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VII. EVENTIVE MOCs OR LOGICAL METONYMY IN DUTCH AND GERMAN

1. Logical metonymy (LM)

In the previous chapter some properties of MOCs have been discussed and some reasons to use or not to use MOCs have been analysed. The focus of the examples was on non-eventive metonymies, i.e. MOCs that shift between two concrete objects, which form a spatial-material gestalt. In chapter IV (§7.4) ‘logical metonymy’ has been presented as a predicative metonymy based on a temporal-eventive gestalt. Such MOCs shift between an event and a concrete object. Sentences (1)-(4) illustrate this.

(1) Mary began reading the book / writing the book.
(2) Mary began the book.
(3) John enjoyed eating a sandwich.
(4) John enjoyed a sandwich.

While in (1) and (3) the activity that was begun or enjoyed is explicitly specified, in sentences (2) and (4) the same activity may be involved, but this is left implicit. Because we cannot begin or enjoy an object as such, some activity with the book or the sandwich needs to be interpreted in (2) and (4). By default, we understand that sentence (2) means that Mary began ‘reading the book’ or ‘writing the book’ (as explicitly expressed in (1)). Sentence (4) is understood in a similar way: Enjoying an object presupposes some experience with the object, which is by default eating it.

In consequence, whereas sentences (1) and (3) are interpreted in a normal way, examples (2) and (4) are interpreted metonymically, that is by inferring an activity needed for the interpretation on the basis of a real world relation with the concrete object. Under a default interpretation, this metonymical interpretation is similar to the meaning of (1) and (3). These examples are considered to be instances of logical metonymy, since the metonymical inference from the object to a related activity is systematically triggered by type requirements of the main verb (Pustejovsky 1995: 54; Verspoor 1997b).

The best-known analysis of logical metonymy is Pustejovsky’s account within his theory of the generative lexicon (Pustejovsky 1989; 1991; 1995). In his view, the
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245 A modified version of this chapter was published as Sweep (2012) “Logical metonymy in Dutch and German: Equivalents of begin, finish and enjoy.” International Journal of Lexicography, 25.2, 117-151. Therefore, I am greatly indebted to the anonymous reviewers who suggest some improvements for previous versions of this paper, from which this chapter has also profited.
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interpretation of an implicit event is triggered by a metonymical link between the concrete object, as referred to by book or sandwich, and the intended activity. This link is said to be directly incorporated in the lexicon via the so-called qualia structure. A qualia structure, which represents lexical information of a noun, comprises four roles: A ‘constitutive’, a ‘formal’, an ‘agentive’, and a ‘telic role’ (Pustejovsky 1995: 76). The first two roles provide information about inherent characteristics of the object, such as the material it is made of (the constitutive role) and the general class or category it belongs to (the formal role). The agentive and the telic roles describe typical actions in which the object is involved, i.e. how it is brought about (the agentive role) and what the purpose or function of the object is (the telic role). The qualia structures for book and sandwich thus look as follows (cf. Pustejovsky & Boguraev 1993: 211, 207):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{book}(x) & \quad \text{CONST} = \{\text{text, paper,...}\} \\
& \quad \text{FORMAL} = \text{physobj}(x) \\
& \quad \text{TELIC} = \text{read}(P,y,x) \\
& \quad \text{AGENTIVE} = \text{write}(R,w,x)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sandwich}(x) & \quad \text{CONST} = \{\text{bread,...}\} \\
& \quad \text{FORMAL} = \text{physobj}(x) \\
& \quad \text{TELIC} = \text{eat}(P,y,x) \\
& \quad \text{AGENTIVE} = \text{artefact}(x)
\end{align*}
\]

According to Pustejovsky, the activity needed for a full interpretation of sentences (2) and (4) is by default understood on the basis of the latter two roles of the qualia structure belonging to, for example, book or sandwich. Based on the qualia structure, the noun denoting a concrete entity is really changed into a noun denoting an event. This change is called coercion.

Most analyses of logical metonymy have two limitations. First of all, analyses of logical metonymy mainly focus on English: Only a very few studies compare English with French (Godard & Jayez 1993; Pustejovsky & Bouillon 1996), but other languages are hardly ever analysed (Horacek 1996 and a recent paper by Rüd and Zarcone 2011 being notable exceptions).

Secondly, most accounts are solely based on introspection: There are only four studies on logical metonymy that use examples from corpora (Briscoe et al. 1990; Lapata & Lascarides 2003; Rüd und Zarcone 2011; Verspoor 1997a). Briscoe, Copestake and Boguraev did a very small corpus study of a total of 235 examples and Lapata and Lascarides use real data only to check automatic predictions on the interpretation of logical metonymies. Verspoor exhaustively analysed corpus examples of logical metonymy with the verbs begin and finish. Rüd and Zarcone examined the German equivalents anfangen (mit) (‘to begin’), aufhören (mit) (‘to stop’), beginnen (mit) (‘to begin’), beenden (‘to finish’) and genießen (‘to enjoy’) in combination with artefacts as direct objects.

This chapter will extend previous research by comparing the behaviour of logical metonymy in Dutch, German, and English. I will base this analysis on English results obtained by Verspoor (1997a) compared to an analysis of Dutch and German corpus examples of equivalents of begin, finish, and enjoy. The German findings will also be compared with Rüd and Zarcone 2011 (which appeared after I had
conducted this study). Although their study has a slightly different line of approach, a different method, uses a different corpus (deWac instead of DWDS) and even took into account slightly different verbs, Rüd and Zarcone’s results and my findings mutually support each other, given that despite differences in the set-up comparable patterns have been revealed.

2. The usefulness of corpus samples

On the basis of a corpus study, Verspoor concluded that the actual use of metonymically interpreted direct objects combined with English *begin* and *finish* is highly restricted (Verspoor 1997a; Verspoor 1997b): Only certain types of nouns and only limited telic interpretations occur in logically metonymical constructions with *begin* and *finish*. She found that mainly artefacts with agentive interpretations (Verspoor 1997a: 188) were used with *begin* and *finish* and only approximately twenty nominal categories, such as texts, pieces of music, food and drink, with telic or agentive interpretations (Verspoor 1997a: 186-187). Based on the BNC, she also found that *finish* showed more logically metonymical examples than *begin* (Verspoor 1997a: 187).

Lexical differences between verbs have also been reported in other corpus studies (cf. Rüd & Zarcone 2011: 22). According to Verspoor (1997a: 187), such restrictions are unexpected in Pustejovsky’s generative lexicon. According to this theory, every noun which has certain values for the agentive and telic role of the qualia structure should be able to occur in a logically metonymical construction, under an agentive as well as under a telic interpretation. If in practice some combinations occur far more often than others, one should, just as Verspoor does, incorporate such conventions within a lexical theory and also within a dictionary.

In this chapter, Dutch and German corpus data of comparable verbs with concrete objects are analysed. The Dutch verbs selected for this study are *beginnen* (‘to begin’), *beëindigen* (‘to end’/ ‘to finish’), *eindigen* (‘to end’/ ‘to finish’), and *genieten van* (‘to enjoy’). The investigated German verbs are *beginnen* (‘to begin’), *anfangen* (‘to begin’), *beend(igen)* (‘to end’/ ‘to finish’), *enden* (‘to end’/ ‘to finish’) and *genießen* (‘to enjoy’). The Dutch and German corpora which have been used are comparable in size (around 100 million tokens) and, more importantly, both corpora are lexicographic corpora, which means that texts have been selected and the amount of different types of texts has been balanced.

All Dutch examples were obtained from the corpus belonging to the dictionary project *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek* (ANW-corpus). More information about the ANW-corpus and about the ANW-dictionary project can be found on http://anw.inl.nl/show?page=help_anwcorpus and http://anw.inl.nl/show

---

246 In the present corpus analysis, the German verb *aufhören (mit)* (‘to stop’) has not been taken into account, because this verb can hardly ever be combined with concrete objects. Rüd and Zarcone in fact also observe this in their study (2011: 21). The same goes for the Dutch verb *ophouden (met)* (‘to stop’).
These ANW-examples were extracted with the help of the SketchEngine (http://www.sketchengine.co.uk/), which allows a balanced selection of random examples as well as an extraction of statistically relevant collocations with the help of the tool WordSketch. The automatic extraction of direct objects can be made with the help of the grammatical relation “direct object” in the Dutch WordSketch (see Tiberius & Kilgarriff 2009). However, since this does not work perfectly, examples were checked by hand, and because of the high rate of noise, an additional random sample of at least 400 examples (without additional infinitives or prepositional phrases) has been analysed for beginnen, beëindigen, eindigen en genieten van.

Because the WordSketch did not provide much noise for the prepositional objects, smaller samples could be analysed for these verb-complement combinations. It proved to be less useful to extract examples of beginnen met or eindigen met, since these verbs occur mostly in constructions without agentive subjects. In order to avoid ‘something starts/ends with something’-examples I therefore searched for beginnen met with specific collocates, such as brief (letter), boterham (sandwich), boek (book), gezin (‘family), or kind (child) and I extracted all pronouns followed by eindigen met. Table 13 gives an overview of the analysed Dutch corpus examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>WordSketch</th>
<th>(additional) sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to begin</td>
<td>beginnen</td>
<td>634 (= total)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beginnen aan</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beginnen met</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111 (= specific objects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to finish</td>
<td>beëindigen</td>
<td>53 (= total)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eindigen</td>
<td>22 (= total)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eindigen met</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114 (= preceded by pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to enjoy</td>
<td>genieten van</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(3384 =)</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Dutch analysed samples extracted from the ANW-corpus

For German, I used randomly selected samples from the corpus of Das digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (the DWDS-Kernkorpus). Random examples can easily be extracted via the online-interface (www.dwds.de). In order to get as many potential metonymical examples as possible for anfangen, beginnen, beenden, beendigen and genießen, I searched for examples without additional infinitives and without prepositional phrases (query example: beginnen with $p=VVFIN &&&!mit &&&!an &&&!zu &&&!*zu) and in addition for combinations of a verb and a specific preposition (anfangen mit; beginnen mit; enden mit) without an infinitive.

A problem with anfangen is that this verb sometimes splits up in finite form. Since the corpus is tagged with the STTS-tagset (http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/projekte/CQP Demos/Bundestag/help-tagset.htm), it is, however, possible to search for split up finite verbs (query: "fangen #5 an with $p=PTKVZ").
The analysed sample of *anfangen* therefore consists of forms that are not separated (*anfängt, angefangen, etc.; sample of 300) as well as split up (*fährt/fangen/etc....an; sample of 200). Table 14 gives an overview of the used samples for German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>analysed random sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to begin</td>
<td><em>anfangen</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>anfangen mit</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>beginnen</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>beginnen mit</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to finish</td>
<td><em>beenden</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>beendigen</em></td>
<td>42 (= total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>enden mit</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to enjoy</td>
<td><em>genießen</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: German analysed samples of the DWDS-Kernkorpus

Apart from these verbs, I will additionally touch upon the semantics of some other alternative translations for *to begin* and *to finish*, such as the Dutch verbs *aanvangen* and *aanvatten* (*to begin* / *to start*), the verbs *voltooien, vervolledigen* and *afmaken* (*to finish* / *to complete*) and the German verbs *vollenden, vervollständigen, erledigen* and *fertig stellen* (*to finish* / *to complete*).

In contrast to Verspoor’s study (1997a: 186), no exact numbers of occurring types of objects for the analysed verbs are provided in this chapter. If one wants to analyse the usage of logical metonymies and the semantics of the verbs involved, one might question to what extent exact numbers are informative. There are several reasons why it is problematic to give exact numbers and why they only provide limited information, which leads to the conclusion that a qualitative analysis, rather than a quantitative one is needed.

First of all, the different verbs allowing logical metonymy are very different in their structures. German verbs such as *beginnen* (*to begin*) and *enden mit* (*to finish*) or Dutch verbs such as *beginnen* (*to begin*) and *eindigen* (*to finish*), for instance, cannot only be used transitive, but also intransitive: In such cases, the event that is started or finished occurs as the subject. Such constructions are not possible with German *genießen* (*to enjoy*) and *beenden* (*to finish*) or with Dutch *beëindigen* (*to finish*) and *genieten van* (*to enjoy*). As a consequence, even if the analysed corpus samples for each verb are the same size, the number of transitive sentences and therefore of potential logical metonymies differ. For this reason, absolute or relative numbers of logical metonymies within a corpus sample do not provide much information.

Secondly, it can be questioned which insights can be obtained from numbers without any statistical analysis. However, often categories are so many or frequency numbers are so low that statistical analyses are problematic.

A third problem is that it is doubtful whether numbers of certain types of objects are useful without taking into account the sources they are taken from. For instance,
suppose that a handbook on how to write novels is incorporated within the corpus. This text could contain many examples which describe how to begin or finish a text. Frequency numbers of such combinations do not provide much information about the usage of logical metonymies in general, if such examples all occur within this single source.

Fourthly, it is not always clear which examples should be classified as belonging to a certain category. For instance, a verb such as German *beginnen* (‘to begin’) or *beenden* (‘to finish’) is often combined with a text, such as a book or a letter. Books and letters are prototypical examples of texts. This is not the case for all direct objects that are interpreted as being read or written. It is, for example, less clear whether a ‘pamphlet’, a ‘sentence’, a ‘survey’, or ‘beautiful scenes’ could all be classified as texts.

The same problem can be illustrated with examples of beginning a company or a commercial enterprise (which are excluded in Verspoor’s analysis, cf. 1997a: 185). Some of these words clearly refer to the concrete stores, hotels or restaurants which are set up and managed. They can be considered instances of logical metonymy. However, other words which refer to commercial enterprises are polysemous between the non-eventive store or company and the activities that are employed in such business enterprises.

Categories which, as we will see, frequently occur with verbs that semantically require an event, are more often ambiguous between the concrete thing and a related event (cf. also Rüd & Zarcone 2011: 19). The category of games, for instance, denote concrete things that can be played, but some words referring to games also denote the gaming-activity. Another group of frequently occurring direct objects with the above mentioned verbs are types of education, such as trainings, studies and courses. Although the referents of these words are of an eventive nature, one could also claim that the agents start to follow the course/training/study. Furthermore, words such as *school* denote a non-eventive institute, while at the same time polysemously referring to the lessons given at school (cf. Moerdijk 1989). Verspoor explicitly states that she only includes such examples, if it is necessary to add an event for the intended interpretation (Verspoor 1997a: 185-186). However, to me it
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247 In the small corpus study by Briscoe et al. of 235 examples in total, which were unequally divided over seven different verbs, 10% of the examples (24 examples) have not been analysed, because the authors had difficulty classifying them.

248 Original German DWDS-examples are, for instance, “wir beenden das Flugblatt” (‘we are finishing the pamphlet’), “Ich beginne mit dem zweiten Satz” (‘I am starting with the second sentence’), “In Lieferung 15 beginnt dann Zatschek eine Übersicht über die deutschböhmisichen Schreibschulen.” (‘In issue 15, Zatschek is then beginning a survey of German-Bohemian writing schools’) or “Schon am Morgen [...] sitze ich an der Schreibmaschine. Ich beginne mit den schönen Szenen.” (‘Already in the morning, I am sitting at the typewriter. I am beginning (with) the beautiful scenes.’).

249 Illustrative in this respect is the difference between ANW-combinations, such as *een hotel beginnen* (to start a hotel) versus *een hotelbedrijf beginnen* (‘to start a hotel business’). A logically metonymical example with a clearly concrete direct object is, for instance, “Hij kon zo een marktkraam beginnen” (‘He could start a market stall right away’).
is often unclear when this is the case (cf. also the discussion with examples (7)-(8) below).250

One could decide to provide exact numbers of selected categories without incorporating problematic examples (cf. Briscoe et al. 1990: 45), but this obscures results. Rather than making the decision whether a specific noun denotes a text or a company, it is important to present the finding that texts and companies are often used in examples of logical metonymy.

This shows that a qualitative analysis, rather than a quantitative one is useful. The semantics and usage of the verbs should be based upon reliable samples, but the analysis itself can be of a qualitative nature. In the terminology of Sinclair this would make the present analysis ‘corpus-assisted’ or ‘corpus-oriented’, because samples of corpus examples are used “to support reasonable claims about the language” (cf. Sinclair 2007: 202).

It should be remarked that a general difficulty of quantitative and qualitative corpus research is that corpus examples do not provide information about the impossibility of categories and telic or agentive interpretations. Corpus data only show how language is used and not what is possible or impossible. Nevertheless, the language use as reflected in corpus examples is based on what is possible. Actual occurrences therefore provide information about important concrete categories and such information is especially relevant for lexicography.251

Modern lexicographers also use corpus samples in a corpus-oriented way: They design their dictionary definitions and incorporate collocations on the basis of interpretations and qualitative analyses of a reliable sample of examples. Likewise, the present chapter provides a qualitative analysis of actually occurring concrete nouns with the above verbs, which can be used to obtain insight into the nature of logical metonymy in Dutch and German.

The results of this analysis are presented as follows: Section 3 will discuss the semantics of concrete complements with the Dutch verb beginnen and the German verbs anfangen and beginnen (‘to begin’). In section 4, logical metonymy with the Dutch verbs eindigen met and beëindigen and German beend(en) (‘to finish’) will be analysed. Section 5 will describe the semantics of Dutch genieten van and German genießen and their concrete complements. These sections will not only examine the actual use of logical metonymy, but also reveal some properties of prepositional objects. In section 6, the lexicographical relevance and practice will be discussed. Implications of this study will be summarised in section 7.

250 Such a kind of polysemy exists in Dutch and German very frequently, since these languages lack gerunds and instead always use verbal nouns (cf. chapter VIII, §4.1). Such nouns are almost always ambiguous between an activity and a concrete object.

251 I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer of the Journal of International Lexicography who stressed the fact that corpus examples strictly speaking only provide information on ‘performance’ and not on ‘competence’. However, performance is of course competence-based. Furthermore, a researcher’s competence is indirectly taken into account, because the corpus samples are interpreted and sometimes additional examples have been searched for. This is comparable with the common practice in lexicography.
3. LM with Dutch and German translations of ‘to begin’

3.1 Direct objects and prepositional objects

In this section, the German verbs beginnen or anfangen (‘to begin’) and Dutch beginnen (‘to begin’) in combination with concrete objects will be analysed. The German verbs beginnen or anfangen and Dutch beginnen cannot only occur with direct objects, but also with prepositional objects. In this subsection, I will first discuss which concrete direct objects could be found in the corpus sample and secondly I will explain which types of prepositional objects occur with the above verbs. Results on prepositional objects will be discussed in full detail in the subsequent subsections.

The verb aanvangen is also Dutch for ‘to begin’, but it is less frequent and mainly occurs in formal, written language. It also was found that within all ANW-examples of aanvangen in finite form in main clauses (307 examples in total), transitive constructions with concrete objects are very infrequent: Besides the fixed combination de terugweg aanvangen (‘to begin (to make) the way back’) the only real metonymical example is one combination with een roman (‘a novel’, interpreted as ‘writing it’). The verb aanvangen has therefore not been included in this analysis.

Besides de terugweg aanvangen one could also use de terugweg aanvatten. This verb, which also has the meaning ‘to begin’ / ‘to start with’, is especially used in Dutch spoken in Belgium. The ANW-corpus provides 348 corpus examples of this verb, in which the verb is written together. Among these examples only a few examples occur in metonymical constructions. Compare in this respect (5)-(7), with the eventive interpretations between curly brackets.

(5) ..., terwijl Bolle geofend een volledig menu aanvatte.  
   ‘..., while Bolle trained a whole menu began’ {eating}

(6) Toen het nummer daarna werd aangevat, ...  
   ‘When after that the track has been begun, ...’ {playing}

(7) anderzijds worden nieuwe thema’s aangevat  
   ‘on the other hand people begin with new themes’ {doing research on & writing about}

It is interesting that the comparable categories which can also be found with other verbs, as will be demonstrated below, are found with aanvatten. In addition to the above examples, one can find combinations such as een studie / training aanvatten (‘to begin a study/training’). Such examples can also be found for the other verbs, but in these cases no metonymy has to be assumed. Examples (8) and (9) (from two
different sources) are probably different in this respect. The university refers to an institute and the interpretation of what is started is something as ‘going to the university’ / ‘following education at the university’.

(8) laatstejaars middelbaar onderwijs die de universiteit willen aanvatten
    ‘pupils in the last year of their secondary school who want to begin university’

(9) de jongeren die universiteit aanvatten
    ‘the young people who begin university’

Such examples again illustrate that there is a tight connection between clear instances of logical metonymy and reinterpreted objects: Although the university does in principle not denote an event, it remains unresolvable whether university is an expressed element of an activity frame or whether it is re-interpreted according to the standard metonymical polysemic pattern PLACE-ACTIVITIES DONE/EDUCATION AT THAT PLACE.

In the corpus samples of Dutch beginnen or German anfangen and beginnen (see Table 13 and Table 14) also only a handful of direct objects referring to concrete entities can be found. Whereas Verspoor found that only a limited number of specific nominal categories are used metonymically with English begin, Dutch and German appear to be even more restrictive in selecting concrete direct objects.

In German almost all metonymical direct objects refer to stories or texts, all with an agentive interpretation (telling the stories and writing the pages, texts, chapters, and so on). In addition, there are some examples with other concrete objects, such as ‘beginning a piece of music’ or ‘beginning a store/company’ (again only with an agentive interpretation).

The Dutch ANW-sample shows a result with exactly the same categories. Telic interpretations are very marginal; an example is the advice to a reader in (10) to start reading another book.

(10) De schouders ophalen en gelaten een ander boek beginnen
    ‘Shrug one’s shoulders and resignedly begin another book’

However, the Dutch verb beginnen and the German verbs beginnen and anfangen cannot only occur with direct objects, but also with prepositional objects. In German, the prepositional objects with beginnen and anfangen are formed with mit (‘with’). In Dutch, prepositional object with beginnen can be formed with aan (‘on’) as well as with met (‘with’) (cf. Broekhuis 2004: 105).
Prepositional objects occur more frequently with nouns which refer to concrete entities as compared to the direct objects. This will be discussed in detail in the following subsections. Section 3.2 will start with some remarks on the usage of Dutch beginnen aan and beginnen met in contrast to transitive beginnen. Section 3.3 will analyse beginnen met in detail and section 3.4 will do the same for beginnen aan. German anfangen mit and beginnen mit will be discussed in section 3.5. Section 3.6 will summarise the semantics of these verbs in combination with objects which denote concrete entities.

3.2 LM and prepositional objects with Dutch beginnen

It has been claimed that there is little difference between minimal pairs of Dutch verbs with direct objects or with prepositional objects (cf. De Schutter 1974: 178, but cf. also examples in note 17). However, with Dutch beginnen, some types of concrete objects can only occur in a prepositional object and not as a direct object, which can be exemplified by the equivalents of begin a sandwich (or other types of food). If one wants to translate this sentence into Dutch while preserving the metonymy, one has to use beginnen aan / met een boterham. The ANW-corpus reflects the obligatoriness of the prepositional object for the metonymy: The only corpus examples of beginnen and boterham (‘sandwich’) are examples with aan, such as in (11) and (12). In their contexts, both examples are given a telic interpretation, i.e. the subjects start to eat the sandwiches.

(11) hij [...] begon aan twee boterhammen
    he began on two sandwiches
    ‘he began two sandwiches’ {eating}

(12) ik begon aan boterham nummer vijf
    I began on sandwich number five
    ‘I began a fifth sandwich’ {eating}

Other examples of beginnen with words denoting concrete objects also require the preposition aan, as in the general expression in (13) and the strongly context-dependent metonymy in (14).

(13) Paren beginnen gemiddeld later aan kinderen.
    couples begin average later on children
    ‘On average couples start a family later.’

(14) Hij haalde de dop weer van zijn pen en begon aan een rechthoek.
    he took the cap again off his pen and began on a rectangle
    ‘He again took the cap off his pen and began (on) a rectangle.’
Comparable examples with words denoting concrete entities that cannot occur as a direct object can be found in a prepositional object with the preposition *met*, as illustrated in (15). The *met*-object has a slightly different semantics than the *aan*-object, both of which I will come back to below.

(15) Zij is begonnen met een half pilletje en heeft er nu 2 of 3 nodig
she is begun with a half pill and has there now 2 or 3 needful
‘She started with half a pill and now needs 2 or 3’

In order to discover whether logical metonymy generally occurs more frequently with prepositional objects than with direct objects, it is useful to analyse how often a specific concrete object combined with *beginnen* occurs as a prepositional object or as a direct object. I therefore extracted all combinations of *boek* (‘book’) and *beginnen* (*met* / *aan*) without additional infinitives and calculated the number of direct objects and prepositional objects metonymies in this selection. The results are displayed in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>form</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>agentive interpr.</th>
<th>telic interpr.</th>
<th>other interpr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>aan</em>-object</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>met</em>-object</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct object</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23 (64%)</td>
<td>10 (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Combinations of *boek* and *beginnen* in the ANW-corpus

The noun *boek* was only used as an object-complement of *beginnen* in 36 examples, of which 4 times (11%) as a direct object and 32 times (89%) as a prepositional object.

---

252 It should be remarked that *book* is a so-called dotted object (cf. Pustejovsky 1995: 93), which means that its meaning is the complex product of the facets (cf. Cruse 2000: 115) or senses ‘text’ and ‘tome’. None of these facets are activities and therefore book as a text as well as book as a tome can be seen as metonymically combined with *beginnen*. However, the activity interpreted can be writing as well as publishing. This has probably to do with the different facets, since writing a book is making the text, whereas publishing the book can rather be described as making the tome. This would mean, however, that the facets correspond to different qualia structures (different agentive roles). As far as I know, Pustejovsky does nowhere explicitly state that this indeed is the case. I severely doubt whether this is theoretically desirable: Facets are interrelated and it is known that several facets can simultaneously be relevant with one occurrence of a word (as for example in *I gave him the book*). The fact that *book* has several agentive roles remains problematic for Pustejovsky’s theory.
This distribution of boek as a direct object or prepositional object supports the idea that the prepositional object is preferred for a metonymical construction.

By far the most examples of logical metonymy have an agentive meaning (23 in total), which can be writing or publishing. If a telic interpretation ('reading') is intended, the prepositional object is used very frequently, i.e. in 9 out of 10 examples (all nine examples with aan). Only three examples are given an interpretation that is not based on the telic or agentive role of the qualia structure. These examples are displayed in (16)-(18) with the context-dependent interpretations between curly brackets. Interestingly, even though aan seems to be the default preposition for the metonymical use of boek, the context-dependent examples all contain a met-object.

(16) Een volgend stapje is beginnen met eenvoudige boekjes
    a next step is begin with simple booklets
    ‘A next step is beginning with simple booklets’ {classifying them in a computer}

(17) Waarom zijn wij begonnen met de digitale boeken?
    why are we begun with the digital books?
    ‘Why have we begun with the digital books?’ {making them available for blind people}

(18) Als het nog moeilijk is, kunnen ouders beginnen met het Turkse boekje
    if it still difficult is can parents begin with the Turkish booklet
    ‘If it is still difficult, parents can begin with the Turkish booklet.’ {read while playing}

The following subsections will investigate the meaning of beginnen + prepositional objects. Subsection 3.3 will discuss the few studies of beginnen + met-object and analyse the semantics of the combination of the verb and such prepositional objects. Subsection 3.4 will do the same for beginnen + aan-object.

---

253 The other examples found for beginnen + boek without infinitives are sentences in which the noun boek is used as a subject of an unagentive beginnen or sentences in which the noun is not directly connected with the verb. Examples of the former are, for instance, “Het boek begint met de handel in bouwmaterialen” (‘The book opens with the trading business in building materials’) or “Gaandeweg begon het boek een eigen leven te leiden” (‘Gradually, the book started to lead its own life’). Examples of the latter are, for instance, “De cultuurfilosoof zet in zijn nieuwe essay de gedachtegang verder die hij begon in zijn boek” (‘In his new essay, the philosopher of culture continues the line of reasoning which he started in his book’), “Wanneer de rust was weergekeerd, begon hij gewoon uit een boek voor te lezen” (‘When silence had returned, he simply began to read from a book’), etc.
3.3 Dutch *beginnen met* and logical metonymy

De Schutter does not only state that there is hardly any semantic difference between *beginnen* with a direct object or a prepositional object (cf. De Schutter 1974: 178), but in addition he claims that the only semantic difference between *beginnen met* and *beginnen aan* is that the latter expresses the relation with the object in a more direct way (cf. De Schutter 1974: 156). Unfortunately, this claim appears to be based solely on intuitions.

In contrast to this, the few other studies on the semantics of *beginnen met* all conclude that *beginnen met* expresses that the started action is the first in a series of comparable actions (cf. Dik 1972: 171). This means that it is a sub-part of a larger coherent action (cf. Honselaar 1980: 148) or the start of a repeated action (cf. WNT (1882-1998): entry *beginnen* meaning 3.1° & 3.2°). More schematically, this can be explained as that *beginnen met*-action V either expresses that action V will be repeated in the future (V-V-...) or that V is part of a more general event W.255

Similar as with *beginnen* with a direct object, the started action V can be left implicit. In such cases, *beginnen met* occurs with a concrete object, on the basis of which an event V is metonymically implied and interpreted.

This meaning aspect of *beginnen met* is directly reflected in examples (15)-(18): In (15) different stages of using pills are described, the larger context of (16) clarifies that the classification of the simple books is a step in a general classification process of all kinds of books and materials, in (17) the first phase of making books suitable for blind people was the adaptation of digital books, and in (18) the inferred activity is the first reading-event that is intended to be repeated. In other words, these examples with *met* illustrate that the metonymical event V is either part of a larger event W or will be repeated in the future.

The examples also illustrate that the implicit events are not, as with *beginnen* with a direct object, primarily agentive. In (15), a telic interpretation is metonymically implied and in examples (16)-(18) the metonymical event is context-dependent and cannot be inferred on either the agentive or the telic role of the concrete object.

The fact that *beginnen met* brings into mind the idea of a repetition of the started event or evokes a larger general action with the started event as a first stage, as in (15)-(18), is reflected by some syntactic properties: The combination *beginnen met* is one of the few constructions which sometimes allows a simultaneous realisation of a prepositional object and a direct object (cf. Broekhuis 2004: 99, 110ff).256 The

---

254 Honselaar in addition assumes that *beginnen met* "event X" can express that someone starts with the first phase or part of event X, which itself is by definition also activity X (Honselaar 1980: 148). In this case, *beginnen met* is synonymous with *beginnen* with a direct object or *beginnen aan* without the projection of an event.

255 Although English *to begin with* has never been mentioned or taken into account in research on logical metonymy, the same semantic aspect seems to apply (cf. e.g., the third meaning in the Cobuild (2003) online dictionary).

256 As discussed by Broekhuis some linguistic conditions (2004: 102-107) and some syntactic tests (2004: 107-109) demonstrate that we are in all probability dealing with a prepositional
metonymical ANW-example (19) and the non-metonymical examples (20) and (21) illustrate *beginnen* with a direct object and a *met*-object and (22) and (23) display similar examples with events as the subjects of passive constructions.

(19) Branson begon zijn zakenrijk met Virgin Records
     Branson began his business empire with Virgin Records
     ‘Branson began his business empire with Virgin Records’

(20) We beginnen de lessen met het typische voetenwerk.
     we begin the lessons with the typical foot-work
     ‘We begin the lessons with the typical foot work’ [context: dancing lessons]

(21) We beginnen onze stadsexploratie met een bezoek aan…
     we begin our city exploration with a visit to…
     ‘We are starting our exploration of the city with a visit to…’

(22) De eerste concerten van de tour worden […] begonnen met een minuut stilte
     the first concerts of the tour are begun with a minute silence
     ‘The first concerts of the tour are started with a minute of silence.’

(23) Meestal wordt een reading begonnen met een algemene legging
     mostly is a ‘reading’ begun with a general laying
     ‘A reading is mostly started with a general fortune telling’ [context: tarot]

The combination of a direct object and prepositional object with *beginnen* corresponds to the interpretation of a sub-action V belonging to a more general action W: The prepositional object specifies the first sub-action (V) of the more general event or action (W), which is expressed as a direct object or passive subject.

The fact that the *met*-complement could be interpreted as a part of another action is also reflected in related constructions without an agentive subject. Examples such as *De voorstelling begon met een dans* (‘The performance started with a dance’) or *Mijn werkdag begint met (het drinken van) een kop koffie* (‘My work day starts with (drinking) a cup of coffee’) illustrate this. In such examples, the interpretation of the subject corresponds to action W and the prepositional object is interpreted as sub-action V. 257

In constructions with an agent, the semantic link of the *met*-complement (V) to another action (i.e. a repetition of V or W, which can be expressed as an underlying direct object in (19)-(23)) explains why more concrete complements and more object rather than with just some adjunct, even if another direct object has been realised simultaneously (Broekhuis 2004: 110-113).

257 If the subject denotes a thing such as a text or CD, such constructions can even occur with two concrete entities, as exemplified in *Het boek begon met een voorwoord* (‘The book started with a preface’), *De brief begon met lieve mamma* (‘The letter started with *dear mum’*) or *De cd begon met een aria* (‘The CD started with an aria’). These examples just express that the first part of an object was another object. In these cases, no events are required for a correct interpretation of the sentence.
context-dependent eventive interpretations are used as met-objects. The inference to the implied action V is easier, because the started (implicit) met-event is related to another action, which is in all probability known in context. In this way, the prepositional object makes it easier to interpret the combination with a concrete noun as compared to the interpretation of a direct object denoting a concrete entity. As a side-effect of the semantics of the met-object, we understand that the event (V) that is needed for a full interpretation must be some action related to other actions (the repetition of V or more general action W).

3.4 Dutch beginnen aan and logical metonymy

In contrast to beginnen met, the precise semantics of beginnen aan is often considered to be complicated (cf. Dik 1972: 172; Honselaar 1980: 152). Dik confines himself to the assertion that in the case of beginnen aan the scale, duration, and implications of the event may be calculable (Dik 1972: 172). However, even Dik himself considers this description tentative, and he does not offer any solid argumentation for this claim, as also indicated by Honselaar (1980: 152).

Honselaar’s account of beginnen aan (1980: 152-154) describes a specific property, which is in line with the findings discussed above (cf. examples (11)-(14)): Honselaar claims that whereas beginnen + direct object needs to be combined with an event-denoting direct object and can only occasionally be used with certain thing-denoting words that are closely associated with a specific event (Honselaar 1980: 145), beginnen aan can be used with all kinds of nouns and pronouns (Honselaar 1980: 153).

Verspoor makes comparable observations for English begin on on the basis of corpus data.258 Since she finds more complicated, context-dependent metonymies with begin + on-object as compared to those with begin + direct object, she deduces that on could serve as a kind of marker for the fact that in the interpretation some event needs to be added (Verspoor 1997a: 191-192).

Initially, the analysis of Dutch aan as a marker for logical metonymy seems to be correct, given that the idea has been independently established for English on. There is one major problem, however: Although aan may seem to be an indication of logical metonymy, it would be impossible for this to be its function, since beginnen aan + events also occurs. Therefore, it is more reasonable to think that there is some independent aspect of beginnen aan that makes logical metonymy easier to understand.

258 Although examples of to begin on X (with the on-phrase as a verbal argument) can be found on the internet, in the BNC (cf. also Verspoor 1997a: 191), and in dictionaries (cf. the bilingual Van Dale 2006 (English-Dutch) or the Cambridge online dictionary), I am aware of the fact that not all native speakers of English consider begin + on-object as correct English.
According to Honselaar, *beginnen aan* strongly brings into mind the idea of an event. He describes this in terms of a ‘projection’ of an ‘event’. He provides the following description of the semantics of *beginnen aan*:

> “Het AAN-complement wordt als volgt begrepen *X begint aan Y* betekent: ‘er is bij DE entiteit een projectie van HET voltooide gebeuren B, waarin Y de zaak is die voltooid wordt, of een betrokkenene in een gebeuren dat voltooid wordt; X is vanaf het BP [JS: = beginpunt] in de eerste fase van het voltooide gebeuren B’.” (Honselaar 1980: 153)

> [‘The ON-complement should be understood as follows *X begins on Y* means: ‘THE entity [JS: i.e. “the one intended by the speaker”] projects THE completed event B [JS: i.e. “the one intended by the speaker”], in which Y is the object which is completed, or in which Y is a related entity in an event that is completed; X is from the SP [JS: = starting point] in the first phase of completing the event B’.”] (Honselaar 1980: 153, my translation)

It remains somewhat vague whether this meaning description can be applied to examples in which the interpreted event B is expressed by Y (the noun of the *aan*-object). Given that the Dutch word *zaak* (‘object’ / ‘entity’ / ‘thing’ / ‘matter’) does not have to refer to a concrete object, but can just refer to some phenomenon in general, Honselaar’s description can be interpreted as that Y could be ‘an event or a concrete entity related to an event’.

The ANW-examples (24)-(27) illustrate that a started event can indeed be realised in the prepositional object (cf. Honselaar’s examples on 1980: 153, cf. however also page 152).

(24) Hij [...] staat te trappen om aan het grote avontuur te beginnen.

> he stands to trample for on the big adventure to begin

‘He cannot wait to begin (on) the big adventure.’

(25) Ik begon aan de bereiding van het sap

> I began on the making of the juice

‘I began (on) making the juice.’

---

259 This analysis is in line with the intuition that *beginnen aan* can be used to express that something has to be done anyway or that it is a planned task (Moerdijk p.c.; De Schutter 1974: 156).

260 The definite articles in capitals are used by Honselaar to express that the interpreted entity is the most expected and suitable one in the context (cf. 1980: 24).
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(26) Na de zomervakantie zijn we echt begonnen aan het opbouwen van een repertoire.
After the summer-holiday are we really begun on the up-building of a repertoire.

‘After the summer holiday, we really began (on) building up a repertoire.’

(27) Hij begon in juli aan het uitzitten van een driejarige gevangenisstraf.
he began in juli on the out-sitting of a three-year-ish imprisonment

‘In July, he began (on) serving a prison term of three years’

These non-metonymical examples show that the noun of the prepositional object does not have to refer to a concrete entity and that it is very well possible to express the started event if some aan-complement is used. This fact is in line with Honselaar’s semantic analysis of X begint aan Y, which should be interpreted that a subject X thinks of some event B, which could be expressed by Y or which could be related to the concrete entity Y.

In addition, it can be observed that Honselaar’s explanation of the semantics of beginnen aan contains the verb voltooien (‘to complete’) three times. This should not be interpreted that Honselaar believes that the event must be finished: The phrase ‘a completed event’ (‘een voltooid gebeuren’) is simply used to express the idea that beginnen aan brings an event as a completed whole into mind (Honselaar p.c.). In other words, Honselaar suggests that the aan-complement evokes the idea of an event which the subject started (Honselaar 1980: 153), in a stronger way than beginnen + direct object does. The specific meaning aspect of beginnen aan is this projection or evocation of an event as such.

This underlying semantics is reflected in the syntactic requirements of beginnen aan: In contrast to beginnen + direct object and beginnen met-object, beginnen aan can only be combined with verbal nominalisations (cf. sentences (25)-(27)) and not with infinitives (cf. Dik 1972: 166; Honselaar 1980: 148, 152). Sentences (28)-(30) illustrate this.261

(28) Marie begon het boek (te lezen)
Mary began the book (to read-INF)

‘Mary began (to read) the book’

261 In line with the previous section and Honselaar’s analysis, three interpretations are possible for (29): Mary could just start to read the book (cf. footnote 254), she could begin reading a book, which she will do more often in the future or she could begin some implicit general event (e.g. studying, doing her homework, relaxing, etc.), of which reading a book is the first activity.
These syntactic requirements reflect the underlying semantics: From a conceptual point of view, the difference between a verbal nominalisation and an infinitive is that the former conceptualises the event as a kind of thing (cf. Langacker 2002: 17, 60). The syntactic requirements of beginnen aan therefore imply that it is not that some event in general is required, as is the case for beginnen + direct object, but rather that some abstract event as a kind of thing-like entity is evoked. This meaning aspect is in line with Honselaar’s analysis that in the case of beginnen aan we think of ‘the event as a projected entity’ (Honselaar p.c.), which is not the case for beginnen met or beginnen + direct object. This semantic difference is reflected in the syntactic form of the different types of objects.

As an additional consequence, the syntactic requirements of beginnen aan directly indicate the metonymy to a hearer, if the verb is combined with a word that refers to a concrete entity. Whereas hij begint (met) een boek (‘he begins (with) a book’) could, because of Dutch OV-word order, still be followed by a verb (cf. sentences (28) and (29)), this is impossible for the sentence hij begint aan een boek, as illustrated in (30). Even if aan does not have the primary function of marking metonymy, from the perspective of the addressee it automatically does so in combination with a word denoting a concrete object, because of its syntactic requirements. It is exactly this semantic-syntactic aspect which makes the use of infinitives impossible and which explains why logical metonymy occurs often with beginnen aan.

Both beginnen met and beginnen aan thus have inherent properties that have nothing to do with logical metonymy as such, which explain why prepositional objects are more often used in logically metonymical constructions. First of all, both prepositional objects are in general more suitable for nouns. Beginnen aan can only

262 In the ANW-corpus, many examples of beginnen met X te V-en can be found, such as “Die man zou eens moeten beginnen met Thorbecke te lezen!” (‘That man should once begin with reading Thorbecke!’ lit: begin with Thorbecke to read); “Ze begon met het verhaal van Harry Dolph te vertalen,” (‘She began with translating the story of Harry Dolph,’ lit: “began with the story of Harry Dolph to translate”) or with music “André Rieu […], die begon met het thema uit The Godfather te spelen.” (‘André Rieu […], who began with playing the theme from The Godfather’, lit: “began with the theme from the Godfather to play”). These examples come from Dutch and Belgian texts.
be combined with nouns and, as explained above, the combination *beginnen met* is also used in constructions with two nouns to express that an event (the subject) starts with another event (another noun).

Secondly, the metonymical inference will be understood more easily in both prepositional objects. In the case of *beginnen aan* the idea of an activity is already brought into mind and the syntactic form directly indicates that the combination with a noun referring to a concrete entity has to be interpreted metonymically. In the case of *beginnen met* with an agentive subject the specific meaning aspect of the prepositional object helps us to understand the intended activity: The event that is needed for a full interpretation must be some action related to other actions in the context.

### 3.5 LM in POs with German *beginnen* and *anfangen*

In German, prepositional objects with *beginnen* and *anfangen* can only be formed with *mit* (‘with’). Similar as in Dutch, the German corpus sample of *anfangen mit* and *beginnen mit* reveals different types of concrete nouns with more telic and more complicated, context-dependent metonymically implied activities as compared to the sample of *anfangen* and *beginnen* with direct objects. Comparable observations have been made by Rüd and Zarcone for nouns denoting artefacts in the German deWac-corpus (2011: 20). In addition to this, I found that the verbs *beginnen* and *anfangen* differ in that the corpus samples of *beginnen* contained in general fewer metonymies as compared to *anfangen* (cf. also Rüd and Zarcone 2011: 19 table 1).

The examples in (31)-(34) illustrate logical metonymies with *anfangen mit*.

### Examples

(31) und jetzt fängst du wieder mit Whisky an!
   and now begin you again with Whiskey [on-PARTICLE]
   ‘and now you are beginning with whiskey again!’ {drinking}

   one began with Aristotle [on-PARTICLE]
   ‘We started with Aristotle’ {reading/studying}

(33) Ich fing mit schwarzen Zigaretten an
   I began with black cigarettes [on-PARTICLE]
   ‘I began with illegal cigarettes’ {selling}

(34) Auch sie fängt vielleicht mit einem Buch an
   also she begins maybe with a book [on-PARTICLE]
   ‘She also maybe begins with a book’ {giving as a present}

Hardly anything seems to be known about meaning differences between the use of direct objects or prepositional objects in the case of *beginnen* or *anfangen*. German dictionaries also do not provide much information about this (cf. section 6). As
discussed above, more is known about the semantics of Dutch beginnen met. Since Dutch and German are very similar and the Dutch semantics of beginnen met even seems to apply to begin with (cf. note 255 below), it seems reasonable to assume that the same meaning aspect plays a role for German anfangen mit and beginnen mit. In consequence, beginnen mit and anfangen mit express that a started event V either will be a repeated event (V-V) or is a subaction of a more general event (W).

Examples (31)-(34) reflect this analysis with metonymically inferred V-events. In (32), the reading of Aristotle will be the first part of study. The metonymically implied drinking of the whiskey in (31) is a repeated event, just as the non-default metonymical interpretation of (34). In (33), after the selling of illegal cigarettes other illegal activities followed. These interpretations show that in all examples, the metonymically implied event is either part of a larger action or will be repeated in the future.

From this it again follows why more words denoting concrete entities and more context-dependent interpretations are found in prepositional objects as compared to direct objects in German: The fact that mit indicates that some activity (V) is repeated (V-V) or is part of a larger, coherent action (W) makes V more easily to infer within the context.

### 3.6 LM with beginnen\textsuperscript{D} and with beginnen\textsuperscript{G} and anfangen\textsuperscript{G}

On the basis of the data discussed in subsections 3.1-3.5 we can draw several conclusions. The actual use of metonymically interpreted direct objects in combination with Dutch and German equivalents of begin is very limited, in a very similar but much more radical way than in English. In Dutch and German, the metonymical use of combined direct objects with all kinds of begin-verbs is almost entirely restricted to direct objects that refer to texts, pieces of music, and companies. The metonymical use of concrete objects is not only restricted to these categories for telic interpretations (as in English, see Verspoor 1997a: 186-188), but even for agentive interpretations. In general, telic interpretations of direct objects referring to concrete entities occur very rarely. These language-dependent differences in the actual use of logical metonymies are unexpected under Pustejovsky’s theory.

\textsuperscript{263} German is different from Dutch in the use of a direct object and a mit-object with anfangen or beginnen. Dictionaries do not discuss this possibility and no example has been found in the DWDS-corpus. However, an anonymous reviewer for the International Journal of Lexicography provided a very natural example taken from the internet, i.e. “Beginnen Sie den Tag mit einem Frühstück?” (‘Do you start the day with a breakfast?’) (http://www.cafe-erdmann.de/karte.pdf [July 2011]). Also, the use of a mit-object without an agent, such as Die Vorstellung begann mit einem Tanz (‘The performance started with a dance’) or, as discussed in footnote 257, Das Buch fängt mit einem Vorwort an (‘The book started with a preface’), is very common. As discussed above, the latter combinations reflect the idea that the prepositional object expresses that its object belongs to some other object and they make the prepositional object suitable for concrete nouns.
Although we have seen that the meaning of prepositional objects is rather complicated, the idea that logical metonymies are more often used in the form of a prepositional object rather than in the form of a direct object is supported by corpus data. The range of categories of concrete nouns is broader in prepositional objects than in direct objects. Moreover, telic interpretations and specific, context-dependent interpretations can be found more frequently in prepositional objects (for German, cf. Rüd and Zarcone 2011: 20 table 2). As indicated, this broader range could be the result of independent properties of the prepositional object as such.

Dutch *beginnen aan* is more suitable for metonymies for semantic-syntactic reasons. First of all, whereas the phrase *beginnen* + direct object / *met*-object could lead to the expectation of an additional verb phrase, the preposition *aan* directly indicates that the noun denoting a concrete thing is all there is. In this way, *aan* in combination with a concrete noun is a direct signal that an inference to some event has to be made. In addition to this, these syntactic requirements point towards a slightly different semantics: Even if *beginnen aan* is combined with a word referring to an event, this event is presented as a kind of thing or abstract entity (cf. Honselaar 1980: 153; Langacker 2002: 17, 60). This makes the step to the use of a noun referring to a concrete thing much smaller.

A similar kind of reasoning applies to the Dutch preposition *met* and probably also to German *mit*. This preposition relates the prepositional object to another kind of action. The use of the prepositional object with an agentive subject therefore evokes the idea of a repetition or of a larger coherent action, which will in all probability be clear in the context. This makes the intended activity more transparent and in this way it makes the metonymical construction with this prepositional object easier to interpret correctly.

4. Logical metonymy with translations of ‘to finish’ / ‘to complete’

4.1 Cross-linguistic differences in expressing ‘to finish something’

A generally known difference between Dutch and German on the one hand and English on the other is the use of drinks as complements with *finish* (cf. Horacek 1996: 122): Whereas Dutch *een boek beëindigen* or German *einen buch beenden* (i.e. ‘to finish a book’ is acceptable with a strong preference for an agentive interpretation (cf. Horacek 1996: 123), Dutch *een biertje beëindigen* or German *ein Bier beenden* (i.e. ‘to finish a beer’) is not.

(35) Mary finished the book.
(36) Marie beëindigde het boek.
(37) Maria hat das Buch beendet. (see Horacek 1996: 122)
(38) Mary finished the beer.
Sometimes this is explained by the fact that German has alternative ways to express such messages, namely with particle constructions, that are preferred over the above ones (cf. Horacek 1996: 110). The same constructions exist in Dutch. Translations of (38) into Dutch and German illustrate this, as shown in examples (41) and (42).

(41) Marie dronk haar biertje op.
    Mary drank her beer up

(42) Maria hat das Bier ausgetrunken.
    Mary had the beer drunk-out

The problem is, however, that in English for finishing a beer also such an alternative exists, as illustrated in (43). The same even holds for the Dutch and German logical metonymies of (36) and (37), as is shown in (44)-(45).

(43) Mary drank up her beer.

(44) Marie schreef het boek af.
    Mary wrote the book off/ready

(45) Maria hat das Buch zu Ende / fertig geschrieben.
    Mary had the book to end / ready written

The existence of particle verbs that are preferred can thus not be the only reason that constructions as in (39) and (40) are blocked. In general, a metonymical construction with aspectual verbs, such as begin or finish and their equivalents, seems to be more acceptable with texts than with drinks in Dutch and German, just as in the case of equivalents of to begin.

If we analyse the other verbs of the rich spectrum of translations for finish, another interesting finding shows up. For some verbs it is very difficult to decide, whether they actually need an event. Therefore, it is hard to conclude whether they can appear in logically metonymical constructions at all. Sometimes it is for instance impossible to explicitly combine an event, although there does exist an associated event with the expression as a whole. Clear examples are verbs like afmaken and fertig stellen.264 They literally mean ‘to make ready’ and because of the incorporated ‘make’ it is questionable whether they need an additional event at all. If one searches in corpora for direct objects combined with these verbs, it turns out that

264 Before the German spelling change of the end of 2006, this was written as one word, i.e. fertigstellen.
almost all hits are combinations with concrete objects, such as texts and buildings. In such examples, as illustrated in (46) and (47), it seems to be impossible to make the associated writing-activity explicit. The a)-sentences come from the DWDS-corpus and the ANW-corpus.

(46) a. Er stellte den Bericht fertig
   he made the report ready
   ‘He finished the report.’ [writing]

   b. */? Er stellte das Schreiben des Berichtes fertig.
      he made the writing the-GEN report-GEN ready

(47) a. Hij moet een boek afmaken
     he must a book finish [lit.: “off/ready-make”]
     ‘He has to finish a book’ [writing]

   b. */? Hij moet het schrijven van een boek afmaken
      he must the writing of a book finish [lit.: “off/ready-make”]

It is, however, not in general impossible to combine events with *afmaken* or *fertigstellen*. A random search of 500 examples in the ANW-corpus contains eventive combinations such as *werk afmaken* (‘finish work / a job’), *een studie afmaken* (‘finish as study’), *een karweitje afmaken* (‘finish a chore’) and so on. *Fertig stellen* behaves in a similar way. It is combined with events such as *den Bau* (‘building’), *den Entwurf* (‘the design / designing’) or *die Übersetzung* (‘the translation / translating’). However, these objects are no prototypical events, since they often also denote concrete things. As a consequence, verbs such as *afmaken* and *fertigstellen* in combination with concrete direct objects do not have to be considered metonymical. The meaning of the ‘making’-activity is literally part of the verb meaning. This idea is also reflected in dictionary information, where the meaning of the verb is specified as finishing the creation of something.265

However, this brings in the problem, that it is very difficult to decide whether a verb actually needs some event from a semantic point of view. This question seems to be a trivial one, but the rich spectrum of translations for *finish* shows how complicated this is. It is not so clear what the right criteria are to judge whether a verb needs an event or a concrete object and intuitions on this are not always clear. The fact that the verb can appear with events is not a very good criterium, since this

265 The online German dictionary *Das digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* defines *fertigstellen* as „die Herstellung von etw. beenden“ (‘to finish the production of something’) and Dutch dictionary WNT describes *afmaken* as “Van een werk dat men te verrichten, of van een voorwerp dat men te vervaardigen heeft. Het geheel ten einde of in gereedheid brengen, voltooien; maken dat het af, d.i. gereed of voltooid is.” (‘About some job that on has to do, or about some object that one has to produce. Get the whole through an end or in readiness, finish; make that it is ‘af’, i.e. completed or finished’). Both verbs thus explicitly incorporate the activity and do not need an event per se.
is sometimes also true for *afmaken* and *fertig stellen* and because the distinction between events and non-events can be vague.

The verbs *voltooien* and *vollenden*, for instance, are in dictionaries described as the completion of an object or event. Only some explicit events can be found in corpora. An analysis of 500 corpus examples of *voltooien* leads to examples such as *een toren / zwembad voltooien* (‘finish a tower/a swimming pool’) as well as *de bouw voltooien* (‘finish a building-event’), but examples like *het schrijven voltooien* or *het schrijfproces voltooien* (‘finish a writing-event’) as a contrast for *een boek voltooien* (‘finish a book’) cannot be extracted. Direct objects of *vollenden* (362 hits) can also be as well texts (e.g. *das Lehrbuch*) or concrete buildings (*Damm, Dom*) as building activities (*den Bau*). Again no writing activities can be found in the DWDS-corpus.

Contrary to *fertig stellen*, however, there can be found one very clear instance of *vollenden* in the DWDS-corpus with an eventive combination, as shown in (48).

(48) Aber der Sintlinger [...] vollendete das Auskleiden
   but the Sintlinger finished the undressing-INF.N
   ‘But Sintlinger finished getting undressed.’

Such combinations, with infinitival nouns, are impossible for *fertig stellen*. Unfortunately, ((48)) is the only, somewhat obscure, old example that uses such a reversed infinitive. For Dutch *voltooien* no example at all can be found. Other events combined with *vollenden*, such as *den Bau* (‘building’), *die Vernichtung* (‘destroying’), *die Suche* (‘the search’), *das Werk* (‘the work’) are, as explained above, not very prototypical events; they often also have a concrete meaning and most of them can also be combined with *fertig stellen*. Dutch *voltooien* behaves in a very similar way.

Many other *finish*-verbs have an even more specific semantics. The German verb *erledigen*, for instance, is always combined with objects that refer to exercises and assignments. This is reflected in the dictionary (cf. www.dwds.de) and can also be confirmed by the analysis of the 286 corpus-examples. The Dutch verb *vervolledigen* (209 corpus-examples) is hardly ever combined with events and the concrete objects do not really require an additional, metonymically inferred, eventive interpretation, since the verb can in all examples be interpreted as ‘to make complete’. This is also reflected in Dutch dictionaries (cf. Van Dale 2005). The German verb *vervollständigen* (174 DWDS-hits) is, as compared to the Dutch verb

---

266 A reason for the lack of writing-events combined with these verbs could be the fact that it is so normal to use the metonymical expression that it is therefore not necessary to use the non-metonymical expression, i.e. the writing-event. This hypothesis was supported for English in a very small corpus study on *start* (Briscoe et al. 1990: 45). The problem is, however, that although such combinations in English may be marginal, they are intuitively possible and can sometimes also be found in corpora. For verbs such as *afmaken, voltooien, fertig stellen* and *vollenden* on the other hand, the combinations with a lot of events can not at all be found in corpora and seem intuitively impossible.
vervolledigen, more often combined with nouns that can denote concrete objects as well as events (e.g. *die Einrichtung, die Beleuchtung, die Ausstattung, die Ausbildung*). However, the combination with clearly concrete nouns also seems to have the meaning ‘to make the object complete’ (cf. www.dwds.de). Interestingly, the English word *complete* can also be used with concrete objects in exactly this sense. A very clear example for this is *to complete the collection*.

On the basis of these observations, we can conclude that the Dutch verbs *afmaken, voltooien* and *vervolledigen* and the German verbs *fertig stellen, vollenden, vervollständigen* and *erledigen* should not be considered verbs that need an event but can appear with concrete objects. Although there is a clearly associated event with examples such as *het boek afmaken or voltooien / das Buch fertig stellen or vollenden* (‘to complete/finish the book’), this event cannot be explicitly added.

Contrary to verbs as German *beenden* and *beendigen* and Dutch *beëindigen* and *eindigen met*, some agentive interpretation (‘making’) turns out to be a part of the verb meaning of such verbs. In case of *fertig stellen, afmaken* and even *voltooien* we can morphologically recognise the ‘make’-meaning. An analysis of corpus-examples with these verbs supports this hypothesis. For *vollenden* the make-meaning is less clear, which is reflected in corpus data, since this verb appears with most eventive combinations.

This discussion illustrates, however, how difficult it is to decide what should be considered instances of logical metonymy. The notion seems to be rather gradual than absolute. The discussion of the examples and of the semantics of each of these verbs, even shows that this is not specific for Dutch or German. The English verb *complete* is, as explained, problematic in a similar way.

The rest of this section will take into account some literal translations of *to finish something* which can be analysed as involving logical metonymy. These verbs are Dutch *beëindigen, eindigen (met)*, and German *beend(ig)en*.

4.2 LM with German *beenden* and Dutch *beëindigen*

The German verbs *beenden* and the more formal variant *beendigen* are combined in logically metonymical constructions with the categories texts, pieces of music, concrete games, and food. For the first two categories only agentive interpretations can be found; and the latter two are always interpreted in a telic way (i.e. playing the game and eating the food).

An analysis of Dutch *beëindigen* basically results in three categories: texts that are written, companies that are shut down, and cancelled agreements such as contracts, subscriptions, mortgages, or subventions. The difference between Dutch

---

267 Transitive use of German *enden, is* obsolete (cf. www.dwds.de). The sample of *enden mit* only yields different constructions with inanimate subjects. The verbs *afhören (mit)* and Dutch *ophouden (met)* are not taken into account, because they can hardly be combined with concrete objects (cf. footnote 246).
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and German could be caused by the fact that the Dutch verb beëindigen is more formal and has a lower frequency of use as compared to German beenden. In respect to combinations of these verbs with nouns referring to food, Dutch and German seem to differ. Even though it appears to be hardly possible to use drinks metonymically in both languages, the combination with (liquid) food, such as soup, is certainly possible in German (cf. DWDS-example (49)), but problematic in Dutch.

(49) Er beendete die Leberknödelsuppe.
    he finished the Leberknödel-soup
    ‘He finished the soup with leberknödel’ {eating}

(50) /* Jan beëindigde zijn soep (met leberknödel).
    Jan finished his soup (with leberknödel)
    ‘Jan finished his soup (with leberknödel)’

Only one Dutch example with non-liquid food was found in the ANW-corpus, that is (51). Examples of ‘finishing food’ in German can easily be found in the DWDS-corpus, as illustrated in (52) and (53).

(51) ..., zodat ik in alle rust het vleesgerecht kon beëindigen.
    ‘so I could finish the meat dish in peace and quiet’ {eating}

(52) Er beendete den Imbiß schnell.
    he finished the snack quickly
    ‘He finished the snack quickly.’ {eating}

(53) wortlos konnte er dann auch sein Frühstück beenden
    without words he could then also his breakfast finish
    ‘he could therefore finish his breakfast without a word’ {eating}

268 No examples of German beenden combined with a drink were found in the DWDS-corpus, but the internet provides some, such as examples with Bier (beer), Wein (wine) or Getränk (drink) as direct objects. In Dutch the combination seems to be less acceptable. The only example on the internet is een fles beëindigen ‘to finish a bottle’ with the general meaning ‘making it empty’ (cf. http://www.thehotzoneonline.com/2006/08/07/review-zaaschila-habanero-pepper-sauce/nl/; www.5keystohealth.com/nl/t33172.html?usg=ALkJrh8sURpU_jqildDwicXkNiIuAhAQ [March 2009])
4.3 The use of LM in Dutch with eindigen and eindigen met

Apart from direct objects referring to events, the Dutch verb eindigen is combined with pieces of music and stories or texts, all with an agentive interpretation. The combination eindigen met also occurs. The use of a prepositional object seems to facilitate the combination of much more words denoting concrete objects (cf. (54) and (55)), but such examples seem to have the additional meaning that the metonymically inferred activity with the object is similar to other activities, such as the last activity within a series of activities.

ANW-examples (54)-(56) illustrate this. Example (54) expresses what drink to start and to end with, and (55) is uttered in the context of the final action of finishing a garden. Events can also be used in the met-object, as in the non-metonymical (56), in which the explicit events are the final one of a coherent series of actions (i.e. producing beer).

(54) dan kan je bijvoorbeeld wel met bier beginnen en met wijn eindigen
then you could for example just with beer begin and with wine finish

(55) We eindigen natuurlijk met klimop (hedera) of maagdenpalm (vinca)
we end of course with ivy (hedera) or periwinkle (vinca)

(56) we eindigen met het afwerken en bottelen van het bier
we end with the finishing and bottling of the beer

These examples illustrate that the met-object with eindigen has similar semantics as in the case of beginnen met: The finished activity is considered to belong to actions of the same kind, that is the final one in a succession of related events (V-V or W with V as a sub-action). Because the thought of a certain event has again already been triggered, a broader range of metonymically interpreted concrete objects can be used within the prepositional object.

4.4 The use of LM with beëindigen/eindigen and with beend(ig)en/enden

In contrast to Verspoor’s finding that more logically metonymical constructions can be found for finish than for begin (Verspoor 1997a: 187), I illustrated in this section that Dutch and German equivalents again show a very limited use of logical metonymy. In fact, the frequently used categories are very similar to the ones found with begin-equivalents.

Apparently, some metonymical relations between activities and objects are simply stronger than others and with gradual differences across languages. The classes of
nouns that can be used felicitously in logically metonymical constructions appear to be hierarchically ordered. Texts or stories and pieces of music are easy to use without specifying the intended event. Companies are also good candidates for logically metonymical constructions. Food is more problematic though; for finish the food-category turns out to be not very acceptable in Dutch and in case of begin-equivalents a prepositional object needs to be used in Dutch and German. Drinks only occur in English corpus data with finish and not with begin (Verspoor 1997a: 186) and cannot be used with Dutch or German aspectual verbs (cf. also Horacek 1996: 122).

In addition to this, the kind of interpretation turns out to be dependent on the type of noun. Although the agentive activity seems to be the default interpretation for most nouns, for some objects, such as for types of food or games, the telic activity seems to be more relevant. This indicates that, in all probability, the relation between food and eating or between games and playing is stronger than the relation between food and cooking or games and making or developing them, whereas this does not apply to the relation between a book and writing or reading.

5. *Genieten van*\(^D\) and *genießen*\(^G\) combined with concrete things

Dutch and German clearly differ in the structure of translations for *enjoy*: German *genießen* is combined with direct objects, whereas Dutch *genieten* in the meaning of ‘to enjoy’ gets an obligatory prepositional object. The combination *genießen von* does occur in German, but is specifically used under the interpretation of eating something (cf. Duden 2006 meaning 1). The combination Dutch *genieten* + direct object is also possible, but this has the meaning of ‘to eat’/‘to consume’ or of ‘to have the advantage of’ (especially in Dutch used in the Netherlands).\(^{269}\) Examples (57)-(59) illustrate sentences of *enjoy (reading) a book* in all three languages.

(57) Mary enjoyed (reading) the book.
(58) Marie genoot van (het lezen van) het boek.
(59) Maria hat das (Lesen des) Buch(es) genossen.

\(^{269}\) Thus an interesting difference exists in Dutch of the Netherlands between *een pensioen genieten* and *van een pensioen genieten* (‘enjoy a pension [DO/PO]’). The first example with a DO expresses that someone receives a pension, whereas the latter expresses that someone enjoys things that could be done with his/her pension or enjoys the situation that one does not have to work but is getting a pension (thanks to Wim Honselaar and Fons Moerdijk for the clear example). Similarly *een maaltijd genieten* simply means ‘to eat a meal’, whereas *van een maaltijd genieten* should be translated as ‘to enjoy a meal’. For Dutch used in Belgium the first example is probably slightly different, given that *genieten van* can also be used in the meaning of ‘to have the advantage of’ as a loan translation of French *jouir de* (cf. Van Dale *genieten* meaning 5).
Apart from those in syntactic form, differences are apparent from a pragmatic point of view as well. Some metonymically interpreted objects are felicitous in English and Dutch, but not (or at least not equally well) in German. Consider (60)-(62):

(60) John enjoyed his grandchildren.
(61) Jan genoot van zijn kleinkinderen.
(62) ?Jan genoß seine Enkelkinder.

Sentence (62) is only possible within a clearly defined context. The reason for this could lie in the interaction between verb semantics and syntactic form: The verb genießen also has the meaning ‘to consume/eat or drink’ (and ‘to have the advantage of’). For some speakers of German, this polysemy gives rise to conflicting interpretations for (62): The non-metonymical interpretation of the sentence is that Jan, who must be some man-eater, has eaten up his own grandchildren. If the context is strong enough to make clear that the ‘enjoy’-meaning and therefore a metonymical interpretation is intended, the sentence can be used as an equivalent of (60). An example for this is (63), which was uttered on an internet forum about having children.270

(63) Und wenn du denkst, dass du dein 2. Kind mehr genießen kannst, ‘And if you think that you can enjoy your 2nd child more,‘

English enjoy has no direct consuming-interpretation. In Dutch the syntactic form disambiguates between the verb meanings: Only genieten with a prepositional object means ‘to enjoy’. Since the German verb genießen with a prepositional object but also with a direct object can be interpreted as ‘consuming’, syntactic form cannot be used for disambiguation.

An analysis of the corpus samples of genießen and genieten van again yields the interesting result that only certain categories of nouns seem to be used metonymically, but more freely as compared to the aspectual verbs (the equivalents of begin and finish).271 Categories that are often used in Dutch as well as in German are: views (e.g., van het uitzicht genieten; den Ausblick/das Landschaftsbild genießen); food (e.g., van uw eetje; den Kaviar mit Wodka); drinks (e.g., van de cocktail; den Rotwein); impressions/feelings, such as ‘taste’, ‘smell’ ‘beauty’,

270 In the DWDS-corpus no examples of this kind can be found. However, the bilingual Van Dale (Dutch-German) gives the sentence sie genossen ihr Kind, and the internet-based deWac-corpus (http://trac.sketchengine.co.uk/wiki/Corpora/DeWaC) provides some examples, such as (63) (original source: http://www.rund-ums-baby.de/).

271 Unfortunately, these results cannot be compared with English, since Verspoor did not extract relevant corpus-examples for enjoy.
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Dutch uses a number of categories that were not found in the German DWDS-sample, i.e. money; animals; and persons (including performing groups). Probably, persons and animals are not found in the German examples because of the ambiguity explained above. The category of art did occur often in the German sample (das Kunstwerk genießen; die vollendete Kunst genießen) but only once in the Dutch ANW-sample. Furthermore German seems to use the category of impressions/feelings more often than Dutch.

Interestingly, not only more categories have been used as compared to equivalents of begin and finish, but the telic role is also suddenly of crucial importance. The same observation has been made by Rüd and Zarcone for genießen in combination with artefacts in the deWac-corpus (2011: 21). The importance of the telic role of course makes sense in light of the meaning of enjoy, but it is not accounted for in most analyses of logical metonymy. In all examples, the implicit event just seems to be some kind of implicit experience with the concrete object.

Many of these examples cannot be explained by Pustejovsky’s qualia structure, because categories such as views, locations, sun/weather or more abstract things do definitely not have agentive roles and telic roles are also problematic to specify. A related problem shows up for the Dutch categories animals and persons. The interpretation of what is actually enjoyed could even be seeing the things that these persons or animals do.

The frame-semantic analysis advocated in the next chapter (VIII) will show that the latter could be explained by the fact that not only the object involved in the experience, but also the agent of such an experienced event could be highlighted. Furthermore, it will be demonstrated in the next chapter that a verb such as enjoy is indeed slightly different in its structure as compared to begin or finish: Rather than an activity in general, enjoy must be interpreted with some kind of experience. For nouns such as food or books, this experience can be specified easily, but for others, such as the sun or children, this is considerably vaguer. Therefore, even if the same mechanism applies, different interpretations are inferred for enjoy as compared to the aspectual verbs begin or finish.

6. Dictionary information

6.1 Lexicographical relevance

Logical metonymy comes into being by the subtle interplay of a main verb and a noun denoting a concrete entity. Although semantic-encyclopaedic information of
the concrete object provides some clarification as to what the activity could be, the need to find a specific activity is triggered by the main verb. In a dictionary, information about logical metonymy could therefore best be incorporated in a verb’s entry, even though the specific activity is in most cases inferred on the basis of knowledge connected to the concrete object.272

Interestingly, the traditional Dutch dictionary WNT clearly reflects this interplay of verb and object in the entry *continueren* (‘to continue’): It states that this verb can metonymically be combined with a direct object referring to a concrete, physical entity (cf. meaning 6.b.). The WNT gives the example of *continueren* in combination with a specific type of text (a baptismal register). In this example, the event which is continued is writing this text or more specifically keeping it up to date. This combination is a perfect example of logical metonymy. The fact that lexicographers have recognised such constructions as metonymical early on can be considered corroboration for the general idea of the existence of logical metonymy. Conversely, new insights into logical metonymy could help to improve dictionaries. In this way, logical metonymy shows that linguistic research and lexicography can clearly benefit from each other.

Since logical metonymy occurs on the basis of a combination of lexical items with an effect on the interpretation of the expression as such, it falls on dictionaries to incorporate information about logical metonymy. Of course it is impossible to provide examples with all kinds of possible concrete object, which could have telic, agentive or several context-dependent interpretations, but something must be said about the general option to use a concrete object instead of an event as a direct object or prepositional object. One also expects to find information about logical metonymy in dictionaries, given that some types of concrete objects are far more frequent than others. Frequently occurring categories of nouns with an explanation of the activity interpreted by default could be incorporated to clarify logically metonymical constructions. In addition, differences in the use of prepositional objects and direct objects are expected to be incorporated.

In the next two subsections, I will therefore discuss which combinatorial information of the discussed equivalents for *begin*, *finish* and *enjoy* with agents as subjects is given in the Dutch Van Dale and the WNT and in the German DWDS and Duden. The comparison of this survey with the results of this chapter will show which improvements could possibly be made to the dictionary entries.

---

272 Such information will be incorporated in the *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek* (ANW) (cf. also Moerdijk 2004; Moerdijk et al. 2008), because the ANW incorporates in nominal entries contextual-encyclopaedic information and combinatorial possibilities with verbs, which take the entry as a direct object. Compare, for example, the direct objects combinations with *bier* (‘beer’) and its so-called semagram in the online demo-version of the ANW: http://anw.inl.nl/article/bier?searchtype=form&form=bier#s=1-3.
6.2 Information in Dutch dictionaries

The best-known and most used dictionaries for Dutch are the ‘Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal’ (WNT) and Van Dale’s ‘Groot Woordenboek van de Nederlandse Taal’ (van Dale 2005). The WNT is the world’s largest dictionary, which has been compiled between 1882 and 2001. The WNT is a historical dictionary, given that it describes Dutch used from the 16th century till the 20th century. The WNT is therefore very rich in information but also heterogeneous in its structure, which makes the WNT more suitable for scientific purposes than for daily usage. For the latter purpose, however, Van Dale 2005 is the reference work of choice. It will therefore be very interesting to compare how information about logical metonymy with the verbs beginnen, eindigen, beëindigen and genieten is incorporated in both dictionaries.

In both dictionaries, examples of beginnen with the often occurring concrete texts and companies as direct objects are included, but the combination with a piece of music is missing. The dictionaries correctly give examples of different types of texts with agentive interpretations, such as letters, which are written, a piece of work, which is written or poems, which are composed. In addition, the WNT gives an example with a book, which is read. Interestingly, the WNT explicitly describes the phenomenon of logical metonymy with beginnen, although the word ‘metonymy’ itself is not used: It states that in general the occurrence with noun referring to a concrete entity suggests that a possible verb should be added in order to interpret the sentence (cf. meaning 4.b and also the prepositional objects in meaning 3).

With the verbs eindigen and beëindigen fewer metonymical examples are provided. With eindigen Van Dale provides an example with a letter and the WNT with a novel, but the frequently occurring companies and musical pieces are missing. With beëindigen both dictionaries are very brief; they only give examples with contracts or agreements. In the WNT, the meaning of eindigen is described as “voltooien” and in Van Dale the verb beëindigen is paraphrased under one meaning description as “afmaken” / “afwerken”. These paraphrases could all be translated as ‘carry out’ / ‘carry through’ / ‘accomplish’. Such verbs are normally combined with direct objects referring to concrete entities. By means of these paraphrases, both dictionaries thus only very implicitly account for the logical metonymy.

None of the dictionaries says anything about eindigen met. Concerning the information about direct objects versus prepositional objects with beginnen, both dictionaries clearly differ on the facts which they account for. The WNT does not only notice that beginnen can occur with a direct object referring to a concrete entity (cf. meaning 4), but also explains that the combination beginnen aan often occurs with words referring to concrete objects (meaning 3 -aan iets). The fact that this prepositional object can also occur with nouns referring to events is not reflected. Also no additional semantic aspects are incorporated in the WNT.

Although Van Dale does not remark at all that beginnen aan is often combined with words referring to concrete entities, Van Dale provides information about the semantics of this prepositional object: It is claimed that beginnen aan zijn werk (‘to
begin on his work’) is used “zonder de gedachte aan voltooiing” (i.e.: ‘without the idea of completion / finishing’). It is very difficult to analyse on the basis of corpus examples, whether it is true that the idea of completion has been left open. The following two ANW-examples show that completion could at least be planned and expected.

(64) wij zijn eraan begonnen, we gaan het ook afmaken we are there/that-on begun we go it also finish ‘we have begun with it, so we are also going to finish it’

(65) Na 2005 begint men aan de tweede fase. after 2005 begins one on the second phase

Die moet in 2012 voltooid zijn. that must in 2012 completed are

‘After 2005, the second phase will start. That should be completed in 2012.’

Contrary to the description of the semantics of beginnen aan, Van Dale tells us hardly anything about beginnen met. Only examples with a VP or specific usages with a concrete person (‘with him’) that have some idiomatic flavour are included, such as begin maar niet met hem (meaning: ‘be sure not to have anything to do with him’), wat moet ik met hem beginnen? (meaning: ‘what am I to do with him?’) or er is niets met hem te beginnen (meaning: ‘he is a lost cause’).

The semantics of beginnen met is, however, perfectly described in the WNT. Meaning 3.1° expresses that the prepositional object refers to the event that is done as a first step and meaning 3.2° expresses that something is started which will be repeated in the future. Examples with events (VPs or NPs) as well as with objects referring to concrete entities are given. This information perfectly reflects the observations above.

Surprisingly, Van Dale hardly discusses the difference between genieten and genieten van. Only two examples are given, i.e. to enjoy some pleasant taste of something and to enjoy a cigar (which does not occur in the ANW-corpus). In

273 The idea that the started activity (which could be explicit or metonymically implied) is probably not totally finished in the case of beginnen aan could be in line with a more common observation: A general semantic difference between a direct object and a prepositional object with the same verb is that the prepositional object does not have to be totally affected by the verb. This is, for instance, reflected in iets schieten (‘to shoot something’) versus op iets schieten (‘to shoot at something’) or in iets eten (‘to eat something’) versus van iets eten (‘to eat from something’) (cf. Broekhuis 2004: 122). The idea that the entity referred to by the noun of the prepositional object will possibly not been finished or could not have been finished, can be paraphrased as that it has begun in a different way: It could be the case that whereas the entity expressed by the direct object is fully affected by the beginning-process, the entity in the aan-object is not, given that it will not necessarily be finished.
contrast to Van Dale, the difference between genieten and genieten van is very well incorporated in the WNT. The WNT says that genieten van iets (lit.: ‘to enjoy of something’) expresses that the something should be seen as the source of a pleasant experience. This perfectly explains the logical metonymy: To enjoy is semantically combined with a certain experience and its source can be mentioned in the prepositional complement.

6.3 Information in German dictionaries

In order to see which information about logical metonymy could be found in German dictionaries, I compared the entries of anfangen, beginnen, enden, and beendigen in the contemporary dictionaries Duden’s Deutsches Universalwörterbuch (Duden 2006) and das digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (DWDS 2002-2006). In general, these dictionaries do not provide explicit information about logical metonymy and the examples with words referring to concrete objects are few and far between.

In both dictionaries, the examples with anfangen differ from the ones with beginnen: For beginnen both dictionaries only include events. The DWDS is even more or less explicit on this, by paraphrasing the verb’s meaning as “mit einer Handlung einsetzen” (‘to start with an activity’). This meaning description reflects the fact that fewer examples of logical metonymy can be found with beginnen than with anfangen, but the meaning paraphrase contradicts combinations in the DWDS-corpus, such as ein Buch / den Roman beginnen (‘to begin the book / the novel’), ein Lied beginnen (‘to begin a song’) and even more occasional combinations from a single source such as das Jäckchen / den Rock beginnen (‘to begin the little jacket / the skirt’).

With anfangen the Duden only provides examples of texts as direct objects. Examples with companies or musical pieces are not incorporated. The DWDS also does not take into account pieces of music, but it does provide examples with texts or companies. An explanation of the interpretation of such combinations or an explanation for the fact that these verbs can occur with implicit events is lacking.

Information about semantic differences between direct objects and prepositional objects with the aspectual verbs beginnen and anfangen is rather summary. A general semantic description of the mit-complement is missing. The Duden provides only one example with an event-denoting noun in combination with beginnen, i.e. mit dem Training beginnen (‘to begin with the training’). Furthermore, both dictionaries only incorporate combinations with an idiomatic flavour, such as was soll ich nun damit beginnen? (meaning: ‘what should I do with it?’), was soll ich mit ihm anfangen (meaning: ‘what should I do with him?’), nichts mit sich anzufangen wissen (meaning: ‘to not know what to do with oneself’) or mit ihm ist nichts anzufangen (meaning: ‘he is unsuited/a lost cause’).

The combination of enden mit is, as reflected in the corpus, hardly ever used with an agent as subject: It primarily occurs in constructions, such as ‘the fight / the letter / etc. ends with...’ (cf. note 267 above). Additionally, both dictionaries include
the standard combination such as der Redner endet mit X (lit.: “the speaker ends with X”), in which the implicit event of a speech or presentation that finishes with the words X has to be added. The incorporation of the combinatorial possibility for this specific logical metonymy is accurate.

With beenden or beendigen, the Duden does not provide a single example of a direct object referring to a concrete entity. The DWDS performs much better in this respect. Besides examples with nouns that denote events such as den Krieg (‘the war’), das Gespräch (‘the conversation’), die Versammlung (‘the meeting’), which are also given in Duden, the DWDS mentions examples with nouns referring to concrete things, such as das Kunstwerk (‘the work of art’) or die letzten Kapitel des Romans (‘the last chapters of the novel’). Comparable to the Dutch dictionaries, this meaning is paraphrased as vollenden (lit.: “full-finish”), which can best be translated into English as ‘carry out’ / ‘carry through’ / ‘accomplish’. This paraphrase automatically evokes the idea of a concrete entity. As is also the case in Dutch dictionaries, the frequently found category of musical pieces is not incorporated. Examples that were found in German in particular, such as food and games, are also not taken into account by the Duden or the DWDS.

With respect to genießen, the DWDS says nothing about the combination with a von-complement, but the Duden does explain the specific meaning of genießen von as ‘to consume’. The DWDS tells us that genießen with a direct object can also be interpreted as ‘to consume’, which is, however, not included in the Duden. The Duden furthermore only incorporates examples of events, which are enjoyed, such as das Leben (‘the life’) and den Urlaub (‘the holiday’) genießen. This is once again different in the DWDS. Besides events such as life and holiday, the DWDS incorporates some of the non-eventive objects which were also found in the corpus, such as impressions, views and nature.

6.4 Logical metonymy and Dutch and German dictionaries

Based on the results of the previous sections, we must conclude that some crucial information and important examples of logical metonymy are missing in most Dutch and German dictionaries. Especially the frequently found category of pieces of music has hardly been taken into account. More examples could be given to illustrate certain collocations and more should be said about the semantics of prepositional objects in contrast with direct objects.

However, some of the observations on the basis of corpus data are in fact reflected in the dictionaries. Although German dictionaries lack explicit information about logical metonymy, the German DWDS has incorporated some classes of concrete objects found with anfangen and with genießen. The German Duden does not give any example with a concrete entity which can be enjoyed, but Duden explains the occurrence with a prepositional object and the clear meaning difference with a direct object. The Dutch Van Dale provides information about the semantics of beginnen aan. The fact that beginnen aan often occurs without expressing the activity has not been included in Van Dale. The latter aspect has been incorporated
in the Dutch WNT, without mentioning that events can occur with aan-objects as well. The exact semantics of beginnen met is nicely described in the WNT, including examples with words denoting concrete entities (cf. meaning 3.1° & 3.2°). Explicit information about the additionally interpreted event is also provided for beginnen. With respect to genieten, the WNT incorporates clear information about the difference between genieten and genieten van, which has surprisingly not been taken into account in Van Dale.

On the basis of this survey, we can conclude two different things. First of all, information incorporated in dictionaries and the observations in this chapter validate each other, given that both describe similar findings independently of one another. However, not all observations have been equally well reflected in different dictionaries. As a second conclusion therefore, the results of this study could be used to improve relevant dictionary entries.

7. Conclusions

Analysing corpus examples reveals differences between verbs in their actual sensitivity to logical metonymy. A similar result has been obtained for English by Verspoor (1997a: 186-192). She suggested that logical metonyms are used in a restricted way with differences between begin, finish, and enjoy (Verspoor 1997a: 192). The Dutch and German equivalents show comparable behaviour. Several observations can be made on the basis of the corpus results. These observations should be reflected in dictionaries, which is not always the case.

A first observation concerns differences in the use of direct objects or prepositional objects. Dutch genieten is obligatorily combined with a prepositional object, whereas German genießen is transitive. Aspctual verbs, such as German anfangen and beginnen or Dutch beginnen and eindigen, are used with a direct object or a prepositional object. The necessity for using a prepositional object depends on the kind of interpretation and the kind of object: More nouns referring to concrete entities are used in the prepositional object slot than in the direct object slot and prepositional objects lead to more complicated interpretations. The latter observation has also been made for English (Verspoor 1997a: 191-192) and for German artefacts (Rüd and Zarcone 2011).

The idea that the preposition serves as a marker for the logical metonymy (Verspoor 1997a: 191-192, cf. also Honselaar 1980: 153) appears to be untenable for Dutch and German, since these prepositions occur with events as well. Rather the preposition brings in some properties independent of logical metonymy, which make the construction more transparent. In case of the Dutch preposition met, as in beginnen met and eindigen met, and probably also in German anfangen mit the preposition indicates that the started or finished action belongs to a series of similar actions or is a sub-part of one coherent larger action. With Dutch beginnen met this coherent action can even be made explicit by an additional direct object. Since the prepositional object hints at the general action expressed or known in the context, the activity can more easily be inferred. A specific property of beginnen aan is that
no infinitives can be added. Therefore, *beginnen aan* projects the event as a kind of thing, i.e. as a complete entity (cf. Honselaar 1980; cf. also Langacker 2002). In addition to this, if a noun which denotes a concrete thing is combined with *beginnen aan*, it is, in contrast to transitive *beginnen or beginnen met*, directly clear that the activity has to be inferred metonymically. Thus, both prepositions make logical metonymy easier to understand: *aan* on the basis of its semantic-syntactic properties and Dutch *met* or German *mit* as a side effect of its semantics.

Secondly, as summarised in Table 16, the corpus samples indicate the tendency that logical metonymy occurs with certain categories of nouns. In practice, the metonymical use of direct objects for Dutch *beginnen* and German *anfangen* and *beginnen* is almost limited to stories, texts, pieces of music, and companies. Metonymical combinations of direct objects with equivalents of *finish* are also very restricted. The common categories for Dutch *beëindigen* are texts and companies, with an agentive interpretation only. In these cases, the expressed concrete object is the result (cf. chapter VI, §4.3 and §4.4). In addition to these categories, German *beenden* and *beendigen* are often combined with pieces of music (with an agentive interpretation), concrete games, and food (both with a telic interpretation). With equivalents of *enjoy*, different and also more categories are used (cf. also Verspoor 1997a: 192-195). The interpretation is also different: Telic interpretations are more common and the interpreted event can often not be derived from qualia structure at all. Information about such combinations is hardly incorporated in dictionaries, as has been summarised in section 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>frequent categories in sample</th>
<th>interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO BEGIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>beginnen (DO)</td>
<td>agentive, telic marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>anfangen (DO)</td>
<td>agentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beginnen (DO)</td>
<td>agentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO FINISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>beëindigen</td>
<td>agentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eindigen (DO)</td>
<td>agentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>beendigen (g)</td>
<td>agentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food; game</td>
<td>telic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO ENJOY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>genieten van</td>
<td>telic &amp; other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>text/story; performance; view; food; drink; impression; location; nature; weather; commercial product; money; animals; persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>genießen</td>
<td>telic &amp; other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>text/story; performance; view; food; drink; impression; location; nature; weather; commercial product; art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Frequent logical metonymies in Dutch and German corpus samples

Thirdly, Table 16 illustrates that qualia structure cannot do all the work. Since there are differences between the *enjoy*-equivalents and the aspectual verbs, logical metonymy is apparently restricted by the interplay between verb semantics and qualia structure (or: the metonymical link between noun and event). Because a verb such as *to enjoy* has to be combined with a kind of experience, the telic role is very important, whereas verbs such as *to begin* or *to finish* express that an activity in general is started or finished by a certain agent. In addition to this, the interpretation can depend on the noun used. Whereas with German *beendigen* nouns denoting texts or pieces of music lead to an interpretation on the basis of the agentive role, food and games are interpreted in a telic way. Furthermore, qualia structures can be very unspecific. In some cases a noun seems to have more values for one role (cf. also Rüd & Zarcone 2011: 20). This appears to be the case for the agentive role of texts (books, chapters, stories, etc.), which could come into existence by writing them, telling them or publishing them. In other cases, role values are lacking (cf. Pustejovsky 1995: 76), as for example with the qualia structure of feelings or persons.

Another problem is the fact that some types of nouns can be more easily used in logically metonymical constructions than others. Language data show that texts and
also pieces of music are often combined with all kinds of verbs in all three languages. Whereas types of food can be used with all kinds of verbs in English, they require a prepositional object when used with the Dutch and German equivalents of *begin* and can rarely be combined with Dutch equivalents of *finish*. Drinks and cigarettes occur in Verspoor’s study only with *finish* (1997a: 186), whereas these categories are never used under an agentive or telic interpretation with Dutch and German aspectual verbs.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, we can thus say that Dutch, German and English display a comparable usage of logically metonymical combination. For all three languages lexical-conceptual information beyond qualia structure is crucial: The semantics of the main verb (in combination with its possible prepositional objects) restricts logical metonymy lexically and some metonymical associations are more strongly anchored than others. Furthermore, all languages use very limited categories of nouns, in all languages the possibility of using logical metonymy depends on the main verb, the agentive interpretation is generally far more common than the telic one (depending on the noun though), and all languages allow more complicated metonymies with prepositional objects than with direct objects. Dutch and German only prove to be less flexible than English.