take a closer look at this verb and at its equivalents in Dutch (*schenken* and *gießen*) and German (*schenken* and *gießen*).

The verb *to pour* usually expresses the fact that some liquid is moved into a container (container A) from another one (container B).231 Examples (111)-(112) from the BNC-corpus illustrate this.

(111) Sweetheart poured tea into her cup from a pretty tea-pot
(112) He watched as she poured water from the jug into the bowl

The focus of the verb is upon the content, which makes *to pour* crucially different from *to fill*, where the filled container (A) is the center of attention. The

---

231 I would like to expressly thank Mara van Schaik-Rădulescu for discussing this observation with me.
consequence of this focus upon the content is that both containers are equally important for the pouring-action. In other words, with *to pour* there is not one but almost always two different containers (A and B) involved in the action expressed by the verb.

These two equally important containers cause a restriction upon the alternation. The metonymical object shift cannot be applied, because there is not just one gestalt involved but actually two different ones: The content is not only poured into some container (such as a filled cup or bowl), but it is poured out of a container (for instance out of a kettle) at the same time. Using a container as the shifted DO of *to pour* can cause confusion, because a pouring process fills one container by simultaneously emptying another. Which of the two containers, i.e. A or B, should therefore be considered ‘poured’?

However, it must be noted that this restriction is not as strict as alleged in most linguistic literature. Some contexts or circumstances could make the use of a shifted object possible. One might even question whether it is actually true that *to pour* does not allow a shifted direct object at all: Although the use of *pour a container with some kind of fluid* is impossible, one can use *to pour a container*, as illustrated by English BNC-examples with the verb *pour* and a container in the DO-position, as in (113)-(116).

(113) Then he looked back at the T'ang, standing there, pouring a second bowl for his father.

(114) She poured her own mug, stirred in two sugars

(115) Luke frowned, went over to the coffee-machine and poured two cups, placing one in front of Merrill.

(116) He got the top off and a cup poured before lowering himself gingerly back into the driving seat and passing it over to Catherine.

One could argue that these examples are slightly different from other examples with *to pour*, in that it is restricted to an interpretation of ‘providing someone with a drink by the act of pouring’. Besides the fact that this is not really the case in examples (114) or (115) and not very likely for the attributive usage in example (116), a similar use of the verb also occurs with a liquid as a direct object, as in the BNC-examples (117)-(119). The verb *to pour something (for someone)* therefore still displays an object change.

(117) Jay poured cocktails for them all

(118) When she went down to the sitting-room to pour tea for her mother,

---

232 Which once again proves that some facts may be overlooked the expression of both participants is always taken into account.
(119) Buckmaster poured coffee for himself

The Dutch and German equivalents of to pour in this context of serving and consuming are the particle verbs *inschenken* and *einschenken* or *eingießen*. These verbs also occur with containers as well as with the content as their direct objects, as illustrated in the ANW-examples (120)-(121) and in the deWac-examples (122)-(125).

(120) Hij schonk de wijn in.
   he poured the wine in
   ‘He poured the wine.’

(121) Ik schonk hun glazen in.
   I poured their glasses in
   ‘I poured their glasses.’

(122) Während ich Kaffee eingoß und mir ein Brot zurechtmachte,
   while I coffee in-poured and me-DAT a bread good-made
   ‘While I poured coffee and prepared a slice of bread for myself,’

(123) ..., eilte Philip in die Personalküche um [...], eine große Tasse einzugießen
   hurried Philip in the staff-kitchen for a big mug in-to-pour
   ‘...Philip hurried to the staff kitchen, in order to pour a big mug.’

(124) In dem Moment, in dem das Bier ins Glas eingeschenkt wird,
   in the moment in that the beer in-the glass in-poured is,
   ‘At the moment that the beer is poured into the glass, ...’

(125) Falls Sie selbst die Gläser auswählen und einschenken müssen,...
    If you self the glasses choose and in-pour must
    ‘If you have to choose and pour the glasses yourself, ...’

The parallel between the English examples (117)-(119) and the Dutch and German ones in (120)-(125) shows that it is not the particle as such but rather the general semantics of the particle verb that makes the shift possible. If the verb is used in the context of pouring a drink for someone, the MOC is possible, as is also true for English. The focus upon the fact that a person gets a drink shifts the attention to the container into which some liquid is poured (container A). Consider in this respect also the morphologically simple verb *schenken* in the Dutch examples (126) and (127).

(126) Tijl [...] schonk zichzelf een bekertje
   Tijl poured himself a cup-DIM
   ‘Tijl poured himself a little cup.’
(127) De ingebouwde [...] teller houdt bij hoeveel kopjes er zijn geschenken the in-built meter holds up how-many cups there are poured ‘The built-in digital meter counts how many cups are poured.’

These examples also show that the particles of (120)-(125) are not crucial in Dutch, but that their general semantics (a focus on the resultant drink in container A) simply helps to avoid confusion about which container is actually intended.

Comparable observations can be made for uitschenken and ausschenken / ausgießen, as illustrated by the Dutch ANW-examples (128)-(129) and the German deWac-examples (130)-(132). In these cases, the focus shifts to the container which is poured empty (B) and, as expected, object change is allowed. The essential difference with schenken and schenken / gießen is that one container (container B) is more prominent than the other (container A) with these particle verbs.

(128) .... terwijl hij de flesjes voor ons ontkurkte en uitschonk. .... while he the bottles-DIM-s for us uncorked and out-poured ‘While he uncorked the little bottles and poured them for us.’

(129) op het moment dat het flesje uitgeschonken is on/at the moment that the bottle-DIM out-poured is ‘the moment the little bottle is poured’

(130) Insgesamt drei 30-Liter-Fässer werden dabei ausgeschenkt in-total three 30-Liters-casks were there-at out-poured ‘With that, a total of 3 casks of 30 liters were poured’

(131) sie gießen die Krüge aus they pour the carafes out ‘They emptied the carafes’

(132) er [...] goß die Kannen über mich aus he poured those jugs over me out ‘he poured those jugs over me’

However, the shift with uitschenken and ausgießen is nowhere near as frequent as that with inschenken and eingießen. This could be caused by the fact that MOCs like to shift to the result of the verbal action. In many cases, the goal of pouring something out is not just to empty a container (i.e. emptying B), but rather to put something into another one (i.e. filling container A). Therefore, the possible confusion concerning which container is intended (the emptied or the filled one, i.e. B or A) can still occur. 233

233 Compare in this respect a German example, in which the filled container occurs as a direct object with ausschenken, cf. “In Unkenntnis oder auch im Trubel wird so manchem Jungen oder Mädchen auch das ein oder andere Glas ausgeschenkt.” (lit. “In ignorance or also in bustle is in this way for many a boy or girl also the one or other glass out-poured”, i.e. ‘In a
English data also reflect this. It has been demonstrated above that a focus on the filled container could result in MOC, as with *to pour someone something*. The English verb *to pour* does not alternate, which is probably caused by the fact that it does not have the meaning of providing someone a drink, as is the case for Dutch and German *inschenken* or *einschenken* and *eingießen*. Therefore, neither of the two containers becomes relevant enough to allow the MOC with English *to pour in*. The verb *to pour out* on the other hand does alternate. In some contexts, it can be used with a container, but again with the one that is actually filled (container A). The BNC-examples in (133)-(135) illustrate this.

(133) she poured out two cups and handed one to her host

(134) During a lull in the shouting I made the tea, and as I was pouring the cups out Mum asked Dad what she should do.

(135) As if to show that bygones were bygones, he produced a bottle of Sandeman’s sherry from a cupboard and, though it was three in the afternoon, poured out glasses for all.

This verb has a semantics of making drinks for someone or providing someone with drinks, comparable to *pour someone something*. The verb *to pour out* should therefore be translated into Dutch and German as *inschenken* or *einschenken* / *eingießen* (‘in-pour’) rather than with *uitschenken* or *ausschenken* / *ausgießen* (‘out-pour’).

Such an analysis which focusses upon the semantics of the verb and its participants explains these linguistic facts more adequately than an account which considers MOCs as a movement of the figure out of a prepositional phrase into a direct object position (cf. also chapter V, §6.4-6.5). According to, for instance, Oya 2009, *to pour in* does not alternate because, in contrast to Dutch *in*- and German *ein-*, the particle *in* lacks a functional structure which makes this movement possible (as is also the case with German *hineingießen*, i.e. cf. Oya 2009: 287). Prepositions such as English *out* and *off*, Dutch *uit* and German *aus*, on the other hand, do have such a functional structure (cf. Oya 2009: 277-278). However, this explanation conflicts with the fact that *to pour out* does not occur with the emptied container (B) but instead with the filled one (container A), as in (133)-(135). The latter two facts are also problematic for the analysis in Levin and Sells 2007. The analysis employed in this dissertation, which takes into account the semantics of the verb and the relation to its participants, explains why the comparable verbs *inschenken*, *eingießen* and *to pour out* (and also *to pour someone a drink*) behave uniformly.

situation of ignorance or also of bustle, there is also one glass or another poured out for many boys and girls in this way’

234 An exception is the BNC-example “So he brought my bottle out and poured his out and we tapped glasses together.”

—
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There can also be other specific semantic contexts which make a shift possible. The German simplex verb *gießen*, for instance, also allows an MOC in the context of watering plants, as in the deWac-examples (136) and (137). The standard variety of Dutch used in Belgium displays the same behaviour, as illustrated in the ANW-example (138).

(136) Er arbeitet daher gerade draußen im Garten,  
he works therefore just outside in-the garden  
gießt dort seine Pflanzen und füttert die Tiere.  
pours there his plants and feeds the animals  
‘Because of that, he is working outside in the garden right now, he is watering his plants there and feeding his animals.’

(137) Und vergiss bitte nicht, die Pflanzen zu gießen!  
and forget please not the plants to pour  
‘And please do not forget to water the plants!’

(138) Ahib heeft niet eens een plant om te gieten.  
Ahib has not even a plant for to pour  
‘Ahib does not even have a plant, which he can water.’

In such examples, there is only one container involved (container B), viz. a watering can (cf. in this respect also example (132)) and the content is defocused, because its default interpretation is water. Therefore, the verb has the lexicalised usage in which the direct object is shifted to the goal of the pouring, i.e. the location to which the water is added, such as the plants. The plants and the water are clearly contiguously connected and shifting need not cause confusion.  

In sum, the fact that metonymical relations between objects play a role in object changes is also reflected by certain restrictions on such alternations. Using one object instead of another is only possible if both objects form one gestalt (such as a container with some content), which as such is crucial within the context evoked by the verb. If two different container-content gestalts (container A and B and their content) are both directly relevant for the verbal action, as with *to pour*, the object change becomes infelicitous, since confusion can occur concerning which container is intended. Only very specific contexts with a clear focus, as could be evoked by particles, can make the shift possible.

---

235 An alternative explanation could be that we are dealing with homonyms: One could assume that this Belgian-Dutch use of *gieten* (‘to water’) is a back formation based on *gieter* (‘watering can’), which is itself based on the original *gieten* (‘to pour’) (Moerdijk p.c.). German casts doubt upon this, because this analysis is very unlikely for German, given that a watering can is *Gießkanne* (‘pour-can’).
This is evidenced by examples with a context in which a drink is poured for someone, as with to pour someone something, to pour out or with Dutch and German inschenken and einschenken / eingießen. With these verbs, the focus is automatically upon the intended goal of the action, i.e. a filled container (A). With Dutch and German uitschenken and ausschenken / ausgießen, on the other hand, the focus is upon container B and its content. Another example is the context of watering plants in Belgian-Dutch and German. In these examples, a location and a container are involved and the container has the default interpretation of a watering can. Therefore, one can use planten gieten or Pflanze gießen (lit.: “to pour plants”).

4.3 Avoidance of ambiguity-of-DO-type: ‘to clear’, ‘to load’ and ‘to pack’

Even if only two objects that form one gestalt are involved (in contrast to to pour / schenken / gießen) and if both participate in the verbal action (in contrast to to fill / vullen), it is still not always possible to shift the direct object from a thing in a location to the location itself or from a certain material to the product. The possibility of MOCs differs across languages (as also mentioned at the end of section 3) and probably even across speakers.

German linguists, for instance, present opposed judgments about laden (‘to load’). Some scholars fully reject the possibility of using German laden with a location-DO such as a car or a wagon (Frense/Bennet 1996: 313-314; Sauerland 1994: 54-55), whereas others actually present this combination as an example of a morphologically unmarked alternation (Brinkmann 1995: 50; Dewell 2004: 23). The use of corpus examples is therefore of crucial importance. 236 Real data reveal that the locative alternation with German laden in the context of vehicles is not totally impossible, though it is very uncommon (cf. also Dewell 2004: 27): No instance of it can be found in the DWDS-corpus (www.dwds.de) and only a few reliable, original German examples are available on the internet, such as examples (139)-(141).237

(139) Der Vater hat den Wagen geladen. Der Wagen wurde von Kühen gezogen.
the father has the wagon loaded the wagon was by cows pulled
‘The father has loaded the wagon. The wagon was pulled by cows.’

236 Similar differences in judgments can sometimes be found for Dutch: De Groot, for instance, explicitly denies that simplex verbs such as smeren or laden can be used with locations in direct object slots (de Groot 1998: 65,68). The ANW-corpus provides evidence that this is absolutely not true for Dutch speakers in general.
(140) Die Heuschwaden reicht die Bäuerin hoch, der Bauer lädt den Wagen.

‘The farmer’s wife hands the hay swathes up, the farmer loads the wagon.’

(141) Ich lud den Karren tüchtig mit Steinen und anderen Materialien,

‘I loaded the cart thoroughly with stones and other materials’

The locative alternation with to load has a very special property, which could explain its restricted use in German. As also touched upon in section 2.1, vehicle-DOS, such as cars or wagons, could not only be involved in some loading event as a location, but also as a locatum, i.e. as an object loaded onto something else. The BNC-examples (142)-(143), the ANW-example (144) and deWaC-example (145) illustrate this.

(142) Once dry of all fluids the car is loaded onto the factory’s rolling ‘D production’ line.

(143) Derek [...] and Luke’s dad Kevin had just loaded a car on the trailer

(144) In Suriname [...] weet men precies

where you a car would can load in a ship

‘In Suriname [...] people know exactly where one could load a car into a ship’

(145) Hier wurde ihr Auto auf einen Klein-LKW geladen

‘Here, their car was loaded onto a truck’

Normally such ambiguity, to which I will refer as ‘ambiguity-of-DO-type’, is avoided. This explains, for instance, why one could express the action of taking away the things from the table by clear a table but not by *to remove a table. The latter is by default interpreted as that the table is removed as a locatum and this interpretation blocks the object change.

This constraint also explains why one can use to clear a table in English, but not translate this into Dutch with *de tafel ruimen or into German as *den Tisch räumen. The verbs ruimen and räumen do not denote ‘make clear’ but rather ‘to take away’. As a consequence, the phrase de tafel ruimen or den Tisch räumen can be
interpreted with the table as the locatum-object and therefore it cannot be used as a location-object, as is the case with *to remove a table.*\(^\text{238}\)

The ambiguity-of-DO-type arises to a much lesser extent for *straten ruimen / Straßen räumen* or *daken ruimen / Dächer räumen* (‘to clear roads’ or ‘to clear roofs’), since one cannot easily take away a street or a roof. The fact that hardly any ambiguity arises in these types of contexts, predicts that the simplex verb *ruimen* and *räumen* do alternate with, for instance, snow and roofs or streets. This prediction is indeed born out, as illustrated in the corpus examples (146) from the DWDS and (147)\(^\text{239}\) from the ANW.

(146) Wenn er im Winter durch die Stadt läuft, when he in-ART winter through the city walks

kümmert sich der Bürgermeister persönlich darum, take care himself the mayor personally there-for

daß die Straßen geräumt und gestreut sind... that the streets cleared and salted are

‘When the mayor is walking in the city during winter time, he personally makes sure that the streets are cleared and salted...’

(147) De weg naar Lenfield is geruimd, maar in de bochten moet je tegensturen The road to Lenfield has been cleared, but one has to steer carefully in the bends

A locatum-location shift can also often be found with Dutch *ruimen* in the context of farms and animal diseases (such as Q fever), as the internet examples (148) and (149) illustrate this.\(^\text{240}\)

---

\(^{238}\) If one assumes that *ruimen* primarily means ‘make space on or in something’ (cf. Van Dale 2005; WNT meaning 2), a comparable line of reasoning applies: One cannot only make space on a table by removing the tableware, but one can also make space in a room by removing a table. In other words, this interpretation of the verb also leads to conflicting interpretations in the case of *de tafel ruimen*. For the examples (146), (147) and (149) below, conflicting interpretations are hardly available under this meaning.

\(^{239}\) The word *Lenfield* could give the impression that this is a translated text, which would make the word *geruimd* a direct translation of *cleared*. This is, however, not true: The ANW-example comes from an authentic Dutch book by the author Bernlef. Comparable examples can be found on the internet (cf. footnote 194).

A committee […] advises pregnant goats to clear

‘A committee […] advises the elimination of pregnant goats’

Today is in Oostrum the first Limburgian goat farm cleared

‘Today, the first Limburgian goat farm has been cleaned in Oostrum.

Because one can only take away moveable objects, no conflicting interpretations arise for (149). The farm will only be interpreted as the location involved in the verbal action and therefore the construction with farm as a direct object or passive subject is allowed.

In a comparable way, it can be explained why afruimen and abräumen allow MOC: Within the combination de tafel afruimen or den Tisch abräumen (‘to off-clear the table’) the table can only be interpreted as the location-DO. This is so, because the verb afruimen or abräumen can only be used in the meaning of ‘taking away tableware from a table/freeing the table from tableware’. Therefore, a table will not be seen as a locatum-object with de tafel afruimen / den Tisch abräumen. Because no confusion will arise, the object change is allowed.

The English phrase to load a car also presents the ambiguous possibility of being a location-DO or a locatum-DO. Of course context easily makes clear which interpretation is intended. In addition to this, the interpretation of the car as a location-DO will be much more frequent. Whereas Dutch and English will therefore probably allow this MOC, German apparently still does not like the ambiguity-of-DO-type with laden. The deWac-corpus supports this fact; while no examples with Wagen / Auto laden (as a locatum) can be found, the corpus does provide some examples with ein Schiff / Frachtschiff laden (‘to load a ship / cargo ship’) as a location-DO. This supports the idea that the former is hardly ever used as a location-DO because of ‘avoidance of ambiguity type’: Ships are loaded onto something else less frequently than cars.

However, this explanation predicts that if no such ambiguity arises, the shift with laden should in fact also be allowed in German. DWDS-sentences (150)-(154) illustrate that this prediction is indeed born out.

She opened the magazine and loaded one bullet after the other,

‘She opened the magazine and loaded one bullet after the other,’

Cf. the deWac-examples of to load a ship: “Im Januar 1579, […], hatte ein Steuermann, namens David Bottig, ein Schiff mit Sand oberhalb Dresden geladen.” (“In January 1579, […], a steers man of the name David Bottig had loaded a ship with sand, above Dresden”); “Die meisten [JS: = Frachtschiffe] waren angeblich nur mit Düngemittel geladen.” (“Most of them [JS: = of cargo ships] were allegedly only loaded with fertilizer”); “Die Andromeda gibt einigen Frachtschiffen, die mit Medikamenten geladen sind, Geleit.” (“The Andromeda sailed in convoy with some cargo ships, which were loaded with medicines.”).
Within the context of putting bullets into guns, i.e. to charge a gun, no such confusion as that with the vehicles can arise. Within this context, German does allow the verb *laden* to combine with the loaded content (the bullets) as well as with the loaded container (the weapon), just as is the case in Dutch and English. The same applies to a more abstract kind of loading, in the context of software, data and computers. Table 10 provides an overview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning <em>laden</em></th>
<th>Realised VP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a) put things onto or into something: load, lade, freight | A *hooi* / *koffers* / *vracht laden*<sup>1</sup>  
*Heu* / *Koffer* / *Fracht laden*<sup>2</sup>  
hay / suitcases / cargo to load  
B *schip* / *wagen* / *auto* / *eszel laden*<sup>2</sup>  
*Schiff* / *Wagen* / *Auto* / *Esel laden*<sup>3</sup>  
ship / wagon / car / donkey to load |
| 1b) put munition into something, provide with munition, load, charge | A *kogels* / *munitie laden*<sup>2</sup>  
*Kugeln* / *Munition laden*<sup>3</sup>  
bullets / munition to load  
B *geweer* / *kanon laden*<sup>2</sup>  
*Gewehr* / *Kanone laden*<sup>3</sup>  
gun / cannon to load |
| 2 load, read in | A *software* / *gegevens laden*<sup>1</sup>  
*Software* / *Data laden*<sup>2</sup>  
software / data to load  
B *computer laden*<sup>2</sup>  
*Computer laden*<sup>3</sup>  
computer to load |

Table 10: German and Dutch *laden*
a. Dutch: zijn spullen pakken (in een koffer)
   German: seine Sachen packen (in einen Koffer)
   English: to pack his stuff (into a suitcase)

b. Dutch: een koffer pakken (met zijn spullen)
   German: einen Koffer packen (mit seinen Sachen)
   English: to pack his suitcase (with his stuff)

The combination of only the verb and DO (without the PP) in the b-sentence can also have two different interpretations, because the Dutch verb *pakken* does not only mean ‘to pack’ but is more frequently used as ‘to grab’ or ‘to take’. According to the etymological dictionary of Dutch (EWN) the meaning ‘pack things into something’ (/to make a pack out of things/) is the basic one, from which the combination ‘to pack a suitcase’ and the new modern Dutch meaning ‘to grasp / take’ has been developed. The latter meaning also occurs with German *packen*, although this meaning is less prominent and is less frequently used than in Dutch. Its interpretation is also slightly different: the meaning in German can be paraphrased as ‘to grab forcefully’ / ‘to catch’ (cf. meaning 2 versus 3 in Table 11). A German phrase such as *Klamotten aus dem Schrank packen* can be found in real language, but it is marked compared to *Klamotten aus dem Schrank nehmen*. Additionally, it should be noticed that, although the use of *pakken* in combinations such as ‘to pack things in a suitcase’ and ‘to pack a suitcase’ is perfectly possible in Dutch, the verb *inpakken*, which also allows content and container as a DO, is more common. The same applies to German, with *einpacken*.

Table 11 schematizes the two meanings of *pakken* and *packen*. The second meaning can be analysed as a metonymical extension of ‘to pack’, because if one is packing things into a container, one automatically also grasps these things. As a consequence, the phrases *de koffer pakken* and -to a much lesser extent- *den Koffer packen* can have the interpretation ‘to pack a suitcase’ as well as ‘to grab / take a suitcase’. This ambiguity caused by the verb is, however, a different ambiguity as...
compared to *to load a car, where the ambiguity arises within a single verb meaning (as is also the case with *to remove a table in the meaning ‘to clear a table’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning in English of pakken(^a) / packen(^b)</th>
<th>Realised VP</th>
<th>metonymy involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to pack, to put things in a container</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> spullen (in een koffer) pakken(^a) Sachen (in einem Koffer) packen(^b) stuff (in a suitcase) to pack</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B</strong> een koffer (met spullen) pakken(^a) einen Koffer (mit Sachen) packen(^b) suitcases (with stuff) to pack</td>
<td>predicative metonymy (MOC: location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to take / to grab / to grasp</td>
<td>kleren uit de kast pakken(^a) Klamotten aus dem Schrank packen(^b) clothes from the wardrobe to take</td>
<td>polysemy based on meaning 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to grab forcefully / to catch</td>
<td>iemand (bij zijn arm) pakken(^a) jemanden (am Arm) packen(^b) someone at his arm to grab de tiger pakt het prooidier(^a) der Tiger packt das Beutetier(^b) the tiger grabs/catches the prey animal</td>
<td>polysemy based on meaning 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: English paraphrases of Dutch pakken and German packen

Another interesting pragmatic-semantic property of phrases such as koffer pakken and Koffer packen has been observed by Dewell: Verbs with a shifted location-object always imply some point of completion (2004: 23ff). According to Dewell, the “completion of the packing event is defined […] in terms of the suitcase”, because “we know that the event has been completed when the suitcase has been filled” (Dewell 2004: 24). This description links to the so-called “holistic effect” (cf. chapter IV, §4.1), but the idea that the suitcase must be full is not in line with my intuitions. Although I do underline the fact that de koffer pakken implies an endpoint, this endpoint is reached as soon as “the packed suitcase […] is ready for travel” (Dewell 2004: 32). Suitcases are, however, not ready for travel if they are totally full, but as soon as all the items needed for travel have been packed into them.

This shows that MOC's are not used without a reason. The focus on the suitcase implies that the container is important and relevant. This is true, because the goal of a packing-event is making something, i.e. the suitcase, ready for travel.

In other words, some kind of functional or resultative element is involved in the location-as-DO, precisely because the location has been chosen as a DO. This explains the observation that alternating verbs with locations “describe a process that is completed when a finished product is created” (Dewell 2004: 32). In the next section, we will see that the focus on the location as a type of result can have some interesting consequences.
4.4 Metonymy types and their continuum: *smeren / schmieren* and ‘to squeeze’

The verb *to pack* is not the only verb which allows a locative alternation with some resultative flavour. In fact, we already saw very similar examples with *smeren / schmieren* (cf. example (34) and (34)-(35) or (55)): The combination *ein Scharnier schmieren* (‘to grease a hinge’, cf. (34)) results in a smoothly working hinge and *een boterham smeren* (‘to spread a slice of bread’, cf. (34)) results in a prepared sandwich. The verb *smeren* and *schmieren* can therefore be used in several ways, with different semantic nuances.

Literally, *smeren* and *schmieren* denote some movement like ‘to smear’. The verbs are basically used in this sense, which could be translated as ‘to spread’/ ‘to grease’/ ‘to smear’ / ‘to rub’. If two objects can be conceptualised as one gestalt (a unity of locatum and location), a shift of the DO-position can occur.

MOCs are, however, not used without a reason. The focus on the location could be warranted because the location-object has some cognitive salience. It must therefore be prominently involved in the ‘smeren / schmieren’-event. The salience could (among many other things) be the fact that the affected location is a kind of desired result.

The fact that *smeren* or *schmieren* in combination with a location-DO often has a resultative meaning-component has lead to another meaning of this verb: Within the context of sandwiches, the verb could also refer to ‘to make sandwiches’. The difference between the ‘spreading a sandwich’-meaning (meaning 1) and the ‘making sandwiches’-meaning (meaning 2) is very subtle, because one is often making sandwiches if one spreads them with something. Consider, however, examples (156) and (157) (from the deWaC and from the ANW-corpus).

(156) de vader […] smeerde voor z'n vlijtige dochter boterhammen met extra dik hagelslag

‘the father spread [lit.: smeared] for his thrifty daughter sandwiches with an extra thick layer of chocolate sprinkles’

(157) Bernardo Fischer […] schmiert Brote. Eines mit Thunfisch, eines mit Eiern und Salatblättern, eines mit Rührei,

‘Bernando Fischer is spreading [lit.: smeared] sandwiches. One with tuna, one with eggs and lettuce leaves, one with scrambled egg.’

The verb *smeren* or *schmieren* cannot literally apply to chocolate sprinkles or egg with lettuce. Therefore, the act of *smeren / schmieren* is not directly referred to in these examples: Based on a relation between a ‘smeren / schmieren’-event (for instance with butter) and the act of making sandwiches, the verb just refers to the latter action with respect to the direct objects of (156) and (157). In other words, the verb is metonymically polysemous. Comparable to the different meanings of *pakken / packen* or of the verb *klateren* (cf. chapter III, §2.2 or §4.7), the original meaning is
extended on the basis of a relation in reality between the original, literal event with another event (corresponding to the extended meaning).

It is important to note that this metonymical meaning extension of the verb does not have to occur in combination with bread. Examples (158) and (159) (from the deWaC- and the ANW-corpus) show sentences in which the meaning of ‘making a sandwich’ cannot be intended.

(158) Dabei klopft wir unser Frühstücksei, schmieren unser Butterbrot und legen eine Scheibe Schinken drauf.
   ‘In addition to this, we take the top of the egg for breakfast off, spread [lit.: smear] our “butterbread” and put a slice of ham on top of it.’

(159) In de ontbijtzaal smeerde hij drie boterhammen, belegde ze met kaas,
   ‘In the breakfast room he spread [lit.: smeared] three sandwiches, put cheese on them,”

Given that the verbs *smeren* and *schmieren* are followed by an act of putting a slice of ham or cheese on the bread, the verb cannot be interpreted as ‘making a sandwich’ (cf. also the Dutch example in footnote 202). Examples (156) and (157) versus examples (158) and (159) clarify the difference between meaning 1 and meaning 2 in Table 12.243

These examples reveal a clear parallel between so-called locative alternations and shifts between material and products: Even locative shifts also often pragmatically evoke the idea of a finished product. The latter can be illustrated by *ein gepackter Koffer* (‘a packed suitcase’), *een gesmeerde ketting* (‘a greased chain’) or *een gesmeerde boterham* (‘a sandwich’), as explained in this section.

---

243 Based on the English paraphrases, one could think that the verbs *smeren* and *schmieren* are used in a separate sense within the phrases *een ketting smeren* and *eine Kette schmieren* (‘to grease a chain’). It could be assumed that in such examples *smeren* and *schmieren* do not mean ‘to smear grease’, but are rather extended to the meaning ‘to make ready for use by greasing’. However, it is not necessary to assume such a separate sense. According to the etymological dictionary (EWN) the Dutch verb *smeren* is a derivation of the noun *smeer* (‘grease’), which tells us that the Dutch verb *smeren* basically means ‘to apply grease’/ ‘to grease’ (lit.: ‘to smear’). The implicit grease (*smeer*) can be replaced by all kinds of semiliquids, as is also the case in combinations such as *brood met boter smeren* or *een ketting met vet smeren*. The same holds for German.
### Table 12: English paraphrases of Dutch *smeren* and German *schmieren*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning in English of <em>smeren</em>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; / <em>schmieren</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Realised VP</th>
<th>Metonymy involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  to move (semi)liquid on a surface or object (lit. ≈ 'to smear') | **A** *boter / jam smeren*<sup>2</sup>  
Butter / Marmelade *schmieren*<sup>2</sup>  
butter / jam to spread [lit.: *smeared*]  
**B** *brood / boterham(men) smeren*<sup>2</sup>  
*Brot / Brotscheibe(n) schmieren*<sup>2</sup>  
bread / slice(s) of bread to spread | Predicative metonymy (MOC: location) |
| to grease (smear/rub fat / grease on a object) | **A** *vet / olie / smeer smeren*<sup>2</sup>  
Fett / Öl / *Schmierfett* *schmieren*<sup>2</sup>  
fat / oil / grease to smear | -- |
| 2 to make sandwiches (no necessarily involved action as denoted by meaning 1) | **A** *brood / boterham(men) smeren*<sup>2</sup>  
*Brot / Brotscheibe(n) schmieren*<sup>2</sup>  
bread / slice(s) of bread to spread | Metonymical polysemy based on meaning 1 |
|  | **B** *belegde broodjes / broodje ham smeren*<sup>2</sup>  
*belegte Brötchen / Schinkenbrot schmieren*<sup>2</sup>  
sandwiches / ham sandwich spread | Metonymical polysemy based on 1) + Predicative metonymy (MOC: result) |
|  | **C** *lunchtrommeltje smeren*<sup>2</sup>  
*Lunchdose schmieren*<sup>2</sup>  
lunch box spread (‘make a lunch box’) | Metonymical polysemy based on 1) + Metonymical DO |

Table 12 also illustrates the difference between a real metonymical meaning shift of the verb (meaning 1 or 2) as opposed to predicative metonymies (MOCs), which only occur at VP-level (A or B). Table 12 also shows the difference between an MOC and a metonymically re-interpreted object: Whereas *brood / Brot* and *ketting / Kette* (meaning 1, VP type B) refer to the literal locations, the noun *lunchtrommeltje*<sup>244</sup> is metonymically used to refer to the sandwiches in it (meaning 2, VP type C).

Table 12 illustrates different types of metonymy and combinations of them. Although MOCs can be distinguished from metonymical re-interpretation of the DO and also from metonymical polysemy on the verb as such, sometimes metonymical

---

<sup>244</sup> Cf. “Ik had al netjes de avond daar voor mijn broodtrommeltje gesmeerd.” (“I had already nicely prepared my lunch box the night before”) (http://jasperdownunder.waarbenijj.nu/Reisverslag/?Australi%EB/Eerste+week+stage/&subdomain=JasperDownUnder&module=site&page=message&id=4014010) or “Jij mag mijn broodtrommeltje wel smeren” (“You can make my lunch box”) (http://forum.viva.nl/forum/Eten/Brood_invriezen_met_beleg_wat_is_lekker/list_messages/73860) [both retrieved in October 2011]. I would like to thank Wim Honselaar for providing me with this type of example.
effects are clearly connected to each other. A beautiful example to illustrate the parallel between different metonymy types and between locations and results is presented in (160).

(160) a. Dutch: De wijnboer perst de druiven
   German: Der Weinbauer presst / keltert die Trauben
   the winegrower presses / squeezes the grapes

b. Dutch: De wijnboer perst de wijn
   German: Der Weinbauer presst / keltert den Wein
   the winegrower presses / squeezes the wine

Verbs such as Dutch persen, German pressen or English to squeeze can be combined with the fruits squeezed or with the juice that is squeezed out of these fruits. This can be illustrated with to squeeze oranges or to squeeze (orange) juice. One cannot exactly determine whether the fruits and the liquid stand in an INGREDIENT-PRODUCT relation or whether they are instead connected as CONTENT AND CONTAINER (i.e. LOCATUM-LOCATION). The context evoked by the verb persen or pressen does not solve this problem: The verb contains the semantic component of ‘cause a movement of something out of something by physical force’ as well as ‘produce something out of something by physical force’.

The combination wijn persen or Wein pressen (example (160)) is even more complicated. This is caused by the semantics of wijn or Wein. If one looks this word up in a dictionary, two metonymically related meanings can be found: The noun wijn or Wein denotes an alcoholic drink made out of grapes, but it can also directly refer to the different kinds of grapes of which the wine has been made. The latter meaning is, for instance, also reflected in the Dutch and German words wijnterras / Weinberg (‘vineyard’); wijnbouw / Weinanbau (‘wine-growing’); wijnrank / Weinranke vs. druivenrank / Traubenranke (‘wine tendril’ vs. ‘grape tendril’), etc.

On the basis of these observations, the difference between the a-sentences and the b-sentences in (160) can be analysed in several ways, all involving metonymy. First of all, one could just consider the direct object wijn / Wein as metonymically referring to the grapes. The combination then involves a metonymical interpretation (metonymical polysemy) of the DO.

Secondly, one could claim that the meaning of the predicate has been metonymically shifted: The verb refers to a production process based on a contiguity relation with a physical action (the original meaning) that is involved in this production process. This explanation analyses the verb in the b-sentences as metonymically polysemous.

However, if one examines the above combination in line with other alternations (such as to squeeze oranges / juice), it turns out that such a kind of polysemy does not have to be assumed (cf. e.g. Van Dale 2005 entry persen meaning 5 or DWDS (www.dwds.de) entry pressen meaning 1). The predicate can be subsumed under a single action and both direct objects can also be considered literally interpreted. In other words, a third analysis is to explain the alternation as MOC: The predicate can
be combined with two types of direct objects in its DO-position, because the predicate evokes a kind of activity, in which these two conceptually connected participants are closely related. The relation between the two objects could be explained as a LOCATUM-LOCATION contiguity or as MATERIAL-PRODUCT contiguity. The resultative meaning of a production process just occurs by the combination of verb and direct object, that is by the semantic import of the ‘wine’-NP in combination with this verb. This analysis has the advantage that the product meaning of the NP is not projected onto the meaning of the verb (cf. Willems 2006: 591 for the same issue with certain adjectives).

These different accounts of example (160) perfectly illustrate the continuum of well-known instances of metonymy and alternations. In addition to this, this example reflects the connection between locatum-location and material-product shifts.

5. Conclusions

In this chapter, I have analysed some verbs that allow two different types of direct objects. The examples which have been taken into account are based on shifts tagged in dictionaries, which have also been discussed by Waltereit, Pinker and Levin. Therefore, the focus in this chapter is on locatum-location shifts (also called transitive locative alternations) and product-material shifts. On the basis of language data in Dutch and German, it has been revealed that these two types of alternations are closely related to each other.

The chapter opened with an explanation of why research on alternations should compare a single verb with two different types of direct objects (DOs) and why additional prepositional phrases (PPs) need not necessarily be taken into account (section 2).

Secondly, as may be expected by the names ‘product-material alternation’ and ‘locatum-location shifts’, it has been demonstrated in section 3 that changes in the direct object should be analysed as metonymy-based. I have shown that the relation between both direct objects within the context evoked by the verb is indeed crucial, because MOCs can only be used if one single gestalt is involved with respect to the verb meaning. In other words, the relation between two objects restricts the possibility of the alternation. Sometimes both objects can be lexically expressed by a single word. In line with the Dutch and German terms “objectsverwisseling” and “Objektsvertauschung”, locative alternations and material/product alternations should therefore be called Metonymical Object Changes (MOCs.)

Section 4 revealed some semantic and pragmatic characteristics of MOCs. In this section, I have analysed some meanings of the English, Dutch and German verbs, such as to fill / vullen / füllen; to pour / schenken / gießen; to clear / ruimen / räumen; to load / laden / laden; to pack / pakken / packen; and Dutch and German smeren / schmieren and persen / pressen or keltern. As illustrated with to fill and füllen, MOCs can only be used if the contiguously related objects play an equally important role within the semantics of the verb. Furthermore, no confusion may
arise concerning how the verbal action applies to the object, as illustrated with to pour (and Dutch and German equivalents); with ruimen / räumen versus afruimen / abräumen and with German laden. In addition, it has been shown on the basis of language data that the two types of alternations are closely related to one another. Last but not least, I demonstrated that MOCs belong to a continuum of several metonymical effects at the end of section 4.

In the previous chapters, I argued that the metonymy involved in such alternations is comparable to the metonymical effect in instances of so-called logical metonymy. This will be worked out in the next two chapters: Chapter VII will discuss the use of some logical metonymies in Dutch and German and analyse the semantics of the verbs involved, while chapter VIII will clarify how all these metonymies can be analysed as highlighting effects within a frame.