Constructions with verbs of dispossession in Dutch
A corpus-based case study

Martine Delorge & Timothy Colleman

Universiteit Gent - Belgium

This paper focuses on the constructional possibilities of verbs of reception and dispossession in Dutch. These verb classes have received considerably less linguistic attention than their counterparts among the verbs of transfer of possession, the verbs of giving. In this paper, we intend to show, however, that reception and dispossession verbs constitute an interesting area of investigation as well, by laying bare the constructional variation they display, both synchronically and diachronically. The first part of our paper provides a brief overview of this variation. In the second part, we present a case study of six typical verbs of dispossession: the simplex verbs *stelen* 'steal' and *roven* 'rob' and their *be-* and *ont-* prefixed variants, *bestelen*, *beroven*, *ontroven* and *ontstelen*. Their use will be examined in corpora of Middle, 19th Century and present-day Dutch.

1   Introduction

This paper focuses on the diachrony of constructions with verbs of dispossession in Dutch.[1] In their semantic categorization of three-participant events, Margetts & Austin (to appear) include the classes 'Agent/recipient takes possession of theme from source' (verbs of reception) and 'Agent removes theme from recipient's possession' (verbs of dispossession). While these two classes are naturally felt to be semantically related, there are some differences to be observed as well. Verbs of dispossession (verbs of taking), for instance, denote the causation of a transfer of an entity out of somebody's sphere of control or possession. The agent instigating the transfer is often the new possessor of the theme, though not necessarily: you can take something away from somebody without being the new owner. Conversely, verbs of reception involve a new possessor who is not necessarily (in fact, who is typically not) the agent of the profiled event: something enters the sphere of control or possession of somebody on the instigation of a third party. In sum, the semantic roles are (i) agent and/or new possessor, (ii) theme and (iii) source/original possessor.

Verbs of reception and dispossession have received much less linguistic attention than their "counterparts", the verbs of giving. This is hardly surprising: first, verbs of giving are undoubtedly the most prototypical subclass of transfer of possession verbs (see e.g. Newman 2005 for argumentation), and, second, the existence of intriguing Dative alternation phenomena in several languages has naturally triggered a lot of interest in the syntax and semantics of give verbs (see Colleman 2006 for a detailed investigation of the Dative alternation in Dutch). In this paper, however, we intend to show that verbs of (reception and) dispossession constitute a challenging area of investigation as well, since they display a lot of constructional variation, both synchronically and diachronically. The next section gives an overview of this variation in Dutch.

2 Constructional variation with verbs of reception and dispossession in Dutch: an overview

2.1 Synchronic variation

In Dutch, verbs of reception and dispossession can occur in three major syntactic constructions.

2.1.1 Transitive constructions with a theme direct object and the original possessor in an (optional) prepositional phrase

The first major syntactic pattern attested with verbs of reception and dispossession is the simple monotransitive pattern which links the agent or new possessor role to the subject function and the theme to the direct object function. The original possessor is encoded as an (optional) prepositional phrase. Two subtypes can be distinguished:

(a) PP with *van* 'from'

This is the "default" construction, attested with verbs such as *krijgen* 'get', *ontvangen* 'receive', *kopen* 'buy', *erven* 'inherit', *stelen* 'steal', *afpakken* 'snatch', *overnemen* 'take over, adopt', etc., as illustrated in (1) and (2). In these sentences, the *van*-constituent is optional.

    (1) Hij kreeg een mooi cadeau van zijn moeder.
          'He got a nice present from his mother'
    (2) Hij stal veel geld van zijn vrienden.
          'He stole a lot of money from his friends'

(b) PP with *aan* 'on'

The source preposition *van* is the default option, but in some cases, the 'contact' preposition *aan* (cognate of English *on*) is used instead. This construction occurs with a number of prefix verbs with *ont-*, which can be glossed 'off' or 'away' in these contexts: *ontlenen* 'borrow, derive', *ontnemen* 'take away', *ontroven* 'rob away', etc., see (3) for an example.

    (3) Prometheus ontstal het vuur aan Zeus.
          'Prometheus stole the fire from Zeus'

2.1.2   Transitive constructions with a possessor direct object and the theme in an (optional) preposition construction

Some verbs occur in a simple monotransitive construction with the direct object coding the original possessor rather than the theme. This is the second major construction type, attested with verbs such as *beroven* 'rob'*, verlossen* 'release, deliver', *ontdoen* 'strip, free'. The theme is expressed as an optional prepositional constituent introduced by *van*, as is shown in example (4). This "reversed" construction is discussed in some detail in De Schutter (1974: 223-227).

(4)   Hij beroofde mij van al mijn bezittingen.
       'He robbed me of all my possessions'

2.1.3   Ditransitive constructions with nominal theme and possessor objects

Verbs of taking can also occur in the ditransitive construction, which encodes both the theme and the original possessor as nominal objects. While ditransitive constructions are prototypically associated with verbs of giving, it is not uncommon for verbs of taking to be used in the same argument structure constructions as verbs of giving (see Newman 1996: 103-104, also see Goldberg 2002: 332-33 on the semantic similarity between GIVE and TAKE). This also explains why verbs of dispossession could be used in the ditransitive construction in older Dutch (see section 2.2 for further elaboration).

In present-day Dutch, this possibility is largely restricted to a number of prefixed verbs with *af-* or *ont-*: *afpakken* 'off-snatch', *afnemen* 'off-take', *ontnemen* 'away-take', etc., as illustrated in (5)-(6).

(5)   Ze ontnamen hem al zijn privileges.
       'They took all his privileges away from him'
(6)   De politie nam hem zijn portefeuille af.
       'The police took his wallet away from him'

2.2   Diachronic variation

From a diachronic point of view, verbs of reception and dispossession also display interesting variation. First, as was already referred to above, the lexical possibilities of the ditransitive construction were wider in older stages of the

language: the following instances, taken from the example sections of the *Middle Dutch Dictionary* (MNW), show that simplex verbs of dispossession such as *nemen* 'take' and *stelen* 'steal' could be used with ditransitive syntax in Middle Dutch:

(7) Ic hebbe ghenomen grote have den riken lieden. (*Karel ende Elegast*, 13th Century)
'I have taken many possessions from the rich'

(8) In ene molen, daer ic die worst hadde ghestolen enen slapenden molenman. (*Vanden vos Reinaerde*, 13th Century)
'In a mill, where I had stolen the sausage from a sleeping miller'

Second, the construction with the contact preposition *aan* occurred with a number of (simplex) verbs of reception and dispossession in older Dutch as well, as shown by (9) and (10) below (present-day Dutch would use the construction with *van* in these contexts):

(9) Philip van Persen quame ende name trike an hem. (J. van Maerlant, *Rymbybel*, 14th Century)
'Philip of Persen came and took the empire from him'

(10) So vercreegh si aen onsen Heer, dat si met heme soud deelen de pine. (*Leven van Sinte Christina de Wonderbare*, 14th or 15th Century)
'So she obtained from our Lord that she would share the pain with him'

To summarize, both the ditransitive construction and the construction with *aan* could be used with simplex verbs of reception and/or dispossession in older phases of Dutch, possibilities which have since largely disappeared from the language.

Section 3 presents a more detailed diachronic corpus-based case study of a number of verbs of dispossession. Since most modern cognitive and functionalist research focuses on the meaning of grammatical patterns and the interaction of verbal and constructional semantics (cf. the advent of Construction Grammar in Goldberg 1995, Kay & Fillmore 1999, etc.) rather than the diachronic evolutions underlying them, we believe that a study of the shifts and evolutions in the grammatical possibilities of all kinds of verbs can teach us a lot about the relationship between verbs and the constructions they occur in.

3 Case-study: *stelen, roven* and prefixed variants

On the basis of the examples presented in section 3, a number of questions can be raised: (i) Could any verb of reception or dispossession be used in the ditransitive construction and the *aan*-construction in Middle Dutch, or were these possibilities limited to a subset of the relevant verbs? (ii) When exactly did these constructional possibilities fall out of use? (iii) Were changes restricted to the ditransitive and the *aan*-construction or did the lexical possibilities of the other constructions signalled in section 2 change as well? In order to answer these questions, reconstructing the constructional evolution of these verbs of reception and dispossession in Dutch will of the essence. Tracing the developmental path of these verbs is also one of the major objectives in the PhD research of the first author of this paper.

As a preliminary investigation, we looked into the use of two typical verbs of stealing, *stelen* 'steal' and *roven* 'rob' in three corpora representing different stages of the language:

a) a 7 million word corpus of Middle Dutch, consisting of 14th and 15th Century literary prose from the cd-rom version of the Middle Dutch Dictionary (MNW)
b) a 4.2 million word corpus of 19th Century literary Dutch, consisting of prose texts archived on the Internet (mostly taken from the Digital Library of Dutch literature <www.dbnl.org>)
c) the 27 million word newspaper corpus of the Institute for Dutch Lexicology (INL), representing present-day Dutch

Apart from the simplex verbs *stelen* and *roven*, their *be-* and *ont*-prefixed variants were included as well: *bestelen, beroven, ontstelen* and *ontroven*.

All forms of the six verbs selected for the investigation have been automatically retrieved from the three corpora, using the Winconcord concordancer for the Middle Dutch and 19th Century corpora and the built-in search facilities of the INL corpus. The results were manually filtered and labeled for syntactic construction. For the most frequent verbs *stelen* and *beroven*, we set a maximum of 250 hits per corpus.[2]

---

[2] The results in the tables in the next subsections never add up to 250 occurrences: this is because a lot of noise had to be excluded from the investigation. Especially in the Middle Dutch and 19th Century corpora, which are not POS-tagged, the automatic corpus queries generated a lot of noise: in the case of *stelen*, for instance, many occurrences of the past tense form *stal* were in fact instances of the noun *stal* 'stable'.

In the next subsections, we shall first present the corpus results for present-day Dutch and then take a closer look at the results for the earlier stages, Middle Dutch and 19th Century Dutch.[3]

3.1 Present-day Dutch

Table 1 sums up the results from the 27-million word corpus of present-day Dutch.[4] The constructions which are not relevant to the present discussion have been subsumed under the label Other.

Verb	construction	frequency
Beroven	NP__NP[source] van NP[theme]	164
	NP__NP[source]	82
	NP__	3
Bestelen	NP__NP[source]	76
	NP__NP[source] van NP[theme]	32
Roven	NP__NP[theme]	68
	NP__NP[theme] van NP[source]	2
	Other	56
Stelen	NP__NP[theme]	121
	NP__NP[theme] van NP[source]	10
	NP__van NP[source]	4
	Other	74
Ontstelen	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	14
	NP__NP[theme] aan NP[source]	1
Ontroven	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	2
	NP__NP[theme] aan NP[source]	2

Table 1: results from INL-corpus

The results confirm the occurrence of the three major construction types discussed in subsection 2.1 above. The construction with a theme direct object and a *van*-PP encoding the original possessor is found with the simplex verbs *stelen* and *roven* only. The construction with a possessor direct object (plus a

---

[3] The intervening stages, that is 16th to 18th Century Dutch, have not been examined yet, for practical reasons: we are still looking for good corpora for those periods.
[4] The codes in the second column are based on the system for coding verbs patterns used in the *Contragram Dutch-French-English Verb Valency Dictionary* <www.contragram.ugent.be/cvvd.htm>. The horizontal bar represents the verb, the NP to the left of the bar represents the subject and the codes to the right of the bar the inner complements. NP__NP van NP, for instance, refers to a construction with a subject, a nominal object and a PP introduced by *van*. For clarity's sake, we have added the roles coded by the complement NP's in square brackets.

van-PP expressing the theme) is found with the *be*-prefixed variants *beroven* and *bestelen* only. Both the construction with a theme direct object plus an *aan*-constituent and the ditransitive construction with nominal theme and possessor objects are found with the *ont*-prefixed verbs *ontstelen* and *ontroven*, only. (11) to (18) list relevant examples.

(11) Martien steelt het belastinggeld van de schout. [NRC][5]
   'Martien steals the tax money from the bailiff'
(12) Al maanden roven gewapende bendes grote hoeveelheden eten van hulporganisaties. [NRC]
   'For months, armed gangs have been robbing large amounts of food from aid organisations'
(13) De verzorgingsstaat berooft mensen van de verantwoordelijkheid voor eigen lot. [NRC]
   'The welfare state robs people of the responsibility for their own fate'
(14) Een onbekende bestal de vrouw van een aantal boodschappen. [NRC]
   'A stranger robbed the woman of some purchases'

(15) Het licht moest aan de rest van de samenleving ontstolen worden. [NRC][6]
   'The light had to be stolen from the rest of society'
(16) De veren zullen aan de vogel moeten worden ontroofd. [NRC]
   'The feathers will have to be robbed from the bird'
(17) Het FIS won de verkiezingen, maar de overwinning is hen ontstolen. [NRC]
   'The FIS won the elections, but the victory was stolen from them'
(18) Het bedrijf heeft een groep arme mensen grond ontroofd. [NRC]
   'The company has robbed a group of poor people of their land'

---

[5] All examples from the INL 27 million word corpus are from the Dutch newspaper *NRC Handelsblad*.
[6] Strictly speaking, passive examples such as (15), (16) and (17) represent a different construction: future research will have to take into account the distinction between active and passive variants of the different constructions. For the present investigation, however, we have lumped actives and passives together, because the number of attested examples is too low for further subdivisions.

3.2 Middle Dutch

Table 2 summarizes the results from the Middle Dutch corpus; *bestelen* is missing from this table because the corpus queries did not produce a single result for this verb.

Verb	construction	frequency
Beroven	NP__NP[source]	62
	NP__NP[theme]	16
	NP__NP[source] van NP[theme]	51
	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	36
	NP__	1
Roven	NP__NP[theme]	53
	NP__NP[source]	33
	NP__	34
	NP__NP[theme] van NP[source]	12
	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	11
Stelen	NP__NP[theme]	71
	NP__NP[source]	6
	NP__	62
	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	22
	NP__NP[theme] van NP[source]	14
Ontstelen	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	1
Ontroven	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	1
	NP__	1

Table 2: results from Middle Dutch corpus

In the Middle Dutch corpus, the ditransitive construction is attested with all the verbs (other than *bestelen*). *Roven, stelen* and *beroven*, none of which can be used ditransitively in present-day Dutch, are attested 11, 22 and 36 times respectively in the ditransitive construction, which amounts to 7.7%, 12.4% and 21.7% of their total number of occurrences in the corpus sample, respectively. Some examples are listed in (19) to (21).

(19) Si roeft hem sijn guet. (*Spiegel der sonden*, early 15th Century)
'She robs him of his possession'
(20) Twee dieven stalen my mijn alder liefste ende weerste goet. (*Historie van Margarieta van Lymborch*, 13th Century)
'Two thieves stole my dearest and most valuable possession from me'

(21) Want elc spoelre berovet den evenkersten sijn guet. (*Spiegel der sonden*, early 15th Century)
'Because every player robs his fellowman of his possession'

The number of instances of *ontstelen* and *ontroven* in the Middle Dutch corpus is very small, so we cannot provide solid hypotheses about their constructional behaviour. This lack of occurrences can be related to the fact that Middle Dutch used the simplex verbs in contexts where we would now use the complex verbs. However, the results do suggest that these verbs were already used in the ditransitive construction in Middle Dutch.

The construction with *aan* is not attested with any of the verbs in the Middle Dutch material. While the examples from the Middle Dutch Dictionary in section 2.2 show that this construction *could* be used with verbs of dispossession, it would seem that this combination was not a very frequent one, at least not with *roven* and *stelen*.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the semantic possibilities of the monotransitive construction with a single direct object were wider in Middle Dutch than in present-day Dutch. With the simplex verbs *roven* and *stelen*, the direct object could encode the source as well as the theme of the transfer, whereas in Modern Dutch, it can only be the theme. (22) and (23) are two instances with the "archaic" linking of the source role to direct object function.

(22) Si daden cracht ende roefden den armen volc. (*Old Testament* in Southern Dutch translation, ca. 1360)
'They violated and robbed the poor people'

(23) Die derde lude sijn die gheen die gheesteliken stelen. (D. van Delf, *Tafel vanden kersten ghelove*, ca. 1404)
'The third kind of people are those that steal from the clergy'

Nowadays, we would use the *be*-prefixed verbs *beroven* and *bestelen* in such contexts. With *beroven* we find the opposite situation. Today, the direct object can only encode the source, but in Middle Dutch, we find a number of examples in which the direct object codes the theme, as in (24).

(24) Ende haer goet berooft sonder alleen her demofoens tente.[7] (*Historie van Margariete van Lymborch*, 13th Century)
'And their possessions were robbed with the exception of Lord Demofoen's tent'

3.3 19th CenturyDutch

verb	construction	frequency
Beroven	NP__NP[source] van NP[theme]	121
	NP__NP[source]	6
	NP__NP[theme]	1
	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	1
Bestelen	NP__NP[source]	27
	NP__	1
Roven	NP__NP[theme]	41
	NP__NP[source]	3
	NP__	11
	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	5
Stelen	NP__NP[theme]	67
	NP__	26
	NP__NP[theme] van NP[source]	3
	Other	8
Ontstelen	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	20
	NP__NP[theme]	2
	NP__NP[theme] aan NP[source]	2
Ontroven	NP__NP[source] NP[theme]	21
	NP__NP[theme] aan NP[source]	6
	NP__NP[theme]	2

Table 3: results from 19th century corpus

Table 3 summarizes the results from the 19th Century corpus. In this 19th Century corpus sample, the distribution of the ditransitive construction differs from what we observed in the Middle Dutch corpus sample. Ditransitives do not occur with *stelen* and *bestelen*. So as far as these verbs are concerned, 19th Century Dutch is

---

[7] In some of the monotransitive clauses with *beroven*, there is overt genitive case marking on the object NP. At present, we do not yet distinguish between patterns with a single accusative and patterns with single dative or genitive objects. Needless to say, this is a further distinction which will have to be taken into account in future research.

relatively similar to modern Dutch: the combination of *stelen* with ditransitive syntax was already obsolete in the 19th century.

Roven and *beroven*, however, *do* occur in the ditransitive construction in 19th Century Dutch, as is shown in (25) and (26) below.

(25) Het was mij, alsof men mij een deel van mijnen eigendom roofde. (J.L.B. Sleeckx, *Op 't Eksterlaer*, 1863)
'It felt to me as if they robbed me of a part of my property'

(26) De kanunnik heeft de macht niet haar mij te beroven. (J.F. Oltmans, *De Schaapherder*, 1838)
'The canon does not have the power to rob her from me'

Beroven, however, is attested only once in the ditransitive construction: it is mostly used in the "modern" construction with the original possessor as a direct object and the theme in a preposition constituent with *van*. *Roven* is used five times in the ditransitive construction, out of a total of 60 occurrences. There is no significant difference between this distribution and the distribution observed for Middle Dutch (11 ditransitives out of 143 instances), which leads us to conclude that the combination of *roven* with ditransitive syntax was still quite natural in 19th Century Dutch. This observation is on a par with the evaluation of *roven* in Brill (1884) who includes *roven* (but not *stelen*) in the list of verbs that could be used with two nominal objects, exemplified by the construed example *Wie roofde hem zijne eer?* (lit. 'Who robbed him his honour?').

As a next step, one would also have to explain *why* the construction survived until the 19th Century with *roven* but not with *stelen*. One explanation could be related to a semantic difference between the two verbs in question: *roven* arguably implies a stronger effect on the original possessor than *stelen* does. For instance, one can steal something from somebody without them even being aware of the act, but it seems impossible to rob somebody of something without them being aware, because the act of robbing necessarily involves violence. Thorgren (2005: 16) describes the relevant semantic contrast between English *rob* and *steal* as follows: "[W]e find that the main difference between *rob* and *steal* is that *steal* is used when something is taken secretly from a person, whereas *rob* is used when something is taken violently from a person or place." Similarly, Goldberg (1995: 45) posits a difference in profiling: *rob* necessarily entails that the robbed person is seriously negatively affected, but *steal* does not. It focuses on the fact that the stolen goods are not legitimately the thief's property, rather than the fact that they are actually someone else's.

Of course, this hypothesis needs further testing against more data, involving more different verbs in order to examine whether there are any indications that, in general, verbs of dispossession which lexicalise a quite strong effect on the original possessor have preserved the possibility to be used with ditransitive syntax longer than verbs which do not lexicalise such a strong effect. In other words, can indications be attested which show that there have been several phases in the evolution of the use of the ditransitive construction with dispossession verbs: from (i) a phase in which the construction could be used with any verb of dispossession over (ii) a phase in which the construction could only be used with dispossession verbs which lexicalise a strong effect on the original possessor to (iii) a phase in which the ditransitive construction can no longer be combined with simplex verbs of dispossession (but only with a relatively small number of complex verbs)? Needless to say, this is exactly the kind of semantic generalizations we are after in this kind of research.

To conclude our discussion of the ditransitive construction, it should be pointed out that the two *ont-* verbs, *ontstelen* and *ontroven*, are attested much more frequently in 19th Century Dutch than in Middle Dutch and that, as expected, they are used ditransitively in the large majority of their occurrences.

The distribution of the *aan*-construction in 19th Century Dutch does not differ from that in modern Dutch: this construction is only attested with the *ont-* verbs a couple of times:

(27) Jacob ontstal den zegen aan zijn broeder. (J. Van Lennep, *De roos van Dekama*, 1836)
'Jacob stole the blessing from his brother'

Finally, we looked into the role of the direct object in simple monotransitive clauses. We still find a small number of sentences with the direct object encoding the source rather than the theme in 19th Century Dutch with *roven* (see ex. 28), but not with *stelen*. Again, *roven* seems to have preserved the "old" construction longer than *stelen*.

(28) Alle kerken waren geroofd en geschonden.[8] (H. Conscience, *In 't Wonderjaer*, 1837)
'All the churches were robbed and violated'

---

[8] We are aware that this example does not represent the most typical event of dispossession, because the original possessor is not a person. We have not found examples with a person being robbed in this context and leave it to future research to determine whether this was possible in 19th Century Dutch.

There is also one monotransitive *beroven* instance with the "old" linking pattern, i.e. with the direct object coding the theme rather than the source:

(29) Men had hunne kiekens en hunne eenige geit beroofd. (H. Conscience, *De omwenteling van 1830*, 1858)
    'They had robbed their chickens and their only goat'

This single occurrence, however, does not justify the conclusion that this was still a productive construction in the 19th Century.

4 Conclusion

To conclude, we will sum up the main findings of this preliminary investigation. First, we observed an evolution in the distribution of the ditransitive construction: in older phases of the language, the simplex verbs *stelen* and *roven* were quite frequently used in this construction, a use which is no longer possible in present-day Dutch. Second, we observed an evolution in the semantic possibilities of the monotransitive construction. Whereas in present-day Dutch *roven* and *stelen* can only be combined with a source direct object, the linking to direct object function seems to have been more flexible in older phases of the language: *stelen* and *roven* are attested with source direct objects and *beroven* is attested with theme direct objects. Third, and finally, we have shown that *roven* seems to have preserved the "old" possibilities – the ditransitive construction and the monotransitive construction with a source direct object – longer than *stelen*, which can be related to their different semantics (*roven* implying a stronger effect on the source participant).

References

Brill, W.G. (1884) *Nederlandsche Spraakleer. Ten gebruike bij inrichtingen van hoger onderwijs. IIde deel: Leer van den volzin (Syntaxis).* Derde uitgave. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Colleman, T. (2006) *De Nederlandse datiefalternantie: een constructioneel en corpusgebaseerd onderzoek*. PhD, University of Ghent
De Schutter, G. (1974) *De Nederlandse zin: poging tot beschrijving van zijn structuur*. De Tempel, Brugge
Goldberg, A.E. (1995) *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Goldberg, A.E. (2002) 'Surface generalizations: An alternative to alternations'. *Cognitive Linguistics* 13(3), 327-356

Kay, P. and Fillmore, J. (1999) 'Grammatical Constructions and Linguistic Generalizations: The What's X Doing Y? Construction'. *Language* 75, 1-33

Margetts, A. and Austin, P. (to appear) 'Three participant events in the languages of the world: towards a cross-linguistic typology' To appear in *Linguistics*. http://www.hrelp.org/aboutus/staff/peter_austin/MargettsAustin.pdf

MNW = E. Verwijs & J. Verdam. *Middelnederlansch Woordenboek*. 11 delen, 's Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1885-1952

Newman, J. (1996) *Give: a cognitive linguistic study*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Newman, J. (2005) 'Three-place predicates: A cognitive-linguistic perspective'. *Language Sciences* 27, 145-163

Thorgren, S. (2005) 'Transaction Verbs: A Lexical and Semantic Analysis of *Rob* and *Steal*'. *Reports from the Department of Languages and Culture* 3, 1-44