

UDC 81'367.332.7'373.612.2

81.163.42:811.511.141

Original scientific paper

Received on 15.01. 2004.

Accepted for publication on 23.06.

2004.

**Rita Brdar-Szabó<sup>1</sup> & Mario Brdar<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Eötvös Loránd University

<sup>2</sup>University of Osijek

## **The MANNER FOR ACTIVITY metonymy across domains and languages\***

Since both metonymy and metaphor are, in the framework of cognitive linguistics, taken to be basic and universally attested processes that help shape conceptual structures and linguistic expressions, the tacit assumption has been that most high-level generalizations that have been established for English (or any other language that happened to provide the empirical confirmation of theoretical claims) should largely hold for other languages as well, discounting of course such language-specific factors as the availability of certain lexical items, etc. In other words, one might expect that similar arrays of metonymically motivated constructions will be found to be fairly frequent across languages. However, as Lakoff (1987) warns, it does not follow that various languages must make use of a particular metonymy in the same way, and in the same contexts. What is more, this universalist underpinning of cognitive research into metonymy may, if unwarranted, i.e. if not supported by cross-linguistic evidence (e.g. typological and contrastive), bring with it a danger of oversimplification and of overemphasizing similarities between languages and thus perhaps even preclude us from gaining some further valuable insights into the nature of the phenomenon. In Brdar and Brdar-Szabó (2003), it is shown that Croatian and Hungarian, unlike English, are reluctant to make use of the MANNER FOR

---

\* We would like to express our thanks to the following colleagues and friends for providing us with data and valuable comments on their native languages: Frank Brisard (Flemish), Stephanie Haussner and Ulrich Langanke (German), Elżbieta Górska (Polish), and Natalia Cseresznyés (Russian).

ACTIVITY metonymy in the domain of linguistic action. In order to check whether the observed cross-linguistic differences are merely incidental, due perhaps to some idiosyncratic fact of Croatian and Hungarian, the comparison is extended (i) by systematically examining the same general type of metonymy in a number of different, more or less related domains (e.g. cognitive activity, physical activity, etc.), and (ii) by adding data from some other Germanic and Slavic languages. Finding some degree of consistency in the use or non-use of this metonymy across domains and languages should contribute towards formulating the set of constraints at work in this area, as well as towards refining the existing typologies of metonymies.

**Key words:** predicational metonymy, typology of metonymies, active zone, ICM, linguistic action, scenario, frame, metaphor

## 1. Introduction

Metonymy is a universally attested cognitive phenomenon that fundamentally shapes conceptual structures and linguistic expressions in all human languages, in one way or another. It does not follow from this sort of universality, however, that all human languages must avail themselves of metonymy in exactly the same way. Lakoff (1987: 78) was among the first to warn that “[s]ince such general principles are not the same in all languages, one cannot simply say that anything can stand for anything else in the right context.” Thus one of the central tasks in metonymy research is to find out which principles work in which language. In a similar vein, Fauconnier (1994: 10), in discussing metonymies of the type *The ham sandwich is getting impatient*, or *Plato is on the top shelf*, observes that there appears to be a lot of variation at different levels: “This implies possible variation from community to community, from context to context, from individual to individual.”

Since the late 1990s a considerable number of insightful studies have been published that are based on an impressive body of data and have led to a number of tentative universal generalizations. Most have, however, dealt with English material and have tacitly assumed that most high-level generalizations should largely hold for other languages as well. The time is now ripe to tackle the question of how universal conceptual metonymies are from a wider cross-linguistic perspective.

This research task was prefigured in Kalisz (1983), though not addressed directly, and, more importantly, not studied in a broader research context. More recently, we note a growing interest in this issue, which has materialized in a series of fine-grained contrastive studies of the use of metonymic models, for example, those by Panther and Thornburg (1999a, b). These studies are very promising because they indicate that further efforts of this sort, particularly if paralleled by large-scale typological studies, could help uncover a

wealth of hitherto unsuspected facts, correlations, and generalizations, and thus contribute towards filling out and/or revising the general picture.

With this goal in mind, we set out in the present paper to examine the frequency of, and conditions for, the use of linguistic expressions that are instantiations of a cluster of conceptual metonymies in a range of Germanic (English, Flemish, German) and Slavic languages (Russian, Polish, Croatian), as well as in Hungarian. We expect our findings to contribute not only towards formulating the set of constraints that seems to be at work in this area by establishing at least some degree of consistency in the use or non-use of metonymy across domains and languages, but also to bear on the fundamental nature of metonymy and to suggest how existing typologies of metonymies can be refined so as to enable an integration of various proposals.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we provide some background on the existing typologies of metonymy. Section 3 is a brief case study addressing the issue of the cross-linguistic universality of referential metonymy. Section 4, the main thrust of the paper, presents some very conspicuous contrastive differences in the use of the MANNER FOR ACTIVITY metonymy in three related domains. Section 5 evaluates the findings of both sections 3 and 4 by relating them to factors such as the type of metonymic mapping, the domain involved, the discourse-pragmatic as well as the syntactic function of metonymic expressions, and, last but not least, to some structural properties of the languages involved.

## 2. Typologies of metonymy

Typologies of metonymies have been proposed in the past (cf. Ullmann 1962; Schifko 1979, Ducháček 1967), but it is recent years that have seen several significant contributions to a cognitively based typology of metonymies, such as Kövecses and Radden (1998), Radden and Kövecses (1999), Panther and Thornburg (1999b: 335f), Seto (1999), and Blank (1999). In this section, we review some of the cognitively spirited attempts.

Within the framework of a pragmatic typology of metonymies proposed in Panther and Thornburg (1999b: 335f), expressions like the ones highlighted in (1) and (2) below are characterized as instances of propositional metonymy. Propositional metonymies come in two subtypes: in a referential metonymy, exemplified in (1), one referring expression, usually a noun phrase, is the vehicle for an implied target that is also a referring expression normally realized as a noun phrase; in a predicational metonymy, illustrated in (2) below, one propositional content stands for another propositional content. The third type of discourse-pragmatic metonymy, extensively discussed in Thornburg and Panther (1997) and Panther and Thornburg (1998), is illocutionary metonymy where one illocutionary act stands for another illocutionary act. Since this

type is not directly relevant to the present paper, it will not be discussed here in any detail. Consider now some examples of propositional metonymies:

- (1)
  - a. Most successful is the Guggenheim, which operates flourishing satellites in Venice, Berlin, and, most recently, Bilbao, Spain. That branch, which opened in 1997, has proved highly lucrative, both for the Guggenheim and for Spain. In addition to spending \$100 million to build the museum, the Basque regional government paid the Guggenheim a one-time fee of \$20 million and subsidizes *the Bilbao's* \$12 million annual budget. But the returns on that investment have been substantial; in the 18 months since *the Bilbao* opened, tourism in the Basque region has increased by 28 percent.
  - b. Only one in eight M.P.s in *Westminster* is a woman, but this is because British antidiscrimination laws bar the party from stacking its lists of parliamentary candidates in women's favor.
- (2)
  - a. Well, look, I mean, abortion is an issue where Governor Bush has been pretty *clear*.
  - b. My first concern in attacking a town garden is to be quite *clear as to* the result I am after.
  - c. Karolyi, whose Belanese riffs on the English language can be unfathomable, was *clear about* the benefits of a more uniform training approach and a more homogenized national style, as in champion Romania.

In (1a-b) we find some typical examples of referential metonymies. In (1a) a name of a town, *Bilbao*, is used to refer to an institution in that locality, i.e. a recently opened satellite of the Guggenheim Museum. Interestingly, there is a formal clue prompting a metonymic interpretation. It is a well-known fact of English grammar that names of museums are normally preceded by a definite article, in counterdistinction to the zero article in front of proper names that are used to simply refer to localities such as towns, cities, counties, etc. (apart from a handful of exceptions such as *the Hague*, *the Bronx*, etc.). The example in (1b) again appears to be the vanilla-type of referential metonymy in which a noun inherently denoting a place, here a part of London, is used metonymically to denote an institution saliently associated with the locality named, in this case the British Parliament.

Metonymy, although ubiquitous, is apt to be frequently overlooked, and this seems particularly true of predicational metonymies, such as the ones illustrated in (2a-c). In these cases predicative adjectives refer to the manner in which various activities are performed that are sometimes named explicitly in complements of adjectives or are only inferable from them or from the larger

context. Here we understand ‘manner’ in a very broad sense so as to also include indications of whether an activity took place or not, etc.

These activities may belong to several related types. They may refer to rather physical aspects of one’s behavior, or to less tangible ones, such as emotive reactions. They can also refer to cognitive activities and to linguistic actions (speaking being the default type, but written communication is also attested). It would be tempting to check in which domains metonymic uses of these adjectives appeared first in order to establish the pattern of polysemy and find out the direction of the spread of this metonymic shift. We surmise that it may have appeared in the domain of general behavior before it occurred in the domain of linguistic action. It would also be interesting to consider the role of metaphorical mappings in facilitating this putative spread. For the time being, due to lack of space, these issues remain only avenues for further research.

These activities can occasionally be quite difficult to keep apart, which is no wonder, given the intimate links between thinking and behavior on the one hand, and between thinking and speaking on the other. However, it stands to reason that while *clear* in (2a) may be interpreted as metonymically standing for either a cognitive process ‘think, have an opinion’, or for a previous linguistic action whose subject matter was abortion, the other two examples are less problematic: *clear* in (2b) is quite likely to be about the subject’s cognitive action, i.e. planning a garden design, while *clear* in (2c) rather refers to the manner in which the president phrased his words.

Although Radden and Kövecses’ (1999) typology of metonymic relations does not explicitly mention the MANNER FOR ACTIVITY metonymy, it may provisionally be characterized as relating whole ICMs to conceptual entities that function as their parts. More precisely, a part of an event stands for the whole event. In Seto’s (1999) system, the MANNER FOR ACTIVITY metonymy would be closest to temporal metonymies of the whole event-subevent type, where the notion of subevent is extended in the case of reporting verbs in such a way that “the sounds, manners, gestures, etc. that accompany events can all be good candidates for the metonymy of this type” (Seto 1999: 107).

This brings us to yet another sort of attempt at typologizing metonymies. Whereas in the above mentioned approach the primary concern is the discourse-pragmatic function of the metonymy, in this second research tradition the starting point is the types of metonymic mapping within a domain, i.e. within an ICM. The two most general types of mapping are: (i) from whole ICM to its part(s), (ii) from parts of an ICM to other parts of the same ICM. The former may involve Thing-and-Part ICM, Scale ICM, the Constitution ICM, the Event ICM, etc., while the latter may involve Action ICM, Perception ICM, Causation ICM, Production ICM, Location ICM, etc. Practically all of these have more specific subtypes, depending on which parts of the ICM are involved.

The two typologies overlap in some interesting ways. Thus, for example, the two variants of the Whole ICM and Its Parts metonymy within the Thing-and-Part ICM, WHOLE THING FOR PART OF THE THING and PART OF A THING FOR THE WHOLE THING generally tend to function as referential metonymies. The same is often true of PLACE FOR INSTITUTION and PLACE FOR EVENT variants of the Parts of an ICM metonymy within the Location ICM. This seems to indicate that an attempt at plotting the two typologies against each other may lead to a more comprehensive typology and even result in some novel and valuable insights.

### 3. Are there any constraints on referential metonymies?

The sheer number of variants of referential metonymies may be one of the reasons why in-depth studies of their cross-linguistic availability are still lacking. A superficial look at various types in a number of languages may give the impression that referential metonymies are relatively unconstrained. However, a closer look reveals that there are some subtle differences among languages and linguistic communities in this area that have to do with cognitive and discourse-pragmatic factors, which at the same time appear to reflect differences in cultural codes of the respective communities. We will first document the existence of such differences with some metonymies involving names of places, and then examine the syntactic environment in which expressions may appear that are normally thought of as referential metonymies.

In some instantiations of the PLACE FOR INSTITUTION metonymy names of capital cities are used to refer to governments of countries, or some other political authority. This phenomenon seems to be widespread:

- (3)a. IMF and World Bank present *Moscow* with reform programme.
- b. Second, his administration will not try to block *Beijing's* bid for the 2008 Olympic Games.

But when examining the PLACE FOR INSTITUTION metonymy cross-linguistically one should be careful to note that the phenomenon is practically limited to a certain type of discourse, viz. to *journalese*. This observation may appear idiosyncratic at first, but we will show below that such a distribution is motivated by interplay of pragmatic, cognitive and cultural factors. What is more, it can be easily observed that names of capitals are used in this way only in certain types of articles, most of the time in news on international affairs i.e. on relationships between countries, then in business news, but relatively infrequently in news on domestic affairs.

This last observation in fact squares with our finding that in some communities journalists are not so ready to use the name of the capital of their own

country in this way, while they often refer to other countries' governments in this way. What we presume to be playing an important role here are pragmatic factors such as perspective and the degree of empathy or its lack (i.e. detachment) that the journalist feels (and, of course, his or her public, if it adopts the perspective he or she suggests) towards the authority in question. What, on the other hand, underlies this way of marking the perspective and expression of empathy, i.e. what makes them possible is in our opinion a variant of the conceptual metaphor EMOTIONAL DISTANCE IS DISTANCE IN PHYSICAL SPACE.

This explains why the majority of the instances of this metonymy make mention of other countries' capitals – there is not enough distance, not only in physical space. This does not mean that, e.g. a Croatian newspaper article will never use *Zagreb* to refer to the Croatian government. In fact, a probe of the newspaper subcorpus of the 30 million words Croatian National Corpus reveals that it is actually used metonymically in a number of instances. There were six instances of this type of metonymy among the first 200 tokens of *Zagreb*. It is telling, however, that all the six examples come from an opposition paper, which becomes even more significant if one considers the fact that the papers sampled in the subcorpus seem to be politically biased in such a way that the number of pro-government papers outnumbers the number of opposition papers, the ratio being at least 2 to 1 in favor of the former. In other words, if a paper, or an article, assumes a more critical overtone towards the government, the emotional distance increases, and this is expressed in terms of physical distance, i.e. a metonymic use of the capital's name becomes more frequent.

In the German example in (4), we note that the name of Germany's former capital is used in a way that is unexpected, i.e. it goes against what we have just stipulated. However, on closer inspection it turns out not to threaten our claim. The paper in question is a national one, but the news itself is reported from Munich:

(4) *Bonn gab Zusage für Kanal-Bau* [*Die Welt*, October 5 1982, 5]

As far as our Croatian data are concerned, we note that in terms of their circulation, all the papers in this subcorpus are national. A different perspective may, however, be assumed in media that have more limited circulation, i.e. in regional and local papers. However, since they are generally less concerned with international affairs, the overall number of referential metonymies under study sharply decreases. In both, national and regional/local media, the change of perspective may be achieved by explicitly stating at the beginning of the article the “deictic center”, i.e. the locality other than the capital from which the correspondent reports, or by introducing quotes or semi-quotes attributed to a source outside the country or the capital, which again licenses this type of metonymy.

It would be interesting to check whether this could be extended in the other direction as well, i.e. in the case of supranational or global media. This could perhaps explain the relatively high incidence of *Washington* in *Newsweek* and *Time* which are international news magazines. However, we must leave open some room for potential cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences, i.e. that in some cultural environments and linguistic communities it is a perfectly normal and usual way of referring to their capitals. On the other hand, if our assumption about the underlying metaphor holds, it could be possible to see a relatively low frequency of the occurrence of this type of metonymy as an index of national homogeneity, i.e. in times of external threats and of increased national unity, it is difficult to establish and maintain public critical distance towards one's government. It would be worthwhile to check this hypothesis and see whether there is a constant increase in the use of *Zagreb* in this type of metonymy over a longer period of time, particularly contrasting the periods before 1990 and afterwards, as well as the early 1990s and the period towards the end of the 1990s, when the war was over and the territorial integrity of the country was restored, which changed priorities and created room for more dissent with the government concerning international relationships and basic issues of democracy. This is a different political and cultural climate from that of the first half of the same decade, during which period the war raged both in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The use of such referential metonymies correlating with genuine physical distance need not be only an expression of detachment due to objectivity and neutrality. It is interesting to note that in some linguistic communities, or their parts, such metonymies are more likely to be used to refer to governments of countries that are seen as ideological or otherwise opponents, or to governments of countries of which the community in question has a relatively low opinion, while allies and countries in good esteem are treated differently. At least the first part of this claim can be exemplified with a random sample of articles in *Berliner Zeitung* from the early 1980s, when the former German Democratic Republic was a faithful satellite of the USSR. In the period in question there regularly appeared articles that were extremely critical of Israel, which was an ally of the USA, and therefore an enemy of the Soviet bloc. Israel was also perceived as the archenemy of many Arab states, which were, in turn, leaning towards the USSR. It is then not surprising that some of the issues we inspected yielded the following headlines:

- (5) a. Demonstration gegen Terror *Tel Avivs*  
 '?!Demonstration against Tel Aviv's terror'  
 [*Berliner Zeitung*, July 9/10, 1983, 5]
- b. *Tel Aviv* baut Siedlungen im Westjordangebiet weiter aus  
 '?!Tel Aviv further extends settlements in the area of West Jordan'  
 [*Berliner Zeitung*, July 9/10, 1983, 1]

- c. *Tel Aviv* baut Kriegsanleihe auf  
'Tel Aviv builds up war loan'  
[*Berliner Zeitung*, July 31/August 1, 1982, 5]
- d. *Tel Avivs* Besatzerpolitik wird einmütig verurteilt  
'Tel Aviv's occupation policy is unanimously condemned'  
[*Berliner Zeitung*, July 30/31, 1983, 1]

Similarly, the large number of tokens of *Brussels* used metonymically to refer to the European Community in various languages may be at least in part due to the skepticism toward the Community in many European countries as well as to the criticism of its bureaucratic practices.

Another possibility we observed in Croatian – a strategy to avoid using the name of the capital – was to use a similar low-level metonymy that effectively increases the relative distance by zooming in on smaller localities within the capital. The president of the republic, the government, and the parliament are referred to by mentioning very specific parts of Zagreb, an elite area of Zagreb in which the president's office is situated (*Pantovčak*), the building which is the seat of the government (*Banski dvori*), and the name of the square in which the building of the parliament is (*Markov trg*). This division of political power is, of course, also reflected in the use of metonymies in many other languages, e.g. by the use of *Westminster*, *Whitehall*, *10 Downing Street* (and perhaps *Buckingham Palace*), *the White House* and *the Capitol*, or *die Hofburg* for the center of Austrian political life.

The second type of Parts of an ICM metonymy within the Location ICM is the PLACE FOR EVENT variant in which names of cities and towns are used to refer to various types of events; in our examples they mostly refer to complex events involving international conferences, agreements, pacts, treaties, accords, processes, etc., illustrated in the following set of English examples:

- (6) a. Critics of *the Kyoto treaty* have long argued that this summary can only have been the result of political sleight of hand. [...]  
This treaty is the framework for *the Kyoto process*. [...]  
And, though the sceptics on the NAS panel itself have rushed to make it clear that their report does not, in any way, endorse *Kyoto*, that is largely because the report offers no views whatsoever on any policy options. [*Economist*, June 16, 2001, 88]
- b. For European Union officials it was a bitter blow that Ireland—of all countries—should reject *the Nice treaty*. [...]  
It still seems unlikely that Ireland's no to *Nice* will stymie enlargement. [*Economist*, June 16, 2001, 37]

- c. *The Nuremberg and Tokyo processes* both invigorated the post-war development of international criminal and humanitarian law, and prompted wider efforts to clarify the future prosecution of acts of inhumanity. In December 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN) unanimously adopted the key “principles” of *the Nuremberg Tribunal*. Two years later, the UN Convention on Genocide came into force and in the 1950s the UN’s International Law Commission began its long-running attempt to establish a “Code of Offences Against the Peace and Security of Mankind”. More broadly still, the post-war development of human rights is also, in part, attributable to *Nuremberg*. [*Encarta Encyclopedia Deluxe* 2000]

The same phenomenon is again recorded in a wide range of languages; cf. the following examples from German, Croatian and Hungarian. Where languages, however, seem to differ is the degree of ease with which the name of a locality may be picked up to refer to an event. Croatian and Hungarian seem to contrast here to a degree with English and German. It is possible for a linguist to be understood by a relatively small circle of his or her colleagues if he or she says in Croatian something like *This year’s Opatija was a real success*, where *Opatija* refers the annual conference of the Croatian Association for Applied Linguistics which now traditionally takes place in this seaside resort. It could be in fact understood to mean either that the whole conference was a success or that it was a success for someone who read his or her paper there, or both. The same would be unimaginable before a more general public. More or less the same holds for Hungarian. In both, the events that can be referred to in this way must be culturally salient, i.e. be firmly established and relevant to the whole community and have relatively long-standing consequences, e.g. the Trianon Peace Treaty in Hungarian referred to simply as *Trianon*, as in (7), and the Marian apparition in Međugorje, or the recent Vukovar battle simply as *Međugorje* and *Vukovar*, respectively, as in (8a-b):

- (7) *Trianon* után minden megváltozott.  
Trianon after everything changed

- (8)a. Tako je bilo i kad se dogodio Lourdes  
thus AUX been too when REFL happened Lourdes  
i kad se dogodila Fatima, a prije  
and when REFL happened Fatima and before  
pada Berlinskog zida javlja se i  
fall Berlin wall appears REFL too

*Međugorje*.  
Međugorje

- b. Poslije *Vukovara*, premješten je u Zagreb.  
after Vukovar transferred AUX:3SG:MASC to Zagreb

However, it appears that in English and German such requirements need not be fulfilled. Even a minimal background, e.g. an article-size piece of discourse, or even less (i.e. the introductory part of an article) is enough to introduce and ground such a metonymy, as in the English examples (6a) and (6b), or in the German example in (9):

- (9) Da können sie noch so originelle Ausreden suchen. Da können sie behaupten, das Votum gegen *den Vertrag von Nizza* sei nur eines einer uniformierten Minderheit gewesen. In Göteborg wurde auch ihnen klar, daß *Nizza* nie wieder passieren darf. [...] Weil *Nizza* nie wieder passieren darf, soll nun ein Konvent einberufen werden, der die nächste EU-Reform vorbereitet. [*Die Presse*, June 16-17, 2001]

Finally, in our third representative example of referential metonymy we consider some metonymies based on the Constitution ICM, viz. metonymies of the type MATERIAL CONSTITUTING AN OBJECT FOR THE OBJECT, as in *oil* for an *oil painting*. Again, this type of metonymic model is widely available in many languages. We note however that these metonymic expressions can be used in the predicative position too, and still have the same referential function in the sense of assigning an entity to a class:

- (10) a. This is *an oil*.

If, on the other hand, these expressions are used predicatively as in:

- (10) b. This portrait is *oil*.

they assume a different function, i.e. they no longer simply assign an entity to a class but rather assign a property to it. Note the zero article in the second example, in contrast to the first. We may stipulate that there is a gradual shift here from a straightforward referential metonymy to something that is closer to a predicational one. Interestingly, although such constructions are perfectly normal in English, they are infelicitous or downright unacceptable in languages such as Croatian or Hungarian.

As an interim conclusion, we may say that referential metonymy is indeed very productive and that some of the constraints on its productivity, which are discursively and pragmatically motivated, seem to be more or less universal in spite of some apparent cross-linguistic contrasts. On the other hand, as we shift from the purely referential metonymy towards those that are more predication-like, the nature of constraints seems to change as well. In the following

section we now turn to one type of predicational metonymy in three related domains in a variety of languages.

#### 4. On MANNER FOR ACTIVITY metonymies

The following sets of examples introduce the MANNER FOR ACTIVITY type of metonymy in the three domains we shall be concerned with, viz. the domain of linguistic action, the domain of cognitive activity, and the domain of general behavior:

- (11) a. At least, I've been *open* about it.  
 b. Sheila wasn't very *definite* on the point.  
 c. Yes – and be *direct* about the effect of his work.
- (12) a. But, 25 years later, Reagan is more *mature* about such things and, anyway, he is not running for a professorship of intellectual history.  
 b. It should help you overcome any natural shyness when you realize that most men are very *naive* about the female sexual response cycle.  
 c. My first concern in attacking a town garden is to be quite *clear* as to the result I am after.
- (13) a. The investors are learning to be more *demanding* about what companies do with their money.  
 b. Mother was very fine and *dignified* about it all.

Now that we have provided some background on this type of metonymy, we proceed to consider how this particular type of metonymy is represented in various languages in the three domains, paying special attention to whether the adjective can be used metonymically or not, i.e. whether it is replaced by the targeted verb. If the metonymic extension is allowed, we check how the active zone is specified, i.e. whether this happens by means of complements, as in English, or by some adjunct-like structures. The term 'active zone' is used here in the sense of Tuggy (1986) and Langacker (1995) to refer to an element that points to the intended target of a metonymy and prompts the metonymic reading. Only the analysis of the first domain, that of linguistic action, will be exemplified in great detail; the results of the analysis for the remaining two domains will be presented in a compressed form.

#### 4.1. MANNER FOR LINGUISTIC ACTION metonymies across languages

That the English constructions under investigation are really MANNER FOR ACTION metonymies seems to be borne out by the fact that the targets of the predicational metonymies may surface in the broader context. They are frequently found in a neighboring sentence or clause:

- (14) a. Reichenbach is not very *specific* about what R is; all he *says* is that R is the time of some other event.  
b. Children hear what parents *are saying* about each other, and if parents are being extremely *negative* about the other parent the children will hear that.

Similarly, a non-verbal expression explicitly or implicitly referring to the domain in question may appear in the broader context; cf. example (15) in which the NP *an account like this* justifies the assumption that *precise about* stands metonymically for a linguistic action verb (either of spoken or of written communication):

- (15) I mean a kind of light-in-the-being, a thing difficult to be *precise about*, especially in *an account like this*, where so many cantankerous erroneous silly and delusive objects, actions and phenomena are in the foreground. [Saul Bellow, *Humboldt's Gift*]

Further, we note that most of the predicative adjectives in the construction under consideration take prepositional complements introduced by *about*, which provides a clue as to the targeted verbs of linguistic action, or verbs of cognitive or emotive activities, since this same preposition frequently introduces prepositional complements of verbs of linguistic action such as *speak* or *talk*.

As might have been expected, the other two Germanic languages in the sample, Flemish, cf. (16) and German, but particularly the former, come much closer to English than the other languages in terms of correspondences that can be observed here. The first two examples are structurally very close to English; they exhibit predicative adjectives followed by prepositional phrases that look like complements. However, in some cases Flemish defaults to explicit mention of the targeted verb of linguistic action, as in (16c):

- (16) a. Ik ben er tenminste *open over* geweest.  
I am there at least open about been.  
b. Sheilawas niet erg *precies/duidelijk op/over* dit  
Sheilawas not very precise/clear on/about this

- punt.  
point.
- c. Ja - en bespreek *onmiddellijk/zonde* *omwegen* het  
Yes - and address directly/without deviances the  
effect van zijn werk.  
effect of his work.

There is only one German counterpart in the linguistic action domain, (17a'), that appears to exhibit a prepositional phrase complementing a predicative adjective and specifying the active zone. However, it is felt by native speakers to be rather colloquial. The variant with a verb of linguistic action modified by an adverb that corresponds to the English predicative adjective is more widely used. In both cases the preposition is *über* 'about/over', which is ubiquitous in the function of introducing complements. Otherwise, we note that German makes use of prepositional adjuncts, paraphrasable by adverbial clauses, or, simply reverts to explicit mention of the targeted verbs.

- (17) a.' Ich war ja wenigstens offen darüber.  
I was well at-least open it-about
- a." Ich habe ja wenigstens offen darüber  
I AUX well at-least open-ADV it-about  
gesprochen.  
spoken
- a.'" Ich war ja wenigstens offen, als ich darüber  
I COP well at-least open when I it-about  
sprach.  
spoke
- b.' Sie war nicht sehr entschlossen bei diesem Punkt.  
she COP not very definite at this point
- b." Sie sprach nicht sehr entschlossen über diesen Punkt.  
she spoke not very definitely about this point
- c.' \*Ja, und sei direkt/ganz offen über den Effekt  
yes, and be direct very open about the effect  
seiner Arbeit.  
his-GEN work
- c." Ja, und sei direkt (ganz offen) im Zusammenhang mit dem  
yes, and be direct very open in connection with the  
Effekt seiner Arbeit.  
effect his-GEN work

- c. <sup>'''</sup> Ja, und sprich ganz offen über den Effekt seiner Arbeit.  
yes and speak quite openly about the effect his-GEN work
- c. <sup>'''</sup> Ja, und sei direkt (ganz offen), wenn du mit ihm über  
yes and be direct quite open when you with him about  
den Effekt seiner Arbeit sprichst.  
the effect his-GEN work speak

The three Slavic languages in the sample are very similar to each other in scarcely allowing predicative adjectives in the metonymic sense to be followed by prepositional phrases as genuine complements. The Croatian sentence (18b'), which appears to contain a genuine PP complement, is downright ungrammatical. The preposition *glede* 'concerning/as regards' in (18a) typically introduces adjuncts and not complements, but even this preposition is at best doubtful for most native speakers. In Polish, (19a'-b'), and in Russian, examples (20a'-a''), the situation is very similar, but even a non-complement-introducing preposition appears to be ruled out. Note that the NPs following the preposition in Croatian are headed by a pronoun. If the NP were headed by a full lexical noun, the prepositional phrases would become considerably worse.

- (18) a. ?Barem sam bio otvoren glede toga.  
at-least AUX COP open concerning that
- b. ? \*Sheila nije bila vrlo određena o tome.  
Sheila NEG-AUX COP very definite about that
- (19) a. ? \*Przynajmniej byłem o tym otwarty.  
at-least COP:1SG about it open.
- b. ? \*Sheila nie była bardzo zdecydowana w tym punkcie.  
Sheila NEG COP:SG very definite/decided in this point.
- (20) a. ? \*V konce koncov ja byl otkryt ob etom.  
in end-PREP end-PL-GEN I was open about this-PREP
- a. <sup>''</sup> \*V konce koncov ja byl otkryt v etom voprose  
in end-PREP end-PL-GEN I was open in this-PREP issue-PREP

More natural counterparts in these languages are predicative adjectives followed by finite adverbial clauses specifying the activity in question (although

they are not necessarily deemed acceptable in Russian), or, still better, more compact monoclausal counterparts where the English adjective is rendered as an adverb or as part of an adverb functioning as a manner adjunct (cf. Polish example (19b<sup>'''</sup>)) and the activity is explicitly named by the verbal part of the predicate. Cf. some examples from Croatian:

- (18) b.<sup>''</sup>?Sheila nije bila vrlo određena kada je  
Sheila NEG-AUX COP very definite when AUX  
o tome govorila.  
about that spoke
- c. I da – govori izravno o učinku njegovog  
and yes speak directly about effect his-GEN  
djela.  
work-GEN

from Polish:

- (19) a.<sup>''</sup> Przynajmniej mówiłem o tym otwarcie.  
at-least spoke-1SG about it openly-Adv.
- b.<sup>''</sup> Sheila nie była zbyt pewna, kiedy o  
Sheila NEG COP:3SG too-much sure, when about  
tym mówiła.  
it spoke-1SG:FEM
- b.<sup>'''</sup> Sheila nie mówiła o tej sprawie w sposób  
Sheila NEG spoke about this matter in manner  
zdecydowany.  
decided-Adj.

and from Russian:

- (20) a.<sup>'''</sup> V konce koncov ja otkryto govoril  
in end-PREP end-PL-GEN I open-ADV spoke  
ob etom.  
about this-PREP
- a.<sup>'''</sup>?V konce koncov ja byl otkryt,  
in end-PREP end-PL-GEN I COP:1SG open  
kogda govoril ob etom.  
when spoke about this-PREP
- b.<sup>'</sup>?Sonja ne byla očen' rešitel'na, kogda  
Sonja NEG COP:3SG very definite when

- govorila ob etom voprose.  
spoke about this-PREP question-PREP
- b.” Sonja ne govorila očēn’ rešitel’no ob etom  
Sonja NEG spoke very definite-ADV about this-PREP  
voprose.  
matter-PREP

Finally, Hungarian appears very close to Russian: both languages are wary of metonymic extensions of predicative adjectives. Practically all postpositional phrases are as good as unacceptable. There are, of course, as in the other languages, constructions that explicitly mention the targeted verbs of linguistic action in which the adjective is relegated to the status of a manner adverbial:

- (21) a.’ \*Legalább nyílt voltam erről.  
at-least open COP:1SG it-about
- a.” \*Legalább nyílt voltam ezzel kapcsolatban.  
at-least open COP:1SG it-with connection-in
- a.”” Legalább nyíltan beszéltem erről.  
at-least open-ADV spoke it-about
- a.””” Legalább nyíltan megmondtam ezt.  
at-least open-ADV said it-ACC
- b.’ \*Sára nem volt valami határozott ezen a  
Sára NEG COP:3SG quite definite this-on the  
ponton.  
point-on
- b.” ?Sára nem volt valami határozott ezzel a  
Sára NEG COP:3SG quite definite this-with the  
dologgal kapcsolatban.  
thing-with connection-in
- b.”” Sára nem beszélt valami határozottan erről.  
Sára NEG spoke quite definite-ADV it-about
- b.””” Sára nem nyilatkozott valami határozottan erről.  
Sára NEG stated quite definite-ADV it-about

#### 4.2. *MANNER FOR ACTION metonymies in the domain of cognitive action and in the domain of general behavior*

Now that we have outlined the range of possible variation in the specification of the active zone of the metonymically used adjectives as well as alternatives that explicitly refer to the targeted verb in the domain of linguistic action, we cut the story short in the other two domains because the situation in these is very similar to what we have just demonstrated, apart from the fact that there are now hardly any adverbial clauses mentioning the targeted verb as active zone specifications. We therefore just list the possibilities and illustrate them with a selection of examples from various languages.

Flemish again exhibits constructions with predicative adjectives complemented by prepositional adjectives in the domain of cognitive action, just like English, but in the case of our sample sentences involving the domain of general behavior, the most natural translations refer explicitly to verbs denoting behavior and the English adjectives are rendered as adverbs. Prepositional phrases that follow function as adjuncts. In fact, even the constructions with predicatively used adjectives in the domain of cognitive action sound more natural if followed by such adjunct-like prepositional phrases as *met betrekking tot* 'with respect to'.

- (22) a. *Daarover* zijn ze erg vastberaden.  
there-about are they very determined.  
'He was very earnest/serious about it.'
- (23) a. Moeder gedroeg zich erg edel en *waardig in* dit  
Mother behaved REFL very fine and dignified in this  
alles.  
all.
- b. 'Hij is werkelijk erg *verstandig* geweest *in* de hele  
'He is really very intelligent been in the whole  
affaire,' zei Tommy.  
affair,' said Tommy

As for the other languages in our sample, the closest they come to the English constructions in (10-12), is the occasional use of prepositional phrases of the 'concerning/with respect to' type as adverbials after adjectives. The most natural counterparts in both domains are again constructions explicitly mentioning the targeted verbs followed by adverbs of manner corresponding to the English adjectives. Cf. the following sets of German and Croatian data:

- (24) a. \*Er war sehr ernst darüber.  
he COP:3SG very earnest it-about

- a." \*Er war sehr ernst hinsichtlich dieser Sache.  
he COP:3SG very earnest concerning this-GEN matter
- a." Er meinte es sehr ernst.  
He thought it very earnest-ADV
- (25) a.' Mutter war sehr feinfühlig (dezent) und würdevoll  
Mother COP:3SG very decent and dignified  
in Bezug auf das alles.  
in relation on that all
- a." Mutter verhielt sich sehr feinfühlig und würdevoll  
Mother behaved REFL very decently and dignified-ADV  
hinsichtlich der ganzen Sache.  
concerning the-GEN whole matter
- a." Mutter verhielt sich sehr feinfühlig und  
Mother behaved REFL very decently and  
würdevoll in dieser Situation/Gelegenheit.  
dignified-ADV in this situation matter
- (26) a. Ozbiljno je to mislio.  
earnestly AUX that thought
- (27) a.' \*Majka je bila jako pristojna i  
Mother AUX COP:3SG very fine and  
dostojanstvena o tome.  
dignified about that
- a." Majka je bila jako pristojna i  
Mother AUX COP:3SG very fine and  
dostojanstvena glede toga.  
dignified concerning that
- a." Majka se glede toga ponašala jako pristojno  
Mother REFL concerning that behaved very fine-ADV  
i dostojanstveno.  
and dignified-ADV

### 4.3. Overview of contrasts across the three domains

Table 1 presents the similarities and differences among the seven languages with respect to the availability of the MANNER FOR ACTION type of predicational metonymy with adjectival predicates.

Language	Domain	Construction type			
		Verbal predicate modified by adverbial of manner	Adjectival predicate exhibiting metonymy - active zone is specified by		
			Adverbial clause	Adverbial PP	Complement PP
English	Linguistic	(+)	(+)	(+)	+
	Cognitive	(+)	-	(+)	+
	Behavior	(+)	-	(+)	+
Flemish	Linguistic	+	-	+	+
	Cognitive	?	?	+	+
	Behavior	+	?	+	(+)
German	Linguistic	+	+	+	(+)
	Cognitive	+	-	-	-
	Behavior	+	(??)	+	-
Croatian	Linguistic	+	+	(+)	(??)
	Cognitive	+	-	-	-
	Behavior	+	-	(+)	-
Polish	Linguistic	+	+	+	-
	Cognitive	+	?	+	-
	Behavior	+	?	+	-
Russian	Linguistic	+	(?)	(?)	-
	Cognitive	+	-	-	-
	Behavior	+	-	-	-
Hungarian	Linguistic	+	+	(?)	-
	Cognitive	+	-	(?)	-
	Behavior	+	-	(?)	-

Table 1. Cross-linguistic availability of the MANER FOR ACTION type of predicational metonymy with adjectival predicates, and its verbal counterparts

We may now summarize our contrastive findings. A general impression from the comparison of the above constructions in the seven languages is that English and Flemish exhibit this type of metonymy with predicative adjectives complemented by prepositional phrases. The other languages in the sample hardly allow the adjectives to be complemented in this way, or not at all.

At the same time there is a remarkable degree of similarity among all the languages – they all allow paraphrases in which the predicative adjective is followed by adverbial structures, clauses and/or prepositional phrases. The important difference, however, is that while these are possible in English but, statistically speaking, underused because the adjective complementation seems to be the preferred variant, in the other languages these paraphrases are often stylistically much better, or even the default option, complement prepositional phrases being utterly ungrammatical.

We also note that across the three domains these languages very frequently make use of paraphrases in which the target verbs (of linguistic action, cognitive action, and of behavior) or its cognate appear explicitly, followed by an adverb which corresponds to the English predicative adjective, which means that there is no metonymy at all in these languages in such counterparts.

There are, of course, the usual caveats: the number of constructions, i.e. predicative adjectives and their counterparts that were analyzed is, for practical purposes, very limited. We are well aware that what is needed is a larger pool of data, with more informants responding.

## 5. Cross-linguistic differences and typology of metonymies

### 5.1. *Ways of specifying the active zone*

Focusing on the form of the element specifying the active zone, we may now note certain tendencies. There are obvious differences between the languages in the default degree of the schematicity of the structure specifying the active zone, provided they allow the adjective to be used predicatively and exhibit metonymy. If we present the possibilities on an informal continuum as follows:

(28) PP as complement > PP as adjunct > adverbial clauses

we see that the most frequent specifications of active zones in English tend to be items on the left of the continuum. They are also found to a degree in Flemish, but the other five languages prefer the specification by more elaborate items on the right. Note that since the adjunct PPs and adverbial clauses do not function as arguments they do not impose a new valency frame on the predicative expression in question and thus do not lead to an increase in grammatical (or constructional) polysemy.

A comparison of English with languages like German, Croatian, Polish, Russian and Hungarian shows that the latter languages regularly fail to tolerate polysemy based on metonymy in other constructions as well, e.g. none of the four languages exhibits a productive use of raising constructions involving predicative adjectives, i.e. subject-to-subject-raising with *certain* or *sure*, and

*tough*-construction. English again exhibits here some fairly schematic elements specifying the active zone, i.e. non-finite clauses, or just infinitival particles (cf. Langacker 1995), which must be accommodated by the left-hand end of our tentative continuum.

There are, of course, other structural correlates of this contrast. English has been demonstrated to rely heavily on metonymic processes in rearranging predicate-argument-structures enabling different ways of construal while at the same time keeping formally one and the same form of the predicative expression. It is notable that covert morphological processes have an important role in English, in particular conversion or zero-derivation, in the creation of new expressions, many of which can then also be used predicatively. On the other hand, other languages may happen to prefer different arrangements in predicate-argument-structure by using formally different predicative expressions, e.g. by availing themselves of suffixation. This is particularly true of Russian, Croatian, Polish, and Hungarian.

We further note the importance of the prior existence of certain construction types or whole subsystems, i.e. networks of constructions from which metonymies can set off by taking a free ride on the momentum of the system. We just point here to the productivity of infinitival complements in English and their relative restricted occurrence in languages like Croatian or Hungarian. A similarly important prerequisite may be the availability of ascriptive constructions with predicative adjectives, and particularly their extension by complements, e.g. by prepositional phrases. This is something which obviously distinguishes Slavic languages, or Hungarian, from English.

## ***5.2. Referential vs. predicational metonymies and cross-linguistic differences***

Broadening now our perspective to include both discourse-pragmatic types of metonymies we discussed in the present paper, we may conclude that there are important differences in the degree of universality of the two types, referential metonymies being more universal, cross-linguistically speaking, than predicational ones. This sort of general conclusion, however, could be premature for a number of reasons. While it is admittedly true that referential metonymies are relatively unconstrained, we must recognize that the constraints involved in the two types of metonymy are very different from each other. With referential metonymies the constraints are of a more discursal and pragmatic nature, whereas in the case of predicational metonymies the weight of structural factors is much greater. For example, some predicational metonymies discussed by Dirven (1999) that are the result of conversion are simply unavailable in languages in which this word-formation process is of minor productiv-

ity. For the same reason, some referential metonymies may be absent in these same languages.

It is, however, not generally true that predicational metonymies are less universal than referential metonymies. There is a large number of other cross-linguistically corresponding predicational metonymies in the languages we investigated; cf. the following examples of the WHOLE EVENT FOR SUBEVENT, and the SUBEVENT FOR WHOLE EVENT metonymies:

- (29) a. George smoked a cigar.  
b. Anne speaks French.

Croatian is in this case just like English:

- (30) a. George je       popužio cigaru.  
      George AUX   smoked cigar-ACC  
b. Ana govori francuski.  
   Anna speaks French

What might be behind these differences are the particulars of the metonymic mapping within the ICM and the internal structure of the ICM. Thornburg and Panther (1997: 211) propose the following constraint on metonymic mappings in speech act scenarios: "The more a speech act component is located at the periphery of the speech act scenario, the less likely that component will be in a "stand-for" (metonymic) relation to the scenario." We propose that the same or a similar principle might be at work in predicational metonymies. Taking a look at MANNER FOR ACTION metonymies, we note that the manner of performing an activity cannot be near the core of the ICM. After all, descriptions of the manner of performing an activity are far more likely to be coded as adverbials, i.e. adjuncts, than as complements. The latter are clearly more central to the core of the ICM.

At the same time we surmise that the internal structure of the ICM may also play a role here. We take ICM to be a cover term for at least three general types of knowledge structure that can be distinguished according to the predominant principle governing their internal organization.

If we liken an ICM to a film production, one type would involve just the cast and the crew, as well as the setting, another would also involve the screenplay, i.e. the scenario, as well as all the stages before and after the actual shooting, including raising the funds, editing and marketing the film. A third type may be compared to the film as a work of art, i.e. just its artistic aspects such as the story, its reception, etc.

The first type of ICM is a flat, static type that mentions only the participants and the setting, the second is a dynamic one in that it also mentions in-

dividual stages, including preconditions and consequences. The third type is a compressed form of the contents, i.e. of the story that can be unpacked and processed at an apposite point, like the folk wisdom crystallized in proverbs and similar expressions. For a lack of better terms, we might informally call the first type a frame-based ICM, the second a scenario-based ICM, and the third could be called narrative-based ICM.

Our MANNER FOR ACTION metonymies would then belong to the flat or static type, while examples like (29) or (30) above would be examples of the dynamic type. We suggest that it could be worthwhile to check whether metonymies involving scenario-like ICMs are in general cross-linguistically more readily available than those that are just frame-based. If this hypothesis should be confirmed by empirical research, this would suggest that another level may be needed in an integrated typology of metonymies, a level coming between the one distinguishing general types of mapping, and the level of more specific metonymies where distinctions are ICM- or domain-based.

### Authors' address

Rita Brdar-Szabó  
Germanistikai Intézet  
Eötvös Loránd University  
Ajtósi Dürer sor 19-21  
1146 Budapest, Hungary  
e-mail: ritamario@dravanet.hu

Mario Brdar  
Department of English Language and Literature  
Faculty of Philosophy  
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University  
Lorenza Jägera 9  
HR-31000 Osijek, Croatia  
e-mail: mbrdar@ffos.hr

### References

- Blank, Andreas (1999). Co-presence and succession: A cognitive typology of metonymy. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. [Human Cognitive Processing 4], ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden, 169-191. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brdar, Mario, Rita Brdar-Szabó (2003). Metonymic coding of linguistic action in English, Croatian and Hungarian. *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing*

- [Pragmatics and Beyond. New Series 113], ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Linda L. Thornburg, 241-266. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dirven, René (1990). Prototypical uses of grammatical resources in the expression of linguistic action. *Meanings and Prototypes: Studies in Linguistic Categorization*, ed. by Savas L. Tsohatzidis, 267-284. London - New York: Routledge.
- Dirven, René (1993). Metonymy and metaphor: Different mental strategies of conceptualisation. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 82.1: 1-28.
- Dirven, René (1999). Conversion as a conceptual metonymy of event schemata. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. [Human Cognitive Processing 4], ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden, 275-287. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ducháček, Otto (1967). *Précis de sémantique française*. Brno: Univers. J.E. Purkyně.
- Fauconnier, Gilles (1994). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. (1995). *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goossens, Louis (1987). Dealing with linguistic action verbs in depth. *Linguistic Action: Some Empirical-Conceptual Studies*, ed. by Jef Verschueren, 95-106. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Goossens, Louis (1990). Metaphonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.3: 323-340.
- Kalisz, Roman (1983). On so called 'beheaded noun phrases' in English and Polish. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 16: 43-51.
- Kövecses, Zoltán, Günter Radden (1998). Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics* 9.1: 37-77.
- Lakoff, George (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago - London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume 1. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume 2. Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1993). Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4.1: 1-38.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1995). Raising and transparency. *Language* 71.1: 1-62.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey (1979). The non-uniqueness of semantic solutions: Polysemy. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3.2: 143-184.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Günter Radden, eds. (1999). *Metonymy in Language and Thought* [Human Cognitive Processing 4]. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda Thornburg (1998). A cognitive approach to inferencing in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 755-769.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda L. Thornburg (1999a). Coercion and metonymy: The interaction of constructional and lexical meaning. *Cognitive Perspectives on Language* [Polish Studies in English Language and Literature 1], ed. by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 37-51. Frankfurt am Main et al.: Peter Lang.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda Thornburg (1999b). The POTENTIALITY FOR ACTUALITY metonymy in English and Hungarian. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. (Human Cognitive Processing 4), ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden, 333-357. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Radden, Günter (2001). *The folk model of 'language'*. [CLEAR. Cognitive Linguistics: Explorations, Applications, Research. New Series 6]. Hamburg: University of Hamburg. Available on-line at: <http://www.metaphorik.de/01/radden.htm>.
- Radden, Günter, Zoltán Kövecses (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. [Human Cognitive Processing 4], ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden, 17-59. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rudzka, Brygida (1982). The verb ASK and the scene of linguistic communication. Unpublished paper. Catholic University of Leuven.
- Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida (1988). Semantic extensions into the domain of verbal communication. *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics* [Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series IV. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 50], ed. by Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, 507-553. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Seto, Ken-ichi (1999). Distinguishing metonymy from synecdoche. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. [Human Cognitive Processing 4], ed. by Klaus-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden, 91-120. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schifko, Peter (1979). Die Metonymie als universales sprachliches Strukturprinzip. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 10: 240-264.
- Thornburg, Linda, Klaus-Uwe Panther (1997). Speech act metonymies. *Discourse and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics* [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 151], ed. by Wolf-Andreas Liebert, Gisela Redeker, and Linda Waugh, 205-219. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tuggy, David (1986). Noun incorporations in Nahuatl. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Linguistics Conference* 2: 455-470.
- Ullmann, Stephen (1962). *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

---

**METONIMIJE TIPA NAČIN UMJESTO RADNJE  
U RAZNIM DOMENAMA I JEZICIMA**

Kako se metonimija i metafora u okviru kognitivne lingvistike drže temeljnim i univerzalnim procesima koji oblikuju konceptuane strukture i jezične izraze, prešutno se pretpostavljalo da bi sve generalizacije opažene u engleskom (ili nekom drugom jeziku koji se rabio za empirijsku potvrdu teoretskih tvrdnji) trebale vrijediti i za druge jezike, naravno uz moguća odstupanja u pojedinim jezicima zbog odsutnosti određenih leksičkih jedinica. Drugim riječima, moglo bi se očekivati da ćemo slične konfiguracije metonimijski motiviranih konstrukcija zateći prilično često u međujezičnim razmjerima. Kako ističe Lakoff (1987), iz toga, međutim, ne slijedi da razni jezici moraju rabiti jednu te istu metonimiju na isti način i u istim kontekstima. Naivni univerzalistički pristup u kognitivno-lingvističkom istraživanju metonimije nosi sa sobom opasnost da se bez podataka o međujezičnoj usporedbi (tipološkoj ili kontrastivnoj) prenaglase sličnosti među jezicima te na taj način izgube iz vida neke pojedinosti koje bi mogle omogućiti potpunije razumijevanje spomenute pojave. Brdar i Brdar-Szabó (2003) pokazuju da hrvatski i mađarski, za razliku od engleskog, jedva rabe metonimije tipa NAČIN UMJESTO RADNJE u domeni lingvističke djelatnosti. Kako bismo provjerili jesu li te međujezične razlike slučajne tj. idiosinkratične činjenice o hrvatskom i mađarskom, u ovom članku proširujemo usporedbu: i. sustavno promatrajući isti, općeniti tip metonimije u nekoliko, više ili manje, sličnih domena te dodajući podatke iz njemačkog. Sustavnost je u porabi tog tipa metonimije (odnosno u njezinu izbjegavanju) u različitim domenama i jezicima preduvjet za razumijevanje skupa čimbenika koji ograničavaju porabu metonimija, a ujedno i korak prema poboljšanju postojećih tipologija metonimija.

**Ključne riječi:** predikacijska metonimija, tipologija metonimija, aktivna zona, idealizirani kognitivni model, lingvistička akcija, scenarij, okvir, metafora