Rita Brdar-Szabó
Loránd Eötvös University, Budapest

Sylwia Wojciechowska: *Conceptual Metonymy and Lexicographic Representation.* **(Polish Studies in English Language and Literature 34). Frankfurt/M. – Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Warszawa – Wien: Peter Lang, 2012. 330 pp. € 52.80.**

The present book, a revised version of Wojciechowska's 2009 *Ph. D. Thesis* (written under the supervision of Prof. Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak at the University of Poznań), focuses on the issue of how cognitive linguistic theories of metonymy can contribute to the improvement of practical lexicography. Specifically, the author takes a closer look at the "Big Five," namely at the five most important monolingual learners' dictionaries, abbreviated as MLD in the book under review (CALD2, COBUILD4, LDOCE4, MEDAL2 and OALDCE7) with the aim of checking if the representation of metonymy is adequate in them.

The content and organization of the book largely reflects its origin as a dissertation. When one disregards the front and the back matter (acknowledgements, list of tables, list of figures, references, appendices) with their 50-odd pages, out of the remaining 153 pages, roughly four fifths (120 pages in the first 3 chapters) are devoted to the theoretical background of the study by providing the overview of cognitive metonymy research so far as well as to the presentation of the metalexicographic framework adopted. The overviews of linguistic and metalexicographic literature are followed by empirical investigations of specific procedures of lexicographic practice adopted in MLDs. There is only one chapter of 25 pages which summarizes the results of research into a special aspect of metonymy and pedagogical lexicography, an empirical study on the coding practice connected with the count-mass distinction of metonymic lexemes in dictionaries.

First, I give an overview of the book under review, and then comment on some points of general interest. The structure of the volume is transparent. A brief Introduction, stating goals and procedure and presenting an overview of the monographs contents chapter by chapter, is followed in Chapter 1 by a quick selective tour of cognitive linguistic metonymy research. Various aspects and models that have been put forward since Lakoff & Johnson are dealt with, a report of research into the relationship of conceptual metonymy and grammar, an issue of great relevance for the present monograph, is however practically omitted.

The remaining part of the book, divided between 3 chapters, is a mixture of lite-

rature overview and a critical analysis of dictionaries (called "empirical study"), all of them closed uniformly by respective "Concluding remarks." The same structural schema characterizes allthe three chapters.

The whole of Chapter 2 is devoted to representation, arrangement and ordering of lexicalized metonymic senses in the microstructure of the 5 MLDs. Starting point of the theoretical overview is the issue of word sense disambiguation and sense ordering from a cognitive point of view with a special emphasis of the linearization problem connected with the presentation of lexical meaning in dictionaries. The empirical part of this chapter offers a critical analysis of lexicographic procedures regarding the representation of metonymic meanings in MLDs. The most interesting issue that crops up in this context is the notion of multiple metonymies, especially the distinction between so called independent multiple metonymies and metonymic chains.

Chapter 3 deals with dictionary definitions of metonymic meanings. Following the discussion of encyclopaedic vs. lexicographic definitions, reviewing criteria for dictionary definitions in MLDs, and taking up the issue of defining styles, this chapter focuses on the relations between basic and derived meanings as wellas on semantic elaboration in lexicographic definitions. The empirical part investigates the definitions of metonymic senses in MLDs. It is well documented that in most cases a sort of reference is made to the source of the metonymy by the definiendum, anaphoric reference or controlled defining vocabulary. At a closer look there seem to crop up however some problems with definitions, such as inconsistent use of reference strategies, weak semantic relation, absence of reference to the source, reference to the target in the definition of the source and misconceived direction of the transfer.

Chapter 4 is concerned with the role of codes, examples and definitions in the indication of the count-mass distinction in the case of metonymic lexemes. The associated empirical study compares the "Big Five" in terms of the effectiveness of the above mentioned coding devices in providing information on countability variation between source and target meanings of metonymy. The main body of the text closes with a brief unit titled "Conclusion" which mainly summarizes the findings of the comparative critical analysis of the five MLDs. The discrepancies between the dictionaries are stated as well as some inconsistencies within each dictionary according to all the criteria of analysis: word sense disambiguation, sense ordering, definition, codification and exemplification. This unit closes with suggestions as to how to avoid these documented inconsistencies and how to put forward a framework with calculable steps, with a special emphasis on template entries

worked out for the representation of regular metonymic transfers. In the closing section, the five MLDs under comparison are evaulated according to a set of variable criteria. MEDAL2 has been labeled "as the most successful from the cognitive perspective." (p. 168). The motivation for this choice is the fact that metonymic meanings are most often nested under the source of the transfer. MEDAL2 has been proved to be the best MLD regarding the transparent assignement of all the codes which is motivated by the extensive use of subsenses. Furthermore MEDAL has introduced metaphor boxes for an optimal representation of metaphoric meanings which serves as a model for Wojciechowska's proposal to establish metonymy boxes with the aim to introduce a more transparent coding system of metonymic meanings. As for other MLDs, COBUILD4 has achieved the best scores for exemplification, i.e. for the highest number of metonymic senses illustrated by examples. Finally, OALDCE7 has been found to offer the most examples coding the count-mass distinction.

The remaining part of the book, comprising 25 pages, contains 4 appendices that follow the References. These are tables with overviews of the detailed results of the empirical studies carried out in chapters 2, 3 and 4, respectively. Appendix A presents the findings of the comparative analysis of the "Big Five" according to the ordering of metonymic senses, Appendix B illustrates variation in the choice of definition types in the case of metonymic lexems, Appendix C summarizes variation in the use of grammatical indicators of the count-mass distinction, and finally Appendix D gives an overview of the absence of lexicographic codification of metonyms differing in countability.

The relationship between metonymy and grammar is in the focus of special attention in chapter 4 in the case of countability variation between source and target meanings. Wolchiechowska is, however, not aware of the fact that this issue has already been dealt with in great detail in cognitive linguistic research as she states the following: "Such differences are hardly ever commented on in the cognitive linguistic literature on metonymy with the exception of Radden – Dirven (2007)" (p. 137). A footnote is added, saying that: "There are quite a few publications on metonymy in grammar (e.g. Goossens 2000; Panther – Thornburg 2000, 2003a; Stefanowitsch 2003). Most of them, however, focus on the interaction between predicational metonymy (see 4.2.) and grammatical structure, or on the grammar of indirect speech acts" (p. 137, footnote 1). It should be however mentioned that there is a growing body of cognitive linguistic contributions as for example Barcelona (2004), Brdar (2009), Panther , Thornburg and Barcelona (2009), Ruiz de Mendoza (1999), Ruiz de Mendoza and Otal Campo (2002), to name only a few. Even more serious is the omission of Sweep's work which focuses on lexicographic aspects of

metonymy and grammar (cf. Sweep 2011, 2012).

To sum up: The title of the volume is somewhat misleading, it sets great expectations and reader looks forward to get offered an overarching integrative account of the relationship between "Conceptual Metonymy and Lexicographic Representation," as explicitly suggested by the wording of the title. These great expectations have been however not fulfilled because subject to investigation are only some aspects of the representation of metonymic meanings, with a special emphasis laid on variation in coding of the count-mass distinction. The second part of the title also appears to be too broad as it is evident that all the empirical investigations are carried out on a limited set of pedagogical dictionaries, the five MLDs. The proposed two way traffic between cognitive linguistic theory and lexicography remains also one of possible avenues for further research on this huge topic.

Dictionaries

Rundell, Michael (ed.). 2007. *Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners* (2nd edition). Oxford: Macmillan. [MEDAL2]

Sinclair, John (ed.). 2003. *Collins COBUILD English dictionary for advanced learners* (4th edition). Glasgow: HarprCollins. [COBUILD4]

Summers, Della (ed.). 2003. *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (4th edition). Harlow: Pearson Education. [LDOCE4]

Walter, Elizabeth (ed.). 2005. *Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [CALD2]

Wehmeier, Sally (ed.). 2005. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English* (7th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press. [OALDCE7]

References

Barcelona, Antonio. 2004. Metonymy behind grammar: The motivation of the seemingly "irregular" grammatical behavior of English paragon names. In Radden, Günter, & Panther, Klaus-Uwe (ed.), *Studies in linguistic motivation*, 321–355. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brdar, Mario. 2009. Metonymy-induced polysemy and the role of suffixation in its resolution in some Slavic languages. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7. 58–88.

Goossens, Louis. 2000. Patterns of meaning extension, "parallel chaining", subjectification, and modal shifts. In Barcelona, Antonio (ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: a cognitive perspective*, 149–169. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, & Thornburg, Linda. 2000. The EFFECT-FOR-CAUSE metonymy in English grammar. In Barcelona, Antonio (ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*, 215–231. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, & Thornburg, Linda. 2003. Metonymies as natural inference and activation schemas: The case of dependent clauses as independent speech acts. In Panther, Klaus-Uwe, & Thornburg, Linda (ed.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*, 127–147. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Thornburg, Linda L. & Barcelona, Antonio (ed.), (2009). *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ruiz de Mendoza, Francisco J. 1999. *Introducción a la Teoría Cognitiva de la Metonía*. Granada: Método Ediciones.

Ruiz de Mendoza, Francisco J., & Otal Campo José Luis. 2002. *Metonymy, grammar, and communication*. Albolote, Spain: Editorial Comares.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2003. A construction-based approach to indirect speech acts. In Panther, Klaus-Uwe, & Thornburg, Linda (ed.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*, 105–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sweep, Josefien (2011). Metonymical transfers: The complex relation of metonymy and grammar. *Linguistics in Amsterdam* 4(1). 1–36.

Sweep, Josefien. 2012. *Metonymical object changes: A corpus-oriented study on Dutch and German*. Utrecht: LOT.