Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

PART FOR WHOLE metonymy in English, Russian and Czech
(Magisterská diplomová práce)

Olomouc 2014   Anastasia Ukolova

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury

V Olomouci 18.08.2014 …………………………

PODPIS

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank to my supervisor Mgr. Michaela Martinková, PhD. for her time and patience, kind help and valuable advice while I was writing this thesis.

Table of contents

1. Introduction.

For a long time metonymy has been regarded as a figure of speech (rhetoric figure, figurative device) based on substitution of the name of one entity for the name of another and the two entities are associated with each other. On the contrary, cognitive linguistics argues that metonymy is a cognitive process in which "one conceptual entity is used to refer to another that is related to it" (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980).The major objective of this thesis is to explore differences and similarities between these two approaches to metonymy and find evidence in language that it is an actively exploited means in ordinary communication.

The thesis consists of two parts. The theoretical part deals with traditional and cognitive approaches to metonymy. The first section examines metonymy in literature and linguistics while analyzing how it is related to other phenomena like metaphor and synecdoche. The second section expands upon Lakoff and Johnson's views on conceptual metonymy, which was introduced by them alongside with conceptual metaphor. This section also examines the studies of other cognitive linguists (Croft, Radden and Kövecses, Fillmore, Piersman and Geeraerts, Seto, Langacker), who contributed to the research of metonymy in this field. Third section is devoted to the description of the different kinds of metonymy (patterns) while paying special attention to the pattern in which a part of entity stands for the whole entity, i.e. PART FOR WHOLE metonymic pattern.

Practical part concentrates on the examples of PART FOR WHOLE metonymy, in which part is expressed by a body part term and whole refers to a person. The example sentences were taken from *Metaphors We Live By* and its translations into Russian (*Метафоры, которыми мы живем* translated by Baranov and Morozova, 2004) and Czech (*Metafory, kterými žijeme* translated by Mirek Čejka, 2002) and grouped into sections organized according to the body part term. The research in this paper follows a case-study design, with in-depth analysis of an English example and its Russian and Czech counterparts. This analysis aims to address the following questions: whether metonymies with the body part terms overlap in all three languages; whether there are culture specific usages of the body part terms with reference to a person on the basis of dictionary meanings and examples in corpora (COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English, НКРЯ – Russian National Corpus, ČNK – Czech National Corpus), and whether typological difference of languages influences the linguistic realization of metonymy. Based on the fact that body part terms are present in all three languages my hypothesis is that metonymies with should be mostly consistent with each other in meaning. More importantly, the results of the research will serve as additional evidence for Lakoff and Johnson's idea and assertion that metonymy is a cognitive phenomenon occurring in ordinary, day to day speech.

2. Traditional approaches to metonymy.

Metonymy has been studied for more than two thousand years in various fields: rhetoric, philosophy and psychology. In literature and linguistics, metonymy is considered a key concept. Due to the importance of metonymy in these disciplines, the first sections of this thesis will focus on different views on metonymy and its role in language (2.1 and 2.2). Linguistic and literary studies have contributed to a better understanding of metonymy while fostering an increased awareness of the principles related to its operation. However, various interpretations of this notion have led to argument and discussion among academics in the broad pursuit of understanding what metonymy stands for.

The word 'metonymy' originated in Greek and denotes "a change of name" ('meta' – other; 'onoma' – name); Latin uses the word "denominatio" to describe metonymy. Thus, the etymology of the word 'metonymy' itself raises the questions: what is understood by the 'name' and how does it 'change'? The first discipline to analyse in relation to metonymy is rhetoric.

The earliest definition of metonymy can be found in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which is dated about 82 A. D.

> Denominatio [i.e., 'metonymy'] is a trope that takes its expression from near and close things and by which we can comprehend a thing that is not denominated by its proper word. (quoted in Koch 1999, 140)

Here it is seen that metonymy is defined as a trope (figure of speech, rhetoric figure), i.e. it refers to the study of figurative language. This is worth noting, because despite distinctions in approaches to metonymy, literary theory and traditional linguistics are unified in treating metonymy as a figure of speech. Hence they consider metonymy typical for literary language and uncommon for use in ordinary communication. Nevertheless, as we will see later, the examples used to illustrate metonymy are not taken from literary texts, but mostly from everyday speech.

It is possible to infer from the definition in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* that the 'name' implied by etymological origin refers to a thing 'that is not denominated by its proper word'. Consequently the 'change' denotes the substitution of one name for the name of 'near and close things' and therefore metonymy can be called a 'change of name(s)'. We also should notice that these words ('names') signify some entities ('things') that have to be closely related, this relation between the two entities plays a key role in the process of substitution or denomination and consequently in the creation of metonymy. The nature of that relation (connection), however, is still an academically divisive issue and point of intellectual contention.

2.1. Metonymy in literature.

As outlined in the introduction, metonymy is predominantly considered to be a figure of speech. In the field of literature this view is advocated by multiple dictionaries of literary terms (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1990, *Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* 1999, *The Glossary of Literary Terms* 1999, *The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993). In addition, many literary definitions of metonymy state that it represents substitution or replacement of "the name of one thing with the name of something else" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1990, 135). These modern definitions correspond well with the Greek name of metonymy, i.e. "change of name(s)". By the 'names' literary theory means words or expressions and hence confines metonymy to the lexical level of language. Thus, in literature metonymy can be interpreted as a change of lexical forms.

The next question to be answered, which was discussed in the introduction, is about the nature of the connection between the words ('names'). Although in this section the issue is examined only within literature, the opinions still vary. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (1999, 510) suggests that names can be substituted provided that they stand for the attribute of the entity and the entity itself: "a figure of speech in which the name of an attribute or a thing is substituted for the thing itself."

The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics (1993, 783) defines the connection in a more specific way. It is claimed that metonymy is "a figure in which one word is substituted for another on the basis of some material, causal, or conceptual relation." In *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (1990, 35) it is argued that the two entities are connected by association: "a figure of speech that replaces the name of one thing with the name of something else closely associated with it". The latter definition generalizes the previous views concerning the relation between two entities.

However, most of the modern dictionaries of literary terms also attempt to place metonymy in a larger context. They tend to say that metonymy and other figures of speech are complex phenomena and therefore can be encountered in everyday speech: "figures are sometimes described as primarily poetic, but they are integral to the functioning of language and indispensible to all modes of discourse" (*The Glossary of Literary Terms* 1999, 96).

In addition, these sources describe metonymy with the terms universally used in other disciplines than literature. One of them is 'contiguity', which is analogous to 'near and close' association and denotes a kind of relation between two entities which is, for the appearance of metonymy, necessary and criterial. Moreover, contiguity is also used as a feature differentiating it from other figures of speech like metaphor.

Modern literary theory has often used "metonymy" in a wider sense, to designate the process of association by which metonymies are produced and understood: this involves establishing relationships of contiguity between two things, whereas metaphor establishes relationships of similarity between them (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1990, 135).

However, there remains a need for an explanation of what it means to say that entities are in the relation of contiguity. The closest approximation can, I believe, be found in the following definition of metonymy in *The Glossary of Literary Terms* (1999, 98).

In metonymy (Greek for "a change of name") the literal term for one thing is applied to another with which it has become closely associated because of a recurrent relationship in common experience.

The presence of "a recurrent relationship in common experience" not only creates the conditions for metonymy to appear, but also explains the multiple examples presented in dictionaries. They are listed under (1).

(1)   a) e.g. *the bottle* for alcoholic drink, *the press* for journalism, *skirt* for woman, *Mozart* for Mozart's music, *the Oval Office* for the US presidency. (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1990, 135)
b) Common examples are *the stage* for the theatrical profession; *the Crown* for the monarchy; *the Bench* for the judiciary; *Dante* for his works. (*Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* 1999, 510)
c) *The Crown* or the scepter can be used to stand for a king and *Hollywood* for the film industry; *Milton* can signify the writings of Milton ("*I have read all of Milton*"); typical attire can signify the male and female sexes: "*doublet and hose ought to show itself courageous to petticoat*" (Shakespeare, *As You Like It,* II. iv. 6 quoted in *The Glossary of Literary Terms* 1999, 98)

Contiguity is crucial for metonymy, since this kind of relationship is different than the connection of two entities by similarity, which is typical for metaphor.

Jakobson provides further evidence that supports the distinction between relation by 'contiguity' and relation by 'similarity' gained from his studies of mental disorders, literary

movements, styles in painting, operations in the unconscious[1]. Though Jakobson was a linguist, his view about the opposition of metaphor and metonymy is similar to the approach adhered to by the field of literature, namely that the difference between metaphor and metonymy concerns not only the relations they express, but also the type of literary work in which they are used. According to Jakobson, metaphor is typical for poetry and metonymy for fiction:

> [F]requent use of metaphor unites the poet's mythology and being, separated from the world. Poets who prefer metonymy, on the other hand, project their being on an outer reality that their emotion and perception displace from the normal. The shifting, sequential character of metonymy […] was more common in prose than in poetry ("Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances" 1956, quoted in *New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993, 784)

However, Jackobson's standpoint is influenced by the fact that he recognized only two main types of tropes, metaphor and metonymy. There are some scholars who have identified a three- or fourfold system of tropes including metonymy, metaphor, synecdoche, and irony.[2] Differences regarding figures of speech are often determined by the number of tropes considered fundamental in the study of literature.

For example, *The Glossary of Literary Terms* (1999, 98) considers metaphor a main figure of speech; therefore it classifies metonymy and the rest as "species of metaphor". The twofold system, which is adhered to by Jakobson and his followers, does not recognise synecdoche and subsumes it under metonymy. According to other classifications, in which synecdoche is not considered as a separate figure, the difference between synecdoche and metonymy is equal to the difference between metonymy and metaphor. Thus, it is also important to examine the distinction between metonymy and synecdoche.

---

[1] In "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances" (1956) Jakobson argued that metaphor and metonymy are the axes of language that help to differentiate between two types of aphasia (a language disorder resulting from memory loss). In particular, he said that the aphasia acts on the two 'axes of language' in different ways. As a result those who suffer from a 'continuity disorder' tend to use substitution (i.e. metaphor) and those who suffer from 'similarity disorder' tend to use association (i.e. metonymy). In addition, Jakobson conjectured that metaphor and metonymy could account for an appearance of some literary movements, namely metaphor was basis for romanticism and symbolism, while metonymy – for realism. Jakobson also thought that metaphor and metonymy could be used to explain the difference between Freud's 'identification' and 'displacement'.

[2] Giovan Battista Vico (1668-1744), a rhetorician and a historian, and Petrus Ramus (1515-1572), a humanist, rhetorician and logician adhered to a threefold system of metonymy, metaphor and synecdoche; Kenneth Bruke (1897-1993), a literary theorist, adds to the list irony and retains a fourfold system; Harold Bloom (1930), a literary critic, acknowledges six main tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, irony, hyperbole and metalepsis.

Similar to metonymy, synecdoche (Greek – "taking together") is also defined as a figure of speech based on substitution of names. Nevertheless, most of the definitions of synecdoche specify that it is conditioned by other types of relations between entities than the types of relations used in metonymy. The majority of dictionaries (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1990, *Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* 1999, *The Glossary of Literary Terms* 1999) agree that synecdoche is a figure which substitutes the name of a part for the name of the whole and vice versa as in examples (2a) – (2b); some (Hrabák 1977, *The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993) also add cases, in which the name of species stands for gender and vice versa as in examples (2c) – (2d); sometimes the replacement of the name of a group for the name of an individual (which can be subsumed under the species-gender case) is called synecdoche and can be seen in example (2e) (*The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 1993).

(2) a) *Give us this day our daily bread* (bread for meals taken every day, i.e. part for whole) (*Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* 1999, 890);

b) *to hire ten hands* (hands for people, i.e. part for whole) (*The Glossary of Literary Terms* 1999, 98);

c) *Chelsea won the match* (Chelsea for the Chelsea football team, i.e. whole for part) (*Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* 1999, 890);

d) *to live by the sword* (sword for weapon, i.e. species for genus) (*The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993,1261);

e) *a ring with a gemstone* (gemstone for diamond, emerald, sapphire etc., i.e. genus for species) (Hrabák 1977,151);

f) *The Roman won the battle* (Roman for the Roman army, i.e. individual for group) (*The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993, 1261).

There is no unanimous opinion about synecdoche, namely about the types of the relations between the entities it expresses. According to definitions and examples above, synecdoche is a part-for-whole and species-for-genus substitution. In other words, one element or sort of the entity (*hand, bread, sword*) can replace the whole entity (*person, meals, weapon*). Thus, synecdoche is called "a one-many substitution" (*The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993, 784) or "change of quantity" (Hrabák 1977, 151). Whereas metonymy is "one-for-one replacement" (*The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993, 784), in which, as it is suggested in example (1a), one entity (*bottle, the press, skirt, Mozart*) replaces the other (*alcoholic drink, journalism, woman, Mozart's music*).

Many dictionaries find it difficult to pinpoint the difference between synecdoche and metonymy and hence use metonymy as a "generic term for both and contrast it with metaphor" (*The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* 1993, 784).

Hrabák stands in opposition to the views cited above. He examines and analyses metonymy from the standpoint of literature, but in a way similar to linguistics. Together with other scholars he regards metonymy as a trope and points out that it is founded on the relation of association in contrast to metaphor, which is based on the relation of similarity (Hrabák 1977, 151). Similar to Jakobson he claims that lyrics and poetry in general tend to utilize metaphor, while metonymy is typical for epic and prose (1977, 140).

However, Hrabák, though a literary theorist, talks about metonymy as a 'transfer of meaning' and differentiates between lexicalized metonymy and poetical metonymy. Lexicalized metonymy, according to Hrabák, is a 'transfer' in ordinary language and consists in the usage of a word signifying a certain entity to denote a new entity or idea, i.e. there is a change in denotation.

> Slovo "přenášení" jsem dal do uvozovek proto, že ano ono nevystihuje přesně povahu jevu. O přenášení významu se dá totiž v pravém slova smyslu mluvit jen tehdy, když užijeme pro nový předmět nebo pro novou představu slova znamenajícího jinou věc a toto nové označení se zlexikalizuje (1977, 138).

As a result of lexicalization, the word acquires a new meaning that does not evoke any additional associations ('connotations'), these are strictly backgrounded.

> Lexikalizace slova v přeneseném významu spočívá v tom, že jde o jednoznačné označení, které nevyvolává žádné zvláštní konotace (1977, 138).

Hrabák illustrates lexicalization on the example of the Czech word *kohoutek*, which has initially the meaning of *cock* (animal), but is also used to denote *tap* (the end part of the pipeline). When speaking about *kohoutek* in the latter meaning, it does not awake the original one and connotations like coloured feathers, cockscomb, spur. Thus, the word *kohoutek* has acquired a new denotative meaning.

The 'transfer of meaning' in literary language, as Hrabák points out, is the opposite process, whose aim is to express a new relation to the entity being designated. The word still keeps the same denotative meaning, but this meaning is backgrounded, while the connotative meanings are brought to the centre of our attention.

Jinak je tomu při "přenášení" významu v básnickém jazyce. Zde jde o vyjádření nového vztahu k označované věci, konotované významy se tedy dostávají naopak do popředí (1977, 139).

Hrabák explains the transfer of meaning in poetic language on the example of *pršelo listí* (1977, 139). It is clear that the expression describes the leaf fall, which is a denotative meaning. At the same time connotative meanings associated with the verb *pršelo* are fronted and concentrate our attention on the way the leaves are falling (fast, heavily, with specific sound). Hrabák's example demonstrates metaphoric transfer of meaning based on the similarity between the two processes, namely the leaf fall and raining.

Metonymic transfer of meaning can be demonstrated on the example in (3).

(3)   *The pen is mightier than the sword.*

The denotative meanings of *pen* and *sword* are a kind of stationery and a kind of weapon respectively and in the example in (3) the denotation is not changed, but backgrounded. While the connotative meanings like *writing* and *communication* associated with *pen, warfare* and *violence* associated with *sword* are brought into the focus.

To summarize, in literary studies metonymy is arranged among figures of speech, while the examples used to illustrate it are taken from the ordinary speech. This section shows that metonymy is based on contiguity, i.e. the recurrent relationship between entities in common experience, and this basic feature is also utilized in other approaches as demonstrated further.

2.2. Metonymy in traditional linguistics.

It is important to reiterate that literature and traditional linguistics have a similar attitude towards metonymy, in that they both designate metonymy as a figure of speech (Cruse 2006, Filipec and Čermák 1985, Galperin 1971, Peprník 2001).

Furthermore, linguistics, like literary studies, also puts forward a relation of association as a base for metonymy (Cruse 2006, Galperin 1971), which can be subsumed under the notion of contiguity discussed in the previous section. In literature, this relation is introduced in contrast to the connection by similarity (Cruse, 2006) or affinity (Galperin, 1971), which is necessary for the creation of metaphor.

[In metonymy] a relation is based not on affinity, but on some kind of association connecting the two concepts, which these meanings represent[3] (Galperin 1971, 140).

However, as it is implied in the definition above and pointed out by Filipec and Čermák (1985, 110), metonymy consists in a conceptual connection, which simultaneously covers and reflects a material one: "Metonymie se skládá na pojmové souvislosti, která odráží i souvislost věcnou".

Thus, both in linguistics and in literature metonymy is regarded as a figure of speech that based on substitution. However substitution is understood differently in linguistic and literary studies. In particular, according to linguists' views, the replacement occurs not on level of words ('names'), i.e. lexical forms, but on the level of meanings correlated with particular words and even with concepts.

Consequently, in linguistics metonymy is a complex phenomenon that results in a 'change of name(s)' due to a change of meaning(s) or 'transfer'. Hrabák uses this term in his literary studies. As for linguists, Galperin (1971, 139) classifies metonymy as a kind of 'transferred meaning', which is similar to 'transfer'; Peprník (2001, 44) defines 'transfer' as one of the ways to change meaning, one that can be achieved via metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche.

Regardless of the type of transfer (metaphor, metonymy or synecdoche) it consists in "giving a new, additional meaning to the existing lexical form" and habitually "the old and the new meaning coexist side by side" (Peprník 2001, 39). The questions concerning metonymy linguistics approaches to answer are: first, what stands behind the new meanings and the original meaning and second, how these meanings coexist.

As to the first question, Galperin (1971, 140) defines metonymy as a "type of relation between dictionary and contextual meanings". According to him, metonymic transfer is clear and conspicuous. It can be considered as a 'derivative logical meaning' and therefore it is sometimes fixed in the dictionaries under a label *fig* ('figurative use'). This label serves as a proof that "the new meaning has not entirely replaced the primary one, but co-exists with it" (1971, 140). By 'dictionary meaning' he understands "the meaning which is registered in the language code as an easily recognized sign for an abstract notion designating a certain phenomenon or object" (1971, 137) and by 'contextual' one – "a meaning which is imposed on the word by a micro-context" (1971, 138). Cruse's definition (2006, 108) is similar to the one suggested by Galperin, but he

---

[3] Although Galperin specializes in stylistics, his main focus is the rhetoric figures of all language levels (phonetic, morphological, lexical and syntactical) used in literature.

uses the terms 'literal meaning' and 'figurative meaning'. Parallels with the meanings referred as 'denotative' and 'connotative' in Hrabák are also at hand.

Filipec and Čermák have chosen the terms 'primary' and 'secondary' meanings. They do not talk about the types of meanings, but rather focus on the ways the meanings coexist. Their view is similar to the one taken by Hrabák, which consists in interpretation of metonymy as a kind of relation between the meanings of a word, in which one is perceived on the background of the other.

This effect has been exemplified by Hrabák in metaphor *pršelo listí* (see section 2.1). As for metonymy, this is evident in the classic example mentioned also in the previous section: *the pen is mightier than the sword.* Here *pen* is interpreted not as a physical object, which is called primary, denotative or literal meaning, but as a means for writing and in general for communication, which is secondary, connotative or figurative meaning. Nevertheless, in this example secondary meaning is based on the primary one being present, but not focused. *The sword* undergoes identical procedure.

However, further Hrabák's and Filipec and Čermák's approaches differ. Filipec and Čermák argue that the two meanings simultaneously coexist and clash. Such interconnection of meanings leads to another perception of each of them and gives rise to new interpretations.

[J]de tedy o jeden lexém s dvěma koexistujícími významovými funkcemi, z nichž jedna se vnímá na pozadí druhé. […] Jde při tom o odraz dvojí skutečnosti ve vědomí, a tedy i o sekundární odraz. Tato koexistence a konfrontace odrazu dvojí skutečnosti přináší nové osvětlení skutečnosti a jejich aspektů nalezením nových souvislosti (1985, 108).

In addition, as it is seen in the statement above, in their investigation of the change of meanings Filipec and Čermák attempt to explain metonymy and other acknowledged tropes as more complex processes characteristic for human mental organization. These issues will be studied in the next chapter more thoroughly.

Linguists consider metonymy to be a phenomenon that concerns lexical units, i.e. lexical form and its meanings communicated through use of the language. This fact gives an opportunity to examine metonymy in a broader context than offered in literature. Nevertheless linguists base their views of metonymy on the axiom that it is a trope and thus is confined to the field of figurative language, which narrows down the scope of investigation. As a result there has appeared the above mentioned tendency to differentiate between 'lexicalized transfers', i.e. "transfers that entered the vocabulary" and 'figures of speech', i.e. "literary ways of expression

for something the writer wants to describe" (Peprník 2001, 44) [4]. However, this difference is not always clearly stated: Galperin talks about lexicalized transfers as "widely-used metonymical meanings", usually (but not always), indicated in the dictionaries and poetic metonymy is not mentioned at all; Filipec and Čermák (1985, 108) consider 'trope' and consequently poetic metonymy as a kind of it to be a way of 'denomination' used in poetry. Therefore in the case with the noun *sail* used to stand for ships it is not clear whether it is poetic or lexicalized metonymy. Oxford English Dictionary (OED) shows that noun *sail* has a meaning 'ship or other vessel', which is not marked as figurative, while the examples illustrating it quote poetry (4a) as well as formal documents (4b).

(4)   a) *Gaze where some distant sail a speck supplies, With all the thirsting eye of Enterprize.* (Byron "Corsair" 1814 quoted in OED).
       b) The Royal navy comprised in all twenty-seven sail. (H. Cox, *The institutions of the English government* 1863 quoted in OED).

In addition, most of the examples of metonymy used by linguists are taken from common discourse. This indicates how the notion of metonymy has entered the day-to-day, ordinary language. In the example of *škola* (*school),* Filipec and Čermák explore the metonymic relations between the different meanings of this word. It usually denotes "an establishment or institution for the formal education of children or young people" (OED), which is considered a primary meaning. However, *škola* (*school)* also has secondary meanings like "building for such an institution" demonstrated in example (5a), and "the pupils (and sometimes staff) of a school collectively" as in example (5b), which are incorporated in the primary meaning (Filipec and Čermák 1985, 110).

(5)   a) *to build a new school* (Filipec and Čermák 1985, 110).
       b) *The school will participate in voluntary work* (Filipec and Čermák 1985, 110).

It is also important to point out that metonymy not only connects the meanings associated with a word, but also "reveals a quite unexpected substitution of one word for another, or even of one concept for another, on the ground of some strong impression produced by a chance feature of the thing" (Galperin 1971, 140-141). Example (6), taken from fiction, is claimed by Galperin to be an example of 'genuine metonymy'.

---

[4] A similar distinction between 'lexicalized metonymy' and 'poetical metonymy' was suggested by Hrabák (see previous section)

(6)   *Then they came in. Two of them, a man with long fair moustaches and silent dark man…*
       Definitely, the moustache and I had nothing in common (Doris Lessing's *Retreat to*
       Innocence quoted in Galperin 1971, 141).

Galperin explains that here *the moustache* stands for the one wearing it, i.e. for the man himself. In addition, he points out that the function of this metonymy is "to indicate that the speaker knows nothing of the man in question, moreover there is a definite implication that this is the first time the speaker has seen him" (1971,141).

Galperin (1971, 141) also demonstrates that *the moustache* and *the man himself* are "both perceived by the mind" of the reader. This view resembles Filipec and Čemák's idea that one meaning, (*the moustache*) is understood on the background of the other (*the man*). Galperin (1971, 141) then goes on to say that in the process of "deciphering" the meaning of metonymy one object does not exclude the other, unlike in a metaphor, where "one image excludes the other"[5]. In case of metonymy it indicates the coexistence of two meanings even though, according to Galperin, the connection is coincidental.

The perspective introduced in linguistic studies shows metonymy as a complex phenomenon and many scholars imply that it does not only appear in words and their meanings, but it also reaches the level of concepts, which represent a human perception of the world. Consequently, linguists attempt to explore the way metonymy operates in the human mind, i.e. represents a mental processes and cognition. While these views are only roughly outlined in traditional linguistics, in cognitive linguistics they are studied as fundamental issues and will be presented in more detail in the next chapter.

---

[5] The metaphorical *lamp* in the "*The sky lamp of the night*" when deciphered, means *the moon*, and though there is a definite interplay of meanings, we perceive only one object, the moon" (Galperin 1971, 141-142)

3. Cognitive approaches to metonymy.

Although metonymy was first described more than two thousand years ago, it was only during recent decades that it became one of the essential topics for research carried by cognitive linguistics and a challenging area for many researchers in the field (e.g., Croft 1993, Radden and Kövecses 1999, Koch 1999, Janda 2011). Throughout this period the understanding of metonymy has been changing and developing. Thus, the modern views of cognitive linguistics on metonymy largely differ from the ones generally accepted in traditional linguistics. These differing views are revealed in the following definition of metonymy that can be found in the recent edition of *Historical Semantics* (Campbell 2013, 225), which attempts to encompass previous and current ideas about this phenomenon:

> Metonymy is change in the meaning of a word so that it comes to include additional senses which were not originally present, but which are closely associated with the word's original meaning, although the conceptual association between the old and new meanings may lack precision: that is, A is associated with B, but need not be like B.

This definition supports the claim of traditional linguistics that metonymy is a change of meaning, namely that the original meaning is substituted for the other closely related to it, but both meanings are perceived simultaneously. In addition, this definition also mentions the 'conceptual association', a concept not explored in traditional linguistics.

On the other hand, it is further stated in the definition that metonymy can be regarded as a 'conceptual shift within the same semantic domain', which is the main claim of cognitive linguistics and the central topic of this chapter. Campbell uses the example of *tea* to demonstrate that the metonymic change takes place on the conceptual level. In particular, noun *tea* generally denotes a "drink", but in English-speaking countries it has also acquired a meaning of "the evening meal" and thus the initial concept of TEA[6] has also changed. In addition, it appears that metonymy is also a culture-specific phenomenon, since the change has only happed in English-speaking areas.

> Metonymy might be thought to be the conceptual shift within the same semantic domain. That is, metonymic changes typically involve some contiguity in the real (non-linguistic) world. They involve shift in meaning from one thing to another that is present in the

---

[6] Following other works in cognitive linguistics, throughout this thesis CAPITAL letters will be used to denote concepts and domain, while word forms will be in *cursive*.

context (though being present may be a conceptual judgement call not necessarily immediately apparent to us before the change takes place) (Campbell 2013, 225)

This new definition calls for rethinking the notion of contiguity, which (as we have seen) is often considered to be the basis for metonymy. In traditional approaches contiguity is determined by a recurrent relationship in the real world, while in cognitive linguistics contiguity should also occur on the conceptual level. In cognitive linguistics, contiguity is determined by the 'semantic domain', a term crucial in cognitive linguistics and for the present 'domain' can be regarded equal to 'context' in Campbell's definition. Before exploring this notion in more detail, I will briefly introduce Lakoff and Johnson's view, who developed one of the influential approaches in cognitive linguistics concerning traditional rhetoric figures.

3.1. Lakoffian approach to metonymy.

In 1980 Lakoff and Johnson published their book *Metaphors We Live By*, which introduced conceptual metonymy alongside with conceptual metaphor. The text expounds upon a radically new view on these phenomena and their role in language, culture and life in general. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 39) put forward the idea that metaphor and metonymy are not simply literary devices, but that they are cognitive processes that "structure not just our language, but also our thoughts, attitudes, and actions". Lakoff and Johnson further argue that metaphor and metonymy do not operate on the linguistic level alone, but also on the conceptual level. Thus, metaphor and metonymy are processes that organize our conceptual system.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 265) also argue that metaphor and metonymy can be assumed to be similar, because in both cases the following formula can be applied: "a linguistic expression with meaning A expressing meaning B."

Metaphor and metonymy do not appear randomly; rather, they are systematic in the sense that the instances of these phenomena can be grouped into certain patterns. For example, metonymies in (7) can be grouped under the PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT[7] metonymic pattern. The discussion of metonymic patterns will be continued in the next chapter, therefore only a few examples are quoted in this section.

(7)   a) *I'll have a **Löwenbräu**.*
          b) *He bought a **Ford**.*

---

[7] Metonymic patterns will also be marked by CAPITAL letters, since they in general stand for concepts.

c) *He's got a **Picasso** in his den.*

d) *I hate to read **Heidegger**.*

The authors point out that metonymy, like metaphor, is understood on condition that it "functions actively in our culture" (37) and we respectively behave according to it. Lakoff and Johnson illustrate this principle with example (7c). When we talk about *Picasso* implying his work, we also "think of it in terms of its relation to the artist, that is, his conception of art, his technique, his role in art history, etc. We act with reverence toward *a Picasso,* even a sketch he made as a teen-ager, because of its relation to the artist" (39).

Beside describing the general similarities between these two notions, Lakoff and Johnson also claim that metonymy is not a type of metaphor and should be considered as a different process. The crucial distinction lies in their functions. According to Lakoff and Johnson, metaphor primarily "provides understanding" by the "way of conceiving one entity in terms of another" (36), while metonymy has "referential function" and "allows us to conceptualize one thing by means of its relation to something else" (36).

However, the scholars admit that metonymy "is not merely a referential device, it also serves the function of providing understanding" (36). Namely it highlights "certain aspects of what is being referred to" (37) and hence provides additional information about the referent. For instance, in (7a) *Löwenbräu* stands for 'beer', but by uttering this brand name we do not simply refer to 'beer in general", but we also specify the kind of product and the properties it should have. In this case it is beer produced by the *Löwenbräu* company.

Thus, contiguity between the concept actually used (LOWENBRAU) and the concept meant (BEER) has a significant influence. *Löwenbräu* is a brewery and hence beer is produced there. While this connection exists, it gives rise to metonymy. For this reason, Lakoff and Johnson consider contiguity as another factor distinguishing between metaphor and metonymy. They argue that both processes are "grounded in our experience", however "metonymic concepts are in general more obvious than in the case with metaphoric concepts, since it [metonymy] usually involves direct physical or causal associations."(39) Hence the relationship between the Löwenbräu company and the beer is a logical, causal connection between producer and product that creates the conditions for the appearance of metonymy in such sentences as (7a). Moreover, we know from our experience with physical entities that the parts, for instance, wheels, usually pertain to a whole, i.e. an automobile. Therefore metonymies as in (8) can emerge in our everyday communication.

(8)   a) *I've got a new set of wheels.* (1980, 37)

b) *I've got a new four-on-the-floor V-8.* (1980, 38)

Given that the real physical objects and their recurrence in the common experience is apparent and thus conceptualized, we can assume the existence of conceptual contiguity, which allows metonymy to appear on the conceptual level. However, metonymy is not confined to the physical objects. Lakoff and Johnson point out that non-physical entities are represented in our mind via physical ones, since we tend to "conceptualize the less clearly delineated in terms of more clearly delineated". (59) As a result, metonymy works also with non-physical-entities.

> Experience with physical objects provides the basis for metonymy. Metonymic concepts emerge from correlations in our experience between two physical entities […] or between a physical entity and something metaphorically conceptualized as a physical entity. (1980, 59)

Examples in (8) are a good illustration of metonymy involving two physical objects (WHEELS and AUTOMOBILE). Other examples of this kind of metonymy are presented in (9).

(9)   a) *The sax has the flu today*. (1980, 38)
      b) *The buses are on strike*. (1980, 38)

Here SAX and BUSSES are the concepts of the physical entities referring to another physical entity, i.e. a person using them. Thus, the contiguous connection as well as the objects themselves are visible and apparent in contrast to the examples in (10).

(10) a) *The White House isn't saying anything*. (1980, 38)
      b) *Paris is introducing longer skirts this season*. (1980, 38)
      c) *Pearl Harbour still has an effect on our foreign policy*. (1980, 39)

These examples clearly show metonymies with non-physical entities. The *White House*, *Paris* and *Pearl Harbour* are all PLACES that metonymically refer to such abstract concepts as the INSTITUTION and the EVENTS closely associated with them. Thus, it is demonstrated that metonymy could be based on strong relations between physical and non-physical entities.

Nevertheless, contiguity is still a rather vague criterion for the identification of metonymy since the entities, abstract as well as concrete, may be related to many other entities. For instance, INSTITUTIONS can also stand for PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE for:

(11)   *I don't approve of the government's actions.* (1980, 38)

Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson have started to use the term 'domain/frame' in order to differentiate between metaphor and metonymy. In particular, they argue that metaphor involves two domains, while metonymy makes use of only one. Their later revisions and the notion of 'domain/ frame' will be explored in more detail in the next section.

3.2. Domain/Frame approach to metonymy.

The idea of 'frame' came from Frame Semantics developed by Charles Fillmore. His non-traditional approach consists in " a particular way of looking at word's meaning, as well as a way of characterizing principles for creating new words and phrases, for adding new meanings to words, and assembling the meanings of elements in a text into the total meaning of the text" (Fillmore 2006, 373). Hence his theory can account for metonymic expressions due to the fact that they are the result of the similar processes. By 'frame' he understood the following (2006, 373):

By the term 'frame' I have in mind any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available.

Currently, Fillmore's ideas are among the most dominant ones in cognitive linguistics and 'frame' has become an essence for further theoretical extensions developed by a number of scholars as well as a generic term for such concepts as 'idealized cognitive model' (ICM) (Lakoff 1987, Radden and Kövecses 1999), and 'conceptual domain' (Croft 1993, Langacker 1993)[8].

Such an approach, in which some elements are in the centre of attention ('figure') and the rest of the elements are on the periphery but are still perceived ('ground') was developed

---

[8] Though there are several terms to denote relatively similar notions, many cognitive linguists agree that frame/domain/ICM altogether represent our general knowledge about a concept that does not always reflect the reality. Fillmore (2006, 379) claims that "very often the frame or background against which the meaning of a word is defined and understood is a fairly large slice of the surrounding culture, and this background understanding is best understood as a 'prototype' rather than as a genuine body of assumptions about what the world is like." His argument is illustrated by testing the word *bachelor* with such questions as: "How old does a male human have to be before he can reasonably be called a bachelor? Is somebody professionally committed to the single life considered a bachelor? Is it right to say, for example, that Pope John XXIII died a bachelor?" (Fillmore 1975, 68). These and other complicated situations involving the concept BACHELOR show that its frame "represents an idealized version of the world that simply does not include all possible real-world situations" (Croft and Cruse 2004, 28). Therefore Lakoff uses the word 'idealized' in his term.

among many by Ronald Langacker (1982)[9]. He introduced the notions 'profile', which is similar to 'figure', and 'base', which is similar to 'ground'.

It is possible to infer that metonymic concepts are also governed by this principle, since in example (7a) the meaning of *Löwenbräu*, which denotes a particular kind of product (beer), can be understood only against the background of the producer (the concrete brewery).

In addition, Langacker seems to use the terms 'base' and 'domain' interchangeably, and as a synonym of what Fillmore called 'frame'. Langacker's theory was used by William Croft as a basis for the in-depth investigation of 'domain' in connection with metonymy. This notion explains the operation of the metonymic principles and their differentiation from metaphoric in terms of the domain approach to word meaning.

Fillmore states that 'frame' is "any system of concepts" (2006, 373), in which one of the elements activates the whole system, while Croft 1993, 272) defines domain as "a semantic structure that functions as the base for at least one concept profile (typically, many profiles)."[10] Together with Langacker he distinguishes between: 'basic domains', which are "rooted in directly embodied human experience" (Croft and Cruse 2004, 24) and 'abstract domains', which denote all non-basic domains. Habitually abstract domains are profiled against basic domains, but this condition is not obligatory. Thus, this view resembles Lakoff and Johnson's claim that even abstract concepts are ultimately interpreted through our physical experience.

Developing his ideas further Croft (1993, 281) argues that "metonymy makes primary a domain that is secondary in the literal meaning" and calls this effect 'domain highlighting'. Croft illustrates this by example (12):

(12)   *Proust is tough to read.* (1993, 280)

According to Croft (1993, 281), our knowledge about PROUST belongs (among many domains) to the domain CREATIVE ACTIVITY. Since Proust is a writer, "the work produced is a salient element in the domain of creative activity" and hence this allows the metonymic shift, in which Proust's works are in focus.

---

[9] The initial idea came from Gestalt psychology and was introduced into cognitive linguistics by Leonard Talmy (1972), who utilized the terms 'figure' and 'ground'.

[10] According to Langacker, "profile refers to the concept symbolized by the word in question, the base is the knowledge or conceptual structure that is presupposed by the profiled concept" (quoted in Croft and Cruse 2004, 15). For example, geometric figures like RADIUS and CIRCLE can be regarded as 'profile' and 'base' respectively: "A RADIUS is a line segment, but not any line segment: the line segment is defined to the structure of the circle. In other words, one can only understand RADIUS only against a background understanding of the concept CIRCLE". (Croft and Cruse 2004, 14-15)

In more general terms metonymy can be described as follows: the concept from the domain supporting the literal meaning ('source domain/ source') can be used to identify a certain concept of the domain that a sentence is specifically about ('target domain/ target'). Applying this terminology to example (12), we can say that Proust is the 'source' and provides a reference to the 'target', which are the works he has written.

Since metonymy requires that the two concepts must be contiguous, the source domain and the target domain have to be associated with each other. Metonymic mapping, i.e. the relation of the source to the target, is established within one complex domain. Langacker and Croft call this complex domain a 'domain matrix', which is defined as "a combination of domains presupposed by the concept." (Croft 1993, 273) Therefore, according to Croft, metonymy or more specifically metonymic mapping "occurs within single domain matrix, not across domains (or domain matrices)" (Croft 1993, 280)

The claim that metonymy operates within one complex domain is supported by many cognitive linguists (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, Radden and Kövecses 1999, Ruiz de Mendoza 2000). In the view of this fact, metonymic mapping is unique:

> In a metonymy, there is only one domain: the immediate subject matter. There is only one mapping; typically the metonymic source maps to the metonymic target (the referent) so that one item in the domain can stand for the other. (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 265)

This interpretation of metonymy is contrasted against the corresponding characteristics of metaphor. Metaphor operates between two domain matrices. Consequently the source and the target belong to different, non-related domains. Additionally, there are multiple mappings between source and target domains.

> In a metaphor; there are two domains: the target domain, which is constituted by the immediate subject matter, and the source domain, in which important metaphorical reasoning takes place and that provides the source concepts used in that reasoning. […] In addition, a metaphoric mapping is multiple, that is, two or more elements are mapped to two or more other elements. (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 265)

This crucial difference was demonstrated by Lakoff and Johnson on the metonymic and metaphoric correlation of TIME and SPACE domains. Example (13) presents metonymy TIME FOR DISTANCE.

(13)   *San Francisco is a **half hour** from Berkeley.* (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 266)

It is apparent from the example that TIME (*a half hour*) metonymically stands for the DISTANCE covered during this time. In other words, the source (TIME) is used to map the target (DISTANCE). Since these two domains can be united by a complex domain TRIP, there is a single mapping. Thus, we can conclude that this is metonymy.

The contrasting example with metaphoric mapping is introduced in (14):

(14)   *Chanukah is **close to** Christmas.* (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 266)

In the given example the source domain LOCATION is applied to describe the target domain TIME: "the relationship between the times of the two holidays is given metaphorically in terms of space (*close to*)" (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 266). Thus, these are two different domains that cannot be joined into a complex one. As a result in this case we deal with a metaphor.

All things considered, metonymy is not a simple substitution of one concept for a word symbolizing another concept on the basis of contiguity between them. Taking into account the notion of 'frame/domain' approach and its role in differentiation between metaphor and metonymy, it can be then defined as in Radden and Kövecses (1999, 21):

> Metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle[11], provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealized cognitive model.

The term 'Idealized Cognitive Model' (ICM) used by Radden and Kövecses was coined by Lakoff in his earlier work. ICM attempts to express the idea that "the knowledge, represented in the frame is itself a conceptualization of experience that often does not match the reality" (Croft and Cruse 2004, 28).

In general the notion of ICM reminds us about the fact that metonymic concepts can be understood more clearly against the cultural, social and sometimes even personal background of the participants of conversation.

---

[11] Radden and Kövecses (1998) use the term 'vehicle' in earlier works, since previously it denoted 'source' and the term 'tenor' denoted 'target'. However, currently cognitive linguists prefer to use the term 'source' and 'target' in their explanations of conceptual process.

4. Metonymic patterns.

Classification of metonymy is an integral part in traditional and cognitive studies of metonymy. Setting up a typology contributes to a better understanding of metonymy and helps reveal some of its operational methods. Cases of metonymy are generally divided into a number of categories, called metonymical patterns, which reflect the conceptualized relation between physical entities as well as between non-physical entities. Classification of these patterns is the topic of present section.

4.1. Metonymic patterns and their analysis.

The first metonymic patterns like PART FOR WHOLE (see examples 2a-2b, 4a-4b, 6), PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT (see examples 7, 12), PLACE FOR INSTITUTION (see example 10a-b) were introduced by the traditional approaches. Though literature and rhetoric mostly deal with metonymy on the lexical level, the patterns have survived and are actively used by cognitive linguists. According to them, metonymy is a mental process that operates with concepts, which means that its scope in the field of cognitive linguistics is broader. Therefore the number of probable patterns has increased. For example, the relations between present tense and future events or between generic and specific use of a word can also be regarded as metonymic. They can be subsumed under PRESENT FOR FUTURE and GENERIC FOR SPECIFIC patterns respectively. Radden and Kövecses illustrate these patterns with sentences like "*I am off*", in which the present tense denotes future action, and "*Boys don't cry*", in which a generic statement might be applied specifically to the situation of a boy crying.

As has been stated previously, one of the key conditions of metonymy is the contiguous relations between conceptual entities. These relations, such as between the place and the institution situated there, are customary in our everyday life and hence give rise to reversible metonymic patterns, like PLACE FOR INSTITUTION as in example (15a) and INSTITUTION FOR PLACE as in example (15b).

(15)   a) *Cambridge won't publish the book*. (Radden and Kövecses 1999, 41)

   b) *I live close to the University*. (Radden and Kövecses 1999, 41)

However, some of these relations are less entrenched and hence one direction is exploited more frequent than the other. This thesis is not concerned with the asymmetrical nature of metonymies, nevertheless we should take into account these asymmetries while describing

metonymic patterns. For this purpose, '&' sign is usually used to denote relations regardless of the popularity of the direction.

The following are common metonymic relations suggested in Norrick (1981) and introduced in the thesis in the form of formulas:

1. Cause & Effect
2. Producer & Product
3. Material & Object
4. Instrument & Action
5. Object & Action
6. Agent & Action
7. Instrument & Agent
8. Part & Whole
9. Event & Subevents
10. Central factor for Institution
11. Container & Contained
12. Location & Located
13. Piece of Clothes & Person
14. Phenomenon & Measure
15. Category & Member
16. Possessor & Possession

As can be seen, there is a great deal of metonymic patterns and the whole diversity could be hardly studied in the scope of this thesis. However, it is necessary to examine briefly some of these patterns and the principles of their operation. Let us look at the patterns and their examples presented by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980):

1. THE PART FOR THE WHOLE
2. PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT
3. CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED
4. INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE
5. THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION
6. THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT

PART & WHOLE metonymic patterns, i.e. PART FOR WHOLE and WHOLE FOR PART, are considered fundamental. According to Piersman and Geeraerts, they are the core of this conceptual phenomenon and other patterns, such as EVENT &SUBEVENTS, are just subtypes of these main ones.

However, in the given pair a special attention is paid to the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy, since it is "less ubiquitous than WHOLE FOR PART metonymy and, hence, more likely to be noticed" (Radden and Kövecses 1999, 31). In addition, it is the most prototypical metonymic patterns since it corresponds to the common figure-ground perception, in which one concept is highlighted, but the whole frame is still present. Lakoff and Johnson apply the term 'synecdoche' in order to refer to PART FOR WHOLE metonymy.

> We are including as a special case of metonymy what traditional rhetoricians have called 'synecdoche', where the part stands for the whole. (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 36)

Some cognitive linguists argue that the relation between synecdoche and PART FOR WHOLE metonymy is more complicated and therefore it requires a separate investigation. Since this question is important for this thesis, it will be postponed to the next section. For the present the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy will be used in order to avoid misunderstanding.

Lakoff and Johnson demonstrate the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy with the following examples in (16).

(16)   PART FOR WHOLE
    a) *We need a couple of **strong bodies** for our team.* (strong people)
    b) *There are a lot of **good heads** in the university.* (intelligent people)
    c) *I've got a new **set of wheels**.* (car, motorcycle)

The relationship between the parts (*body, head* and *wheels*) and the wholes (person, car) is one of contiguity. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, the 'source', which corresponds to the parts, gives access to the domains or domain matrices HUMAN BEING / CAR. That is to say, in examples (16a) and (16b) the parts of the body give access to the domain matrix HUMAN BEING, but they highlight other domains in the domain matrix, which are contiguous to the relevant part of the body – in example (16a) physical strength, in example (16b) intelligence. In addition, (16a) and (16b) can be subsumed under PART OF BODY FOR PERSON metonymy. In example (16c) the part, i.e. *wheels*, serves as a reference to the whole domain CAR.

This metonymic pattern, namely PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT, has already been demonstrated in the previous chapter, however only individual examples were described, but not the whole pattern. Thus, the examples in (7) are copied here under (17):

(17)   a) *I'll have a **Löwenbräu**.*

       b) *He bought a **Ford**.*

       c) *He's got a **Picasso** in his den.*

       d) *I hate to read **Heidegger**.*

On the basis of the given information about the pattern, it should be summarized that PRODUCER is a metonymic source providing access to the domain PRODUCT. Highlighted elements here are particular features and quality ensured by the producer. In addition, the examples (16c-16d) can be subsumed under widely used subtype pattern: CREATOR/ARTIST FOR HIS WORK.

Metonymic patterns listed in (18) and (19) represent the triple relationship between the institution, the location of the institution and the people responsible for it. The close association between these elements has already been discussed in section 2.2[12]. Now it needs to be stressed that these concepts are not only interconnected, but in terms of cognitive linguistics, the domain INSTITUTION presupposes both the PLACE domain and the HUMAN BEING domain.

The INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE metonymy will be introduced first in example (18).

(18)   INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE

       a) ***Exxon** has raised its prices again.*

       b) *You'll never get the **university** to agree to that.*

       c) *The **Army** wants to reinstitute the draft.*

       d) *The **Senate** thinks abortion is immoral.*

       e) *I don't approve of the **government's** actions.*

Here the institution (*the Exxon Company*, *university*, *the Senate*, *Army*, *government*) represents a kind of a whole, which can also represent individuals. Thus, here we observe that in this type of metonymy the domain PEOPLE is profiled against the domain INSTITUTION,

---

[12] There was introduced Filipec and Čermák's example of the polysemantic word *škola* (*school*). *Škola* is firstly defined as institution. However, it also has secondary meanings like "building for such an institution" and "the pupils (and sometimes staff) of a school collectively", which, according to Filipec and Čermák, are incorporated in the primary meaning.

which signifies the unified group of people. Metonymic shift gives rise to a special kind of metaphor - personification. It consists in perception of physical objects as human beings (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 33). Therefore the examples in (18) describe the actions of the institutions with the verbs used to describe human actions.

The examples in (19) illustrate the PLACE FOR INSTITUTION metonymy.

(19)   THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION
        a) The **White House** isn't saying anything.
        b) **Washington** is insensitive to the needs of the people.
        c) The **Kremlin** threatened to boycott the next round of SALT talks.
        d) **Paris** is introducing longer skirts this season.
        e) **Hollywood** isn't what it used to be.
        f) **Wall Street** is in a panic.

In the examples in (19) a similar process takes place, namely one of the presupposed domains highlights the domain matrix that it belongs to. As a result the domain PLACE (*White House, Washington, The Kremlin, Paris, Hollywood, Wall Street*) is used to single out the institutions or organizations which are situated in these places (government, film or fashion industry, financial market). In addition, the relationship between the place and institution are very close. This allows the reversible pattern THE INSTITUTION FOR THE PLACE, for example, *I live near the hospital,* to be used. Since the INSTITUTION is a domain matrix that makes the domains of PLACE and PEOPLE contiguous, personification is also possible and is expressed in the predications, which signify the reference to human beings in (19a-19c, 19f).

The interpretation of abstract concepts by concrete physical objects can be seen in the examples in (20), which represent THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT metonymy.

(20)   THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT
        a) *Let's not let Thailand become another **Vietnam**.*
        b) *Remember the **Alamo**.*
        c) ***Pearl Harbor** still has an effect on our foreign policy.*
        d) ***Watergate** changed our politics.*
        e) *It's been **Grand Central Station** here all day.*

The examples in (20) can be explained as follows. The domain matrix EVENT couples both basic domains, like TIME, PLACE, PARTICIPANTS and non-basic domains, like

STATUS OF THE EVENT, ACTS, OUTCOME, or CHARACTER. The examples in (20) illustrate the reference to the EVENT domain via the place. Nevertheless, each of the examples highlights particular aspects associated with the events. For instance, in (20a-20d) it is the domain of military and political ACTIONS, and in (20e) it is the customary state of the place. In addition, it can be noted that the other non-highlighted domains of the domain matrix (ACTIONS, PARTICIPANTS, CHARACTER OF THE EVENT) are also activated. As an illustration, when talking about *Pearl Harbor* (20c), we associate it primarily with a war event or military action, but we also think about victims, outcomes, government reaction, political influence.

Another important metonymic pattern, illustrated by Lakoff and Johnson, is CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED. According to them, the main focus of this relationship is responsibility.

(21)   CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED
         a) **Nixon** *bombed Hanoi.*
         b) **Ozawa** *gave a terrible concert last night.*
         c) **Napoleon** *lost at Waterloo.*
         d) **Casey Stengel** *won a lot of pennants.*

In these examples the domain CONTROLLER is profiled against the domain matrix HUMAN BEINGS, but more specifically against the domain CONTROLLED, which represents a whole consisting of several members (e.g. Government, orchestra, army, sports team). The purpose of this metonymic pattern is to provide reference to the whole through its part, which possesses the quality of responsibility. Thus, it is possible to judge a group by the actions of its representative. In Lakoff and Johnson's own words (39, 1980), in example (21a) "Nixon himself may not have dropped the bombs on Hanoi, but via the CONTROLLER FOR CONTROLLED metonymy we not only say "Nixon bombed Hanoi" but also think of him as doing the bombing and hold him responsible for it."

4.2. PART FOR WHOLE metonymy and Synecdoche.

The term 'synecdoche' was introduced to cognitive linguistics by Lakoff and Johnson, who defined it as PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. They borrowed the term from rhetoric, in which synecdoche is considered as a substitution based on various kinds of relations. As it has been observed in section 1.1, synecdoche in traditional approaches denotes part for whole substitution and vice versa, but also genius for species and vice versa. Thus, Lakoff and Johnson

apply the term synecdoche only to one kind of replacement, i.e. part for whole, of the forth possible.

Other cognitive linguists, for instance, Seto, argue that there is a difference between these two types of substitution. It lies in different kinds of relations between conceptual entities, which, though, in general can be called PART & WHOLE. According to Seto, synecdoche is based on taxonomy, while metonymy is based on partonymy (or meronymy). The scholar asserts that these two notions tend to be confused.

> [T]axonomy is a 'kind-of' relation while partonomy is a 'part-of' relation. In other words, taxonomy is the relation between a more comprehensive category and a less comprehensive one, while partonomy is the relation between an entity and its parts, such as the relation between a table and its legs. (Seto 1999, 93)

The taxonomic relations are illustrated by Radden and Kövecses on the example of *aspirin* that can stand for the category of pain-relieving tablets' as in (22a). Partonomy (meronymy) is shown by the same scholars on the example of *wheels*, which is used as reference to a car as in (22b).

(22)   a) *Is it safe to take aspirin during pregnancy*? (The BabyCenter Editorial Team, 2013)
        b) *Those are cool wheels you have here.* (Radden and Kövecses 1999, 31)

Thus, taxonymy establishes the part-whole relations in the systems invented by a human, such as the biological classification of animals or plants. The division of medicines on categories according to their therapeutic action hence can be ascribed to an artificial hierarchy, in which painkillers is one of organized classes, i.e. whole, and aspirin is a concrete 'kind of' it (part). On the contrary, partomyny (metonymy) deals with natural systems, such as human organism, in which the parts (of body) are inextricable from the whole; or as in case with the car, is not accepted as proper whole without its parts (wheels, engine, steering wheel).

> Partonomy is based on real-world constitutive relations; taxonomy is concerned with mental (re)classifications of categories (Seto 1999, 94)

Thus, synecdoche exploits part-whole relations in conventionalized systems that are mostly universally accepted, while metonymy deals with the same relations in the systems based on human experience, which is often influenced by cultural factors.

All things considered, I will use only the term PART FOR WHOLE metonymy in this thesis.

5. Metonymies with body part terms.

This chapter will investigate PART FOR WHOLE metonymies with body part terms in English and in Russian. The purpose of this investigation is to see whether the body part terms are exploited in both languages similarly or differently as metonymic sources to indicate the domain matrix HUMAN BEING[13].

The body part terms were chosen for several reasons. This thesis supports the cognitive approach to metonymy, namely that metonymy is a cognitive process typical for every human and presumably present in every language. Similarly, body part terms can be used metonymically in any language. Thus, the general hypothesis is that metonymies involving the body part terms should be similar in English, Russian and Czech, namely that a particular part of the body as a concept will be utilized as metonymic source to give access to the domain matrix HUMAN BEING and the highlighted domains will also coincide in both languages.

Another reason is that many cognitive linguists (Lakoff and Johnson, Radden and Kövecses, Janda, Croft and Cruse) use metonymies with body parts terms as an illustration for PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. Moreover, body part terms are also used in the literature to illustrate synecdoche, which is considered as a part for whole substitution (see section 2.1).

Several factors determined the selection of languages for the present study. English and Russian are distantly related (that is, belong to different groups of the Indo-European family) and are typologically different, namely English is an analytical language, while Russian is an inflectional language. Therefore different linguistic means can be exploited in metonymies. Moreover, some Czech examples will be included as an additional material in order to compare two typologically and genetically close languages, i.e. Russian and Czech.

The set of lexical data for current investigation was compiled from examples with the body part terms from Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980, 36-38) and corresponding examples from the Russian version of the book *Метафоры, которыми мы живем* translated by Baranov and Morozova (2004, 63-65), and from the Czech version *Metafory, kterými žijeme* translated by Mirek Čejka (2002, 50-52). Overall, in Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and its translations 27 examples (9 examples per each book) were found involving such body parts as FACE, BODY, HEAD, BUTT, ARM, HAIR and BLOOD. Though the last two are not considered as prototypical body parts, Lakoff and Johnson use them as well to illustrate PART FOR WHOLE metonymy and their metonymic target is identical to the target of typical body part terms. Besides, additional examples were retrieved from dictionaries (OED, *Толковый словарь русского языка*, *Словарь русского арго*, *Slovník spisovné češtiny*) and

---

[13] Also called PERSON.

corpora (COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English, НКРЯ – Russian National Corpus, ČNK – Czech National Corpus).

The examples were analysed according to several parameters. Firstly, the body part terms in English were compared to the equivalents used in Russian sentence on the basis of their dictionary meanings. Secondly, the examples were compared according to the domain highlighted by the particular metonymic source with special attention to the premodifiers. On the analysis of these two parameters it was judged whether the metonymies are identical and, hence, exist in both languages provided that the Russian sentence is idiomatic and is not a literal translation. As for English examples, they all were treated as idiomatic. Otherwise, another possible variant of metonymy is offered. In addition, typological features of languages are also described whenever relevant.

Russian examples were rather problematic to analyze primarily because they come from a translation. It is clear that the translation of the culture and language and specific metonymies is a challenging task. The editors preferred to translate literally the majority of the examples and accompany all of them by the counterpart from the original. Therefore in some cases I have suggested a more appropriate variant of translation based on the analysis of the original example.

Another difficulty faced in this research is the judgment about idiomacity of examples. The body part terms were checked in explanatory dictionaries (*Толковый словарь русского языка*, *Словарь русского арго*), however some of metonymic meanings are not fixed. Therefore they were also checked in the Russian National Corpus (НКРЯ). Future study may test the examples in both languages on a larger group of native speakers in order to obtain more precise data.

5.1. HEAD FOR PERSON metonymy.

It would be logical to start with head, the most important and uppermost part of human body. The examples in (23) show metonymies with this body part term.

(23)   a) *There are **a lot of good heads** in the university.*

       b) *В университете   **много светлых голов**.*

         In university LOC   many   bright heads GEN

       c) *Na naší fakultě   pořád ještě chybí aspoň   několik **mladých bystrých mozků.***

         On our faculty LOC   as yet   lacks at least some young bright brains GEN

In the given examples (23a) and (23b) the body part term *head* is used as metonymic source highlighting the domain INTELLIGENCE. The noun *head*, according to Russian and

English dictionaries (OED and *Толковый словарь русского языка*), could be used to refer to a person and indicate a person's mental attitude or ability. Thus, this metonymy is lexicalized and idiomatic in the both languages. While in English such collocations as *clever*, *wise*, *good head* are used, in Russian the most popular collocation is with the premodifier *светлый*, which is translated literally as *light*, *bright* (usually used to describe colours), but in this case it describes mental abilities and the intelligence.

Both in Russian and in English the body part term *head* is used metonymically in more than one sense, as can be seen from the examples in (24).

(24)   a) *Delegates will start the day with a 'coffee, tea and danish' at £5.95 a head*.
(Independent 8 June I. 5/1, 2000 quoted in   OED)
b) *Всего   приходится по рублю   с головы*.
   Altogether   goes   at rouble DAT per head GEN
(quoted in *Толковый словарь русского языка*)

In these examples body part term *head* targets domain matrix PERSON, who is regarded as a unit of counting. Surprisingly, in Russian another body part term can appear in the same function, it is *нос* (*nose*).

(25)   *И всего   две   с половиной   тысячи   с носа*.
       And altogether two NOM with half INS thousands GEN per nose GEN
       [НКРЯ: Освободители (2003) // «Криминальная хроника», 2003.06.24]

In English it is possible to exploit the body part term *head* as a part of the compound, in which premodifier becomes a part of word. As mentioned in OED, such compound *acidhead, crackhead, dopehead, hophead, meth head, pothead* function as metonymic source indicating a person, namely "an addict or later a habitual user of particular substance (as alcoholic drink), or drug etc, also without modifying: a drug addict, as in the following examples.

(26)   a) *A crystal meth-head, the detective had called Ward Lynch. Desperate for cash, to feed his addiction*. (J. C. OATES 2006, *Missing Mom*, quoted in OED)
b) *The smoke-free world, where I could scowl at tobacco-heads and use little coughs to signal my disapproval and moral superiority* (Texas Monthly Dec. 48/1, 1991 quoted in OED)

Thus, English exploits the analytical means to produce metonymies with noun *head*, while in Russian it is impossible. In general, compounds can be formed in Russian. However, the most frequent variants with the word *голова* (*head*) will be adjectives like *тупоголовый, бритоголовый* that cannot be regarded as metonymic sources.

An interesting and different example was demonstrated in Czech version (23c). As equivalent to the word *head* Czech translators used the body part term *brain* that can be a source of separate metonymy, but similar to the initial one: BRAIN FOR PERSON.

In English and in Russian, as in Czech, noun *brain* could mean "a person in the control, the directing intelligence, the cleverest person in the group" (OED). However, it should be mentioned that BRAIN is not interchangeable with HEAD, though the body parts are physically close and the concepts are similar. Moreover, there are collocations rather with body part term *brain*, than with noun *head*, in which it can be used to refer to person. One of them is present in all three languages: *brain drain, утечка мозгов, odliv mozku.*Here BRAIN stands for the intelligent people migrating from their own country to another in search of better conditions and salaries.

Thus, HEAD FOR PERSON metonymy has two interpretations in Russian and English. First, body part term *head* is closely associated with INTELLIGENCE and is used to refer to intelligent people. Second, it can simply stand for an individual, more precisely to stand for the whole frame. However, there are some metonymies linguistically and culturally specific. In English compounds with the noun *head* when exploited metonymically are not encountered in Russian.

5.2. TYPE OF HAIR FOR PERSON metonymy.

The study now will continue with another uppermost component of the human organism, namely hair. Though it represents a less prototypical part of body, metonymies with the terms for types of *hair* deserve the attention. The examples in (27) illustrate them.

(27)   a) *We don't hire **longhairs***.

      b) *Мы   не   нанимаем   **длинноволосых***   *(букв. длинные волосы).*

        We not   hire 1pl   long-haired GEN pl   (lit. long hairs NOM)

      c) ***Holé lebky***   *prostě   neuznávám.*

        Bald sculls ACC   simply   not accept 1sg

In Lakoff and Johnson's example (27a) the body part term *longhairs* indicate the target domain PERSON. In this case the highlighted domain depends on the extralinguistic context. In

English the noun *longhair* can be used to talk contemptuously about "a 'brainy' person, an æsthete, an intellectual; also, a devotee of classical (as opp. to popular) music" (OED online), but also as a name for a hippie or a beatnik. Thus, the larger context is needed to understand which characteristic features of a person are emphasised by the speaker with the body part term *longhair*: whether it is simply the appearance or personal qualities, or perhaps individual preferences in life style, music or poetry.

In addition, metonymic source in example (27a) is formed by a compound. English is an analytical language, in which compounding is used more frequently in word formation than in synthetic languages as Russian and Czech. Therefore, in example (27a) it is evident that morphological properties that are specific for English can be exploited in metonymies.

This linguistic peculiarity of English example complicates the conversion of the metonymy into Russian. The literal translation of compound *longhairs* will be a phrase consisting of noun and premodifying adjective like written in parenthesis in (27b): *длинные волосы*, which would be completely inappropriate for Russian native speakers. For this reason Russian authors suggested a compound adjective *длинноволосый* that in the given example (27b) functions as noun, i.e. is substantivized.

The word *длинноволосый* has different meaning than English word *longhair*. Therefore the better substitution would be adjective *волосатый*, which is derived from noun *волос* and can be translated as *hairy*. In Russian it is also used to describe a hippie and in some collocations an influential person, according to *Словарь русского арго*. Nevertheless both of these substantivized adjectives directly signify a person, but not a body part.

There appears a question to be answered: whether the substantivized adjectives *волосатый/ длинноволосый* can be considered as metonymic sources so that metonymy would be preserved. Janda (2011) argues that:

> In word-formation, the source corresponds to the source word that the derivation is based on, the context for metonymic relationship is the affix, and the target is the concept associated with the derived word (360)[14].

Evidently the given adjectives were not transformed into nouns by affixation, however this process, i.e. substantivization, can be compared to conversion, i.e. a shift from one part of speech to another without changes in the form of the word. It is included by Janda (2011) as a case of 'zero-suffixation' and hence it is able to carry a metonymic relation.

---

[14] According to Janda (2011), Russain word *брюхан* and Czech word *břicháč* illustrate a BODY PART FOE PERSON metonymy, in which "a person is identified by means of a salient body part.

However, Prohorova (2012) claims:

Care should be taken not to mix up cases of conversion with cases of substantivization of adjectives. Some scientists (Otto Jespersen, Kruisinga and others) consider substantivization of adjectives to be cases of conversion. This is not correct from the point of view of some of our scholars (Arnold, Vinokurov, Ivanov and others), because substantivization of adjectives is characteristic of many languages, Russian included, where the morphological system is very rich. And conversion is characteristic of English where the system of morphological forms is poor. Substantivization of adjectives is not the result of changing paradigm, it is the result of the slow process of changing the syntactical functions of a word (2012, 30)[15]

All arguments considered adjectives *длинноволосый* from example (27b) and *волосатый* cannot be regarded as metonymic sources.

Since in Russian there are no words derived from the body part term *волосы* that could stand for a person, comparing to Czech where such words as *zlatovláska*, *tmavovláska*, *dlouhovláska* etc. can be formed, it can be concluded that body part *волосы* is not utilized as metonymic source in Russian.

As for Czech, another example of TYPE OF HAIR FOR PERSON was demonstrated in (27c). In Czech a collocation *holé lebky* stands for the right-hand extremists. Thus, HOLÁ LEBKA is metonymic source that gives access to the domain matrix PERSON and highlights the characteristics typical for a person as a member of this group.

In Russian there is a collocation *бритый затылок* (*бритый* – shaved, *затылок* – back part of the head) that usually in plural might be used metonymically for a man in prison or in the army, since they usually have their heads shaved. One of the examples is presented in (28).

(28)   *Бритые затылки   подхватили   на плечо   свои баулы   и*
       Shaved heads NOM picked up 3pl on shoulder ACC   their trunks ACC   and
       затрусили в сторону   казарм.
       jogged 3pl in direction   military barracks GEN
       (Александр Хан 2012, *Порт-Саур,* chapter 3)

---

[15] Prohorova further explains this process. She says that in word combinations of an adjective with a noun adjective is semantically stronger because the noun usually expresses some general notion (e.g. a native man, a conservative man). "Later on, the noun is dropped as it is less important semantically, and the attribute is now used in the function and with the meaning of the whole combination" (2012, 30-31)

To sum up, metonymies with the body part term *hair* are definitely less frequent than metonymies involving other prototypical body parts. As can be seen from the analysis, in English *longhair* have a dictionary fixed meaning and hence this metonymy has been already lexicalized. As for Czech phrase *holé lepky*, it is normally utilized in political context, whereas in Russian no metonymies with *волосы* (*hair*) were found, however the collocation *бритые затылки* was discovered as one exploited in Russian. Thus, both Russian and Czech prefer BALD HEAD FOR PERSON metonymy, however it differs in meaning.

5.3. FACE FOR PERSON metonymy.

Lakoff and Johnson pay special attention to FACE FOR PERSON metonymy. According to them, this metonymy is one the most active and highly functioning in contemporary human culture. Its popularity comes from the tradition and portraits in painting and photography. Lakoff and Johnson explain the operation of this metonymy in our everyday thinking and acting in the following way:

If you ask me to show you a picture of my son and I show you a picture of his face, you will be satisfied. You will consider yourself to have seen a picture of him. But if I show you a picture of his body without his face, you will consider it strange and will not be satisfied. You might even ask, "But what does he look like?" (2003, 37).

They conclude that it is the face and not gestures or posture that gives the basic information about a person and hence FACE among other body part terms usually metonymically replaces PERSON, i.e. the domain matrix without highlighting any other specific domain.

Since the tradition of portraits is present cross-culturally, FACE FOR PERSON metonymy may be considered as the most wide-spread and easily understood in many languages, including English, Russian and Czech. The examples in (29) illustrate this point of view.

(29)   a) *There are an awful lot of faces out there in the audience.*

       b) *В аудитории   огромное количество лиц.*

        In audience LOC   huge amount NOM   faces GEN

       c) *Z hlediště   na mne   civěla   spousta cizích tváří.*

        From audience GEN   on me ACC   stared   many foreign faces GEN

As can be assumed from the example (29a), the phrase *an awful lot of faces* and refers to an awful lot of people sitting in the audience and the equivalents used in Russian and Czech have similar metonymic target. As was mentioned before, the Russian version of the book offers the literal translation of the English sentences presented in Lakoff and Johnson (1980), nevertheless example (29b) is idiomatic, but it would be understood better in the particular context of extralinguistic reality, for instance at the door of the lecture room with people gathered there. In order to avoid ambiguity without the specifying context, the premodifier like *незнакомый* (*unknown*) can be used to make the sentence more appropriate to Russian native speakers as in example (30).

(30)   *В аудитории   (находится/ собралось) огромное количество незнакомых лиц.*
       In audience LOC   (is/ gathered)   huge amount NOM unknown faces GEN

A similar approach to the one in the example (30) was adopted in the Czech translation (29c). Here the premodifier *cizí* is used. According to *Slovník spisovne čestiny*, it denotes and consequently specifies that people sitting in the audience are not familiar to the speaker.

Thus, as can be judged by the examples in (29), in all three languages the body part term *face* can be utilized as a reference to a person and this fact was also confirmed by the dictionaries (OED, *Толковый словарь*, *Slovník spisovné češtiny*), in which FACE FOR PERSON metonymy is already fixed. However, in English it is possible to use body part term *face* without premodifier, whereas in Russian and in Czech the premodifier is required to highlight the domain FAMILIARITY and to rule out any misunderstanding in the interpretation of the meaning of the sentence.

However, ambiguity might appear in English as well, since the body part term *face* with a premodifying word in the sentence can denote other aspects of person in all three languages as shown in the examples in (31) and (32) later.

(31)   a) *We need some new faces around here.*
       b) *Нам   нужны **новые лица**.*
          We DAT   need   new faces NOM pl
       c) *Už   bychom tady   potřebovali   pár   **novych tváří***
          Already would here   needed 1pl   pair NOM new faces GEN

The examples demonstrate that the phrase *new faces* and its Russian and Czech equivalents, *новые лица* and *nové tváří* respectively, is idiomatic in all three languages.

Consequently it can be concluded that concept NEW FACE exists cross-culturally and denotes a person who has not been previously met, a stranger, or a newcomer (OED). Similar to the concept UNKNOWN FACE illustrated by previous examples, NEW FACE indicates an unknown person, however the highlighted domain is not FAMILIARITY, but NOVELTY specified by the premodifier *new*.

Examples in (32) present FACE FOR PERSON metonymy and its counterparts in Russian and Czech used to denote a different meaning.

(32) a) *She's just a **pretty face***.

b) *Она   всего лишь   **милое личико**.*
  She NOM   just   pretty face NOM

c) *Ona   je prostě jenom taková **pěkná pusinka**.*
  She NOM   is simply   such pretty mouth NOM

In example (32a) borrowed from Lakoff and Johnson (1980), the body part term *face* is a part of the expression *to be just a pretty face*. According to OED, it denotes a person with "no qualities other than attractiveness, especially with connotations of low intelligence; usually in negative contexts". Hence the body part term *face* metonymically refers to a person as in the previous cases and the premodifying elements *just pretty* are used to highlight the domain of ATTRACTIVENESS and simultaneously to exclude the domain of INTELLIGENCE, which is in this context perceived as an antonym to the former one.

As for the Russian example (32b), *милое личико* is an idiomatic expression and conveys similar meaning as in English. Nevertheless the given example also shows the language specific behavior. The word *личико* is in fact the diminutive form of *лицо*, which is the exact translate equivalent to English noun *face.* In addition, the initial form *лицо* in the given context would not be idiomatic. Thus, in this case rich morphology of Russian language is exploited to convey the metonymic relationship between two domains, while in English only the form *face* is used in all examples of FACE FOR PERSON metonymy.

Since Czech language belongs to the same typological group as Russian, morphological means can also be exploited to produce metonymy, which is demonstrated in the example (30c). The word *pusinka* is diminutive form of the word *pusa*. According to *Slovník spisovné češtiny*, noun *pusa* has two meanings. First one signifies *mouth* and the second - a *kiss*, which could be acquired metonymically. There is a strong causal association between MOUTH and KISSING, namely the possible widening of meaning could be subsumed under the metonymic pattern INSTRUMENT FOR ACTION PERFOMED.

Hence noun *pusinka* also denotes *mouth,* however in *Slovník spisovné češtiny* it is stated as well that it can be used as an address to a young pretty person. The usage of body part term *pusinka* in the second meaning premodified by *pěkná* is illustrated in example (32c), suggested by Czech translators as a counterpart to English example (32a). Nevertheless the word *tvářička*, i.e. the diminutive form of noun *tvář* (*face*), can be also used instead of noun *pusinka* in the example (33c) preserving the focus on the domains ATTRACTIVENESS and the exclusion of the domain INTELLIGENCE. In addition, neither *pusa* nor *tvář*, i.e. the initial forms, would be idiomatic in given context.

Thus, in all three languages *pretty face* and its literal translations (*милое личико*, *pěkná pusinka/ tvářička*) are idiomatic. In Czech even two body part terms *pusinka* (*mouth*) and *tvářička* function similarly, however their appropriateness in language should be decided by native speakers of Czech. In addition, the examples in Russian and Czech indicate that the typological feature of these languages, such as the usage of inflections, is applied in production of metonymies.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, body part term *face* is actively used in metonymies involving the reference to a person. The examples above proved that the metonymic usage of body part term *face* in all three languages largely coincide, but there are also specific cases in which metonymies with body part term *face* are different.

One more meaning discovered in OED shows that in British slang body part term *face* denotes a member of a subgroup within the 1960s 'mod' movement, in African-American slang it is sometimes applied as a derogatory word to refer to a white person as in (33)

(33)   *I was parting with some bad faces over in the East Bronx* (S. Kopp 1978, *End to Innocence*, quoted in OED)

While in English it is used in the non-standard language, in Russian it is widely exploited as a legal term. In particular, the Russian word for face *лицо* with the premodifier *юридический* can be often encountered in administrative and business documents. Since the legal system in Russia and in the UK is different, this term is translated variously into English. Black's Law Dictionary suggests the term 'legal entity', "as a firm, authorized by law with duties and rights, recognized as a legal authority having a distinct identity, a legal personality. Also known as artificial person, juridical entity, juristic person, or legal person".

Another idiomatic expression that exploits the metonymical sense of the word *лицо* (*face*) in Russian is the legal term *физическое лицо,* which is usually translated as 'individual' (in economic and financial documents) or 'natural person' (in legal documents). Both terms denote a

single person as distinguished from legal entity, i.e. association, corporation or partnership, according to Black's Law Dictionary.

Thus, the difference in language specific metonymies with the body part term *face* lies not only in the functional styles. As can be seen, while in English the word *person* is used as a part of legal terms, in Russian metonymic relationships between PERSON and FACE may have influenced the usage of body part term *face* as a representation of both, concrete individual and abstract company.

To sum up, metonymies with the body part term *face* largely operate in all three languages under consideration. Moreover, the analysis of the examples report that the majority concur with each other in the referent, but also in highlighting similar domains, when premodified by synonymous equivalents. However, in Russsian as well as in English there are special metonymies with noun *face* that vary depending on the functional style and the group of users.

5.4. SENSE ORGANS FOR PERSON metonymy.

Previous sections dealt with metonymies HEAD FOR PERSON and FACE FOR PERSON. Now metonymies with sense organs will be discussed. Though the examples with them are not presented in Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Sense organs are parts of human body which, like head, are very important for conceptualization of the world because these are the organs that help humans to perceive the world. It is not surprising, therefore, that metonymies with *nose, ear, eye, tongue and mouth* are frequently encountered in the language. Similar to other metonymic sources discussed in this chapter, sense organs are also used to indicate a PERSON and usually highlight the function associated with the particular organ.

The concept EYE is connected with the concept VISION. In Russian and in English metonymies involving this body part term describe a person as an observer or onlooker of events, in plural it simply refer to the audience. The examples are presented in (34).

(34)　　a) *She needed to get away from the hundreds of eyes staring at her*. (COCA: 2011: FIC: Bk:TamedByHighlander)

b) *Тысячи глаз　　　　следили　　за тем,　　как вздрогнула*
　　Thousands MON eyes GEN　watched 3pl　for that INS　as　shuddered 3sg F
массивная белая башня,　　начав　свой медленный поворот.
massive white tower F NOM　starting　　its slow turn ACC
[НКРЯ: Илья Бояшов. Танкист, или «Белый тигр» (2008)]

There are also language specific applications of this body part term. Among other meanings, noun *eye* incorporates the following one, which is frequently used in military and intelligence contexts: a person positioned so as to be able to view or monitor a situation and relay information (OED). This definition is exemplified in (35).

(35)   *We need to get more eyes on the ground… Three or four covert teams.. ought to do the job*. (J. F. CASEY 2009, *Bridge at Ban Bak* quoted in OED)

The concept EAR is inseparable from domain HEARING and can be also used metonymically. In Russian the body part term *ухо* (*ear*) usually in plural premodified by adjective *лишний* (*extra*) denotes an undesirable person, who can learn the information as in (36).

(36)   *Операция   все-таки хоть и межгородская, но лишних ушей нам не надо.*
         Operation NOM   still though   intercity ,   but extra ears us DAT not need.
         [НКРЯ: Петр Галицкий. Опасная коллекция (2000)]

Thus, noun (usually in plural) *уши* has negative connotations in Russian when used metonymically; on contrary to English, where the body part term *ear* is utilized to describe often the character or disposition of a listening person as in the examples in (37).

(37)   a) *People from all over the country travel to Beijing to try to find a **sympathetic ear** in the government*. (COCA: 2006: SPOK: NPR_ATC)
         b) *The biblical model of the "beloved community," as Martin Luther King Jr. liked to call it, is so strong that it comes as a shock to our 21st century **American ears***. (COCA: 2008: NEW: USAtoday)

The concept related to the domain OLFACTION is NOSE. In English, according to OED, signifies a person, who creates, identifies, or judges fragrances, especially in the perfume industry, is called a *nose,* like in example (38).

(38)   *Even expert 'noses' who can identify the ingredients of a perfume cannot predict the final result on the woman who wears it*. (Harrods 1985 Mag. Christmas 8/1 quoted in OED)

In English slang noun *nose* also denotes a spy or informer especially for the police, which is demonstrated in the example (39).

(39) *He knew that CID men are allowed to drink on duty because much of their time is spent with 'noses' or informants* (R. EDWARDS 1974, *Dixon of Dock Green 7* quoted in OED)

As far as Russian is concerned, except for the previously mentioned meaning of the body part term *нос* as a unit for counting (see example 25), there was not found any meaning with reference to a person. However, *Словарь русского арго*, which focuses on non-standard language, suggests that noun *нос* has derogatory meaning and could be used to talk ironically about Georgians, Armenians and other representatives of Caucasian nations and provides an example listed in (40).

(40) *На базар   носы   понаехали.* (quoted in *Словарь русского арго*)
      On market ACC   noses NOM   came (gradually and in numbers) 3pl

Such body part as TONGUE is often related to the activity of speaking. In English the metonymic usage of this body part term was not attested, while in Russian and in Czech noun *язык/ jazyk* in plural premodified by adjective *злой/zlý* is applied to people, who treat the entity in question unfriendly and even hostilely. The examples in (41) illustrate this meaning.

(41) a) *Правда, злые языки утверждали, что разбойники   обнаружили*
         In fact   evil tongues asserted 3PL that highwaymen NOM   discovered 3PL
         вовсе не уксус,   а большие запасы   спиртного.
         not at all vinegar ACC, but large stock ACC PL alcohol GEN
         [НКРЯ: И. Сокольский. «Кислое вино» // «Наука и жизнь», 2006]
      b) *Zlé jazyky   dokonce tvrdí ,   že právě tito čtyři bratři   ovládají*
         Evil tongues NOM even assert 3PL that only these four brothers NOM control 3PL
         pákistánský show- business.   (ČNK: Reflex, č. 51/2005)
         Pakistani show-business ACC

The part of body MOUTH is also connected with speaking, but mostly with eating of food. Therefore in English and in Russian noun *mouth* (*рот*) is used as metonymic source that targets the domain matrix PERSON highlighting such human need as FOOD CONSUMPTION. The examples are displayed in (42).

(42) a) *With you gone we will have one less **mouth to feed** anyway*. (COCA: 2011: FIC: FantasySciFi)

b) *Они рады были избавиться от **лишних ртов**, верили, что детям у нас будет хорошо*. [Любовь Кузнецова. «...Собираю разрозненные брёвнышки народа своего...» (2003) // «Вестник США», 2003.09.03]

The metonymies in these examples are constructed by different syntactic means: in English noun *mouth* is postmodified by infinitive *to feed* (however, the noun can simultaneously be premodified by adjectives *hungry, extra*), while in Russian noun *рот* is premodified by adjective *лишний,*they carry similar meaning, namely denote a dependant, typically child, to be provided for (OED, *Толковый словарь русского языка*). Surprisingly, the body part term *mouth* is used similarly in metonymies in two distantly related languages, whereas in Czech, which is genetically and typologically closer to Russian, body part term *krk* (*neck*) is usually utilized to convey the meaning mentioned above.

(43) *Živím   dva hladové krky*.   (ČNK: Mladá fronta DNES, 23. 10. 2006)
      Support 1SG   two hungry necks ACC

Thus, body part terms naming sense organs also used to activate domain matrix PERSON. Each sense organ has particular domains associated with it, which are mostly shared cross-culturally, but often with different connotations, as can be shown by comparing Russian and English examples (*eyes* and *глаза*, *ears* and *уши*, *nose* and *нос*). However, metonymic usage of the terms for sense organs still varies. In addition, it can be similar in unrelated languages and different in kindred ones.

5.5. BODY FOR PERSON metonymy.

This section will examine the usage of the body part term body as a metonymic source targeting the domain HUMAN BEING. Similar to previous sections, the following group of examples (44) includes English (44a), Russian (44b) and Czech (44c) sentences obtained from Lakoff and Johnson's book and its translations.

(44) a) *We need a couple of **strong bodies** for our team*.
      b) *Нашей команде   необходима   пара   **сильных тел** .*
         Our team DAT   necessary   pair NOM   strong bodies GEN

c) *Do naší dílny   potřebujeme   ještě par   **silných rukou***

    To our workshop GEN   need Pres 1PL   more pair   strong hands GEN

English example (34a) demonstrates that body part term *body* evokes the domain matrix PERSON, in which the domain PHYSICAL STRENGTH is highlighted by means of the premodifier *strong*. This metonymic meaning of noun *body* has been lexicalized in English, since it is fixed in the dictionaries. For instance, OED contains such definition of *body* as "an individual; a person, typically one of a specified type or character". It is also marked that the word body in this meaning is now typical for colloquial speech and also in context with religion as in (45).

(45)   *I have always held that there is a want in him. Something in the eye that would lead a body to say here is someone that is not just right*. (E. McNamee 1998, *Resurrection Man* quoted in OED)

As OED shows, the word *body* is also defined as physical and mortal aspect of a person as opposed to the soul or spirit. Hence, as I believe, this meaning, which is a part of the concept BODY, simultaneously influenced by the metonymic relationship between BODY and PERSON may have resulted in usage of body part term *body* as a reference PERSON in religious context.

The analysis of Russian example (44b) reveals that the body part term *тело*, which is translation equivalent to *body*, is not idiomatic. Nevertheless the body part term *тело* can be utilized as metonymic source providing access to the domain matrix PERSON, like in examples in (46) taken from internet blogs.

(46)   a) *Два пьяных   тела   ввалились в магазин   и   настырно требовали*

      Two drunken bodies NOM   tumbled into shop ACC   and annoyingly demanded

      шлангов. (Белоиван, 2009)

      hoses   GEN

      b) *Тела   ввалились   в коридор,   попутно   снося   все*

       Bodies NOM barged 3PL into entrance ACC   in passing   pulling down   everything

      на своем пути с криком   Хепиньюйеар. (Кравчиня, 2011)

      on their way   with scream   HappyNewYear

The examples in (46) serve as evidence that the body part term *тело* is used in Russian to activate the domain matrix PERSON, though this meaning is not fixed in the dictionaries applied

in this study. In my view of the native speaker of Russian and considering the examples above, the word *тело*, when exploited metonymically, signifies a person in unconscious uncontrolled state, which is usually a result of alcoholic intoxication, but also might be caused by weariness or illness.

In addition, noun *тело* in Russian has a neutral gender, while a person, who is the metonymic target, normally has a feminine or masculine gender. Hence the reference to a person by the body part term *тело* describes him/her as a living creature, but deprived of human qualities. Thus, the gender, which usually ascribed to nouns in inflectional languages like Russian, in this case contributes to the interpretation of metonymy BODY FOR PERSON.

Returning to the original English sentence and its translation into Russian, there is still a question whether in Russian exists a body part term that can be used to evoke domain matrix PERSON and to highlight the domain PHYSICAL STRENGTH provided that the body term *тело* (*body*) cannot be exploited for this purpose. The body part usually associated with muscle power in Russian is *рука* (*hand*). The body part term *рука* premodified by adjective *сильная* (*strong*) as in example (47) would preserve the metonymy and convey the similar meaning as strong body in Lakoff and Johnson's example (see 34a).

(47)   *Нашей команде необходима   пара   сильных рук.*
        Our team DAT   necessary   pair NOM   strong hands GEN

Surprisingly, as can be seen in the example (44c), the Czech authors instead of *tělo*, which would be the direct translation to English *body* and Russian *тело*, also preferred to the body part term *ruka*, which is translation equivalent to English word *hand* and Russian word *рука*.

It appears that there is a common tendency in both languages, Russian and Czech, and hence in both cultures to associate HAND rather than BODY with PHYSICAL STRENGTH. Though HAND and BODY are equally related to PERSON, in Czech and Russian it is only the former that can metonymically indicate a strong person, while in English both options can be exploited as reveal the examples in (48)

(48)   a) *She felt strong hands catch her and drag her away from the building*
        conflagration.(COCA: 2011: FIC: Bk:AfterDarkWithScoundrel)
        b) *For how are we to bring in the corn harvest with all those strong hands and strong*
        arms gone? (BNC: A0N: W_fict_prose: King Cameron. Craig, David. Manchester:
        Carcanet Press, 1991, pp. 15-113. 2685 s-units)

As can be seen from example (48b), it is not only body part terms *body* and *hand*, but also *arm* that can be encountered in English in connection with physical strength. Hence metonymy HAND/ARM FOR PERSON will be examined in more detail in the next section.

To sum up, the body part term *body* is utilized in metonymies in Russian and English differently due to the cultural peculiarities of the concept that might be influenced by extralinguistic reality. Therefore in order to produce metonymy with body part term and the same highlighting effect, the best option in Russian and Czech is the word *hand*.

5.6. HAND (ARM) FOR PERSON metonymy.

Before introducing the examples, it should be reminded that in Russian and Czech the words *рука* and *ruka* respectively denote, as *Толковый словарь русского языка* and *Slovník spisovné češtiny* show, a part of body from shoulder to the fingertips and the same word is also utilized to signify the end part from wrist to fingertips. Regarding English, it has two words referring this part of body. OED defines the word *arm* as the upper limb of the human body from the shoulder to the wrist; while *hand* is a polysemantic word, which similar to Russian and Czech signify "the terminal part of the human arm beyond the wrist, consisting of the palm, four fingers, and thumb, and used for grasping, holding, and manipulating things, and for gesturing" and also the entire arm from shoulder to the tips of the fingers. Thus, while in Russian there is one body part term *hand*, in English exist two terms, *arm* and *hand*, which creates the conditions for two metonymies ARM FOR PERSON and HAND FOR PERSON. Since in Russian and in Czech there is only one body part term, i.e. *рука* and *ruka*, which is used to translate two variants of similar human limb in English, both English terms will be analysed in this section.

The examples (49a) and (49b) present HAND (ARM) FOR PERSON metonymy in English and Russian respectively, while the Czech authors illustrated the meaning conveyed by this particular metonymy with the body part term *noha* (*leg*) in (49c).

(49)   a) *The Giants need a **stronger arm** in right field.*

        b) *Гигантам   необходима **сильная рука**   в нужной области.*

           The GiantsDAT need ADJ F strong hand NOM   in necessary area LOC

        c) *Kometa potřebuje na pravém křídle   **hbitější nohy**.*

           Kometa   needs   on right wing LOC swift legs NOM

In example (49a), similar to body part terms *body* and *hand*, the word *arm* is a metonymic source targeting conceptual domain PERSON and the highlighted domain is PHYSICAL STRENGTH, which is activated by the premodifier *strong*. Though the body part

49

terms *hand* and *arm* have similar meanings, in this case the word *arm* might be more suitable due to the frame evoked by the words *the Giants* and *right field.* Namely, *the Giants* that refer to the baseball team and *right field* that presumably denotes the position of the player on the baseball field, activate the frame of BASEBALL GAME. Thus, the word *arm* is preferable in this context, since it is the most crucial part of the body in this game.

English metonymy incorporating the frame BASEBALL GAME in example (49a) is not easily reproduced in Russian so that it would be accepted by native speakers. In Russian example (49b), which presents a literal translation of the example (49a), metonymy with the body part term *рука* will be understandable only for those, who are acquainted well enough with American culture and sport so that they would be able to recognize the Giants as a baseball team. Thus, this example would be clear only for those, who have formed particular concepts, for instance THE GIANTS, PITCHER, RIGHT FIELD, in order to activate the whole frame AMERICAN BASEBALL.

As for Russian, there might be some metonymies with the body part terms used in the context of other games or sport to convey the meaning of English metonymy. In case of body part term *рука* (*hand*), volleyball or basketball, for instance, would be a better option than baseball. However, free search on the internet sources and 851 tokens of lemma *сильная рука* in Russain National Corpus showed no evidence of this body part term exploited metonymically with the reference to a sport player. Thus, for Russian native speakers the example (49b) and alike is not idiomatic, but tolerable, as has been mentioned previously. Personally, I believe, that such metonymies could be encountered in Russian, but they are very rare and in colloquial language.

Another body part term, such as *leg*, was suggested by Czech translators in example (49c) as possible counterpart to Lakoff and Johnson's metonymy. Here LEG is a metonymic source that gives access to the domain matrix PERSON and the domain DEXTERITY is highlighted. The frame activated in this case is HOCKEY, since *Kometa* is the name of Czech hockey team. However, the frame FOTBALL is also possible inasmuch as the phrase *pravé křídlo* (*right wing*) can be used for both, football and hockey.

Concerning the Russian body part term *нога* (*leg*), the examples retrieved from RNC did not attested the existence of metonymies with this body term in relation to football/ hockey or any other sport. Thus, the Czech variant of metonymy would also be considered as non-idiomatic in Russian.

It is important to reiterate that idiomaticity is one of the key issues for consideration in this research. Therefore from the analysis introduced above it could be concluded that further investigation and testing involving native speakers is required.

Other interesting results were discovered in the dictionaries. According to them, the body part term *hand* has several meanings referring to a person, which are similar in Russian and English, the main languages of study.

Firstly, the body part term *hand* can denoted a person "with allusion to the hand as an instrument of agency" (OED online), which is evident in examples in (50).

(50)   a) *Volunteers will be on duty at events throughout the country. Extra hands are always needed* (Medway Extra 1987, 10 Apr. 4/5 quoted in OED).

   b) *Я решила, что тут нам   лишние руки   ни к чему*.

   I decided   that here we DAT   extra hands NOM   not for anything (unnecessary)

   [НКРЯ: [Татьяна Соломатина. Девять месяцев, или «Комедия женских положений» (2010)]]

Second, the body part term *hand* usually with premodifying words and in plural is used to describe people "employed in any manual or unskilled work; a labourer or workman" (OED online) as in examples in (51).

(51)   a) *He doesn't even know how many plant hands have taken advantage of the new program* (Idaho State Jrnl. 1977, 31 Aug. A3/1 quoted in OED).

   b) Стране нужны рабочие руки. (quoted in *Толковый словарь русского языка*)

The Russian noun *рука* can be used in a rather specific metonymic meaning, which is not among the meanings of the English *hand* or *arm*. In *Толковый словарь русского языка* it is said that this body part term can stand for a person (and in general for people), who renders considerable, but indirect assistance. The example is introduced in (52).

(52)   *У него   своя рука в министерстве*. (quoted in *Толковый словарь русского языка*)

   He GEN   his hand   in ministry LOC

To sum up, the body part term *hand* (*arm*) is a very frequent metonymic source. Various senses with the reference to a person, which are consistent with each other or different, confirm it. Moreover, dictionaries contain the majority these meanings. However, in connection with sport metonymies involving body part terms seem to be idiomatic in English, while in Russian and in Czech such examples are rare and less appropriate.

5.7. BLOOD FOR PERSON metonymy.

One of the interesting examples of PART FOR WHOLE pattern presented by Lakoff and Johnson is BLOOD FOR PERSON metonymy listed in (53). Blood is hardly classified as prototypical part of body compared to previously mentioned hand or head. Nevertheless, it is generally a part of human organism. Moreover, similar to other prototypical body part terms, *blood* can be exploited as metonymic source that targets domain matrix PERSON. Therefore the body part term *blood* was included into the analysis.

(53) a) *We need some **new blood** in the organization.*

   b) *Нашей организации   необходима   **новая кровь**.*

   Our organization DAT   necessary   new blood NOM

   c) *Naše strana   potřebuje novou krev*

   Our party NOM   needs   new blood ACC

As evident in the examples, the body part term *blood* (*кровь, krev*) are idiomatic in all three languages and more importantly it is metonymically exploited in a similar way. In particular, the noun *blood* premodified by adjective *new* gives access to the domain matrix PERSON, where the domains NOVELTY, INNOVATION, CHANGE are highlighted. The usage of the body part term *blood* serves as evidence that the concept NEW BLOOD exists cross-culturally. Therefore, it is not surprising that the following meaning is found in OED and similar remarks are noticed in Russian and Czech dictionaries:

   new blood: (with reference to the idea of refreshing a bloodline by introducing new stock) new elements or influences which bring fresh life or energy to something; *esp.* new people admitted to a family, society, etc., who act as an invigorating influence

In addition, such adjectives as *fresh* and *young*, the latter especially used for energetic young people, can also premodify the noun *blood* to carry the meaning quoted above. Examples in (54) support this claim.

(54) a) *Well, we need **fresh blood** and new opinions, and this guy has them* (COCA: 2006: SPOK: CNN_Situation)

   b) *Some **young blood** around here is just what we needed* (COCA: 2004: FIC: BkJuv:LateBloomer)

As Russian examples in (55) display, the translation equivalents of *fresh*, i.e. *свежий*, and *young*, i.e. *молодой*, convey similar meanings as in English.

(55) a) *«Детройт Ред Уингс» была   уже   достаточно возрастной командой,*
   "Detroit Red Wings"   was 3sg F already   enough   old   team F, INS

   и   все   понимали,   что в нее   обязана   влиться
   and everyone understood 3PL that in her   obliged V, 3sg F   flow INF REF

   молодая кровь.   [НКРЯ: Вячеслав Фетисов. Овертайм (1997)]
   young blood ACC

   b) *Основная наша задача – привлечь   в спорт **свежую кровь**.*
   Main our task NOM   attract INF in sport   fresh blood ACC.

   [НКРЯ: Станислав   Акимов. Властелин колец: кольцевые мотогонки, первое
   приближение (2004) // «Хулиган», 2004.06.15]

One more surprising usage of body part term blood was discovered in English. According to data and examples in OED, the noun blood in African-American slang can denotes a black person or occasionally the black people collectively as can be seen in (56)

(56)   *I swear, Officer, I did not touch another woman, I was sniffin' coke with my bloods all night!* (E. CONLON 2004, *Blue Blood* quoted in OED)

Hence two contextual antonyms appear in African-American slang, namely *face* and *blood*, based on the metonymic usage of these body part terms. As was demonstrated in section 5.3, the noun *face* can be a metonymic reference to white people; while *blood* is used to describe black people. Thus, metonymies BLOOD FOR BLACK PERSON and FACE FOR WHITE PERSON detect the linguistic tendency in African-American slang, namely reveals the conceptualization of the world reflected in language. It is possible to assume that such qualities as passionate, impulsive, high-spirited individuals associated with noun *blood*, i.e. the concepts in the domain BLOOD, might be a part of metonymy BLOOD FOR A BLACK PERSON, but also reflect as way of self-perception by African-Americans.

To sum up, the body part term *blood* premodified by such adjectives as *young*, *fresh* or *new* is actively exploited in metonymies BLOOD FOR PERSON in English, Russian and Czech. Nevertheless languages specific cases, like the usage of *blood* for a black person in African-American slang, can also exist.

5.8. BUTT FOR PERSON metonymy.

Having started with *head*, it would be logical to end the analysis with the body part term *butt* and metonymies with it. Examples in (57) demonstrate English metonymy from Lakoff and Johnson and its variants in Russian and Czech.

(57)　　a) *Get your butt over here!*

　　　　b) *Тащи　　　сюда　свою задницу!*

　　　　　Drag IMP　　here　your butt NOM

　　　　c) *Usad' si　　　　　svůj　ctěný　zadek　　　　třeba sem.*

　　　　　Seat 2sg IMP REFL　　your respectable butt ACC　for instance here

It should be noted that all three examples are imperative sentences. Their special feature consists in the absence of overt grammatical subject, which is nevertheless is implied in English example and marked by the form of the verb in Russian and in Czech. Thus, examples in (57) might not be the best cases of metonymies taking into account that the target, though obliquely, and the source are both present in the sentence. Nevertheless, Lakoff and Johnson regard (46a) as an example of PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. Following their view, it will also be considered in this thesis as a PART OF BODY FOR PERSON metonymy.

Moreover, the body part term *butt* is chiefly used in American English in informal speech (OED) and can be encountered in such example as in (58).

(58)　　*I'll want to know where your little **butt** is going* (COCA: 1993: FIC: BkJuv: ShadowBoxer)

Here the metonymic source is expressed by the body part term *butt* targeting PERSON. Though this metonymic meaning is not fixed in the English dictionaries used for the study, it can be suggested that the reference to a person via this body part term, which is also used to denote person's buttocks or anus, is perceived as contemptuous. Hence, CONTEMP might be the domain highlighted in this metonymy.

As for Russian, it should be put forward that such words as *задница* (*butt*) and other English body part terms were brought into Russian everyday communication with the popularization of American films after 1990s, especially action films where this body part terms were actively exploited. The words like *ass, butt, dick, cunt* (also *damn, shit, son of a bitch* and others) marked as informal and offensive or vulgar in English are either absent from Russian dictionaries or marked as obscene or taboo. Moreover, Russian scholars claim (Mokienko,

54

Zhelvis and others) that Russian profanity ('mat') that were used by the Russian translators for dibbing the action films[16] is more expressive and emotionally coloured than their English equivalents. Hence, example (57b) must be the instance of the phrase that entered Russian language through the poor translation of American lexicon in action films.

Nevertheless, nowadays the noun *butt* and other vulgar body part terms are actively used in Russian spoken and sometimes written language. This metonymic meaning has not yet entered the Russian dictionaries, however the unacknowledged sources as Wiktionary defines the word *задница* as a bad, amoral person. BUTT FOR PERSON metonymy in example (59) can serve as evidence of the current situation in Russian language.

(59)   *Эта сионисткая задница предупреждает нашего президента против повторения*
       This Zionistic butt NOM   warns   our president GEN   against repetition GEN
       ошибок   Адель Насера   в 1967 году.
       mistakes GEN   Abdel Nasser GEN in 1967 year DAT
       [НКРЯ: Василий Аксенов. Новый сладостный стиль (2005)]

Thus, as can be seen from the examples presented in this section, BUTT FOR PERSON metonymy is now typical not only for English, but it has also firmly settled in Russian.

5.9. Summary.

The results obtained from the analysis of examples in Lakoff and Johnson and their Russian translations are summarized in Table 1. Czech examples are also included, even though, as mentioned at the beginning of this section, Czech examples were used as complementary to English and Russian, and less detailed analysis was carried out in Czech, comparing to English and Russian.

---

[16] At this period hundreds of action films were illegally imported into Russia. Later on, they were dubbed by simultaneous interpreters like Volodarsky, Gavrilov, Michalev. The quality of the translation is still controversial, but the catch phrases quickly became idiomatic.

Table 1.

Language	Premodifier	Body part term	Highlighted domain
English	good, wise, clever	*head*	INTELLIGENCE
	--		UNIT OF COUNTING
	Acid-, crack-, dope-, hop-, meth , pot-		ADDICTION
Russian	светлый	голова	INTELLIGENCE
	--		UNIT OF COUNTING
* Czech	bystrý	mozek	INTELLIGENCE
English	-	longhair	INTELLECTUAL AESTHETE, DEVOTEE OF CLASSICAL MUSIC, HIPPIE, BEATNIK
Russian	бритый	затылок	SERVICEMEN PRISONERS
*Czech	holá	lebka	RIGHT-HAND EXTREMIST
English	- /unknown	face	STRANGER
	new		NOVELTY
	pretty		ATTRACTIVENESS
	-		WHITE PERSON (in African-American slang)
Russian	незнакомый	лицо	STRANGER
	новое		NOVELTY
	Милое	личико	ATTRACTIVENESS
	Юридическое	лицо	COMPANY (law)
	Физическое		INDIVIDUAL (law)
*Czech	cizí	tvář	STRANGER
	nová		NOVELTY
	pěkná	tvářička/ pusinka	ATTRACTIVENESS

English	strong	body	STRENGTH
	-		CORPORAL FORM (in religion)
Russian	- / пьяный	тело	UNCONSCIOUS STATE
English	Strong	hand (arm)	STRENGTH (also in sport)
	(Extra)	hand	INSTRUMENT OF AGENCY
	factory-, farm-, ranch-, stage		UNSKILLED WORK
Russian	сильная	рука	STRENGTH
	(лишняя)		INSTRUMENT OF AGENCY
	рабочий		UNSKILLED WORK
	Своя		PATRON
English	New, young, fresh	blood	NOVELTY, CHANGES
	-		Black person
Russian	Новая, молодая, свежая	кровь	NOVELTY, CHANGES
*Czech	Nová	krev	NOVELTY, CHANGES
English	-	butt	CONTEMPT
Russian	-	задница	CONTEMPT, AMORALITY

It was predicted that body part terms can be used metonymically in English, Russian and Czech in a similar way due to the following reasons: metonymy is a ubiquitous cognitive process and body part terms exist in all these languages.

The analysis showed that all of the BODY PART FOR PERSON metonymies presented in Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have counterparts in Russian (and also in Czech). However, some of them have different realizations accounted for linguistic or cultural peculiarities. As table 1 shows, 5 out of 7 metonymic patterns, i.e. HEAD FOR PERSON, FACE FOR PERSON, HAND FOR PERSON, BLOOD FOR PERSON and BUTT FOR PERSON, noticeably overlap in Russian and English, namely the translate equivalents were exploited as metonymic sources and similar adjectives premodified the body part term to highlight identical domains.

Moreover, FACE FOR PERSON metonymy presented in Lakoff and Johnson (1980) by 3 different examples showed significant correlation in all three languages, namely the premodification and domains highlighted match in English, Czech and Russian. It should be noted that in Russian and Czech the body part term *face* when premodified by the adjective *pretty* was transformed by addition of a diminutive suffix. It means that in typologically related languages as Russian and Czech specific means, in this case affixation, are implemented to

produce idiomatic metonymy. As for English, sometimes the result is achieved by compounding, which is more typical for analytical languages than for inflectional. It is evident on the body part term *longhair* and other nouns like *head* and *hand*, when the premodifier becomes a part of a complex word (ex. *acid-head*, *dope-head*, *farmhand*).

A minor limitation is apparent in the usage of HAND FOR PERSON metonymy. Since there are two body part terms *hand* and *arm* in English that are translated by one word into Russian, they can be utilized differently. In particular ARM FOR PERSON metonymy in Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is produced on the background of the frame BASEBALL GAME, while in Russian no evidence was found that a concrete game or sport is sufficiently associated with the body part, so that it could be used metonymically. However, this fact does not exclude the existence of such metonymies, only hints that further examination is required concerning the frame of the whole sentence and its influence on metonymy. This supposition is also strongly confirmed by other metonymies with body part terms discovered only in one language, since they are usually encountered in particular context communication, which does not always depend on the metonymic source, but on situation: *face, blood* in African-American slang, *нос* (*nose*) in Russian jargon, *юридическое/ физическое лицо* in legal language.

In addition, BUTT FOR PERSON metonymy might be considered imperfect, since it more recent and was established in Russian due to the influence of other language, in particular due to popularity of American movies. However, linguistic borrowings are typical for every language and therefore this peculiarity is not greatly significant in the interpretation of the results.

An interesting observation that emerged from the data comparison was the correlation of the premodifiers and highlighted domains. There are metonymies, in which a premodifier only supports the connection produced by the metonymic source. For instance, HEAD is usually associated with intellect, but can also be premodified by *clever, wise, good* focusing on similar quality. However, in case with body part term *face*, premodifier usually determines the domain highlighted. Therefore further examination is needed.

Nevertheless there are metonymic patterns, i.e. TYPE OF HAIR FOR PERSON and BODY FOR PERSON, which have different realizations in English and Russian. In the former case, dissimilar body part terms were exploited, while the reference to HAIR was preserved (*longhair, бритый затылок, holá lebka*). In the latter case, the body part term was identical, but the highlighted domains were inconsistent with each other. This finding implies that less prototypical body part terms have specific metonymic meanings than the more prototypical ones, which are present in metonymies cross-linguistically as well as utilized in more concrete linguistic context.

6. Conclusions.

Conceptual metonymy and its pervasive presence in everyday life is the general focus of this thesis. Metonymy was viewed for a long time as a figure of speech exploited for aesthetic purposes, while recent research in cognitive linguistics attempts to prove that it is an actively used communicative tool. A special kind of metonymy, namely PART FOR WHOLE metonymic pattern, was chosen for research to support cognitive approach developed by Lakoff and Johnson and other scholars (Croft, Radden and Kövecses, Piersman and Greraerts, Janda).

According to Seto, PART FOR WHOLE metonymy is based on meronymic (patronymic) relationships, namely on the division of the whole on parts natural for the speakers of language. A good example is parts of body that are inseparable elements (parts) comprising a human (whole). Since terms naming them exist in English, Russian and Czech, it was assumed that identical metonymies with body part terms referring to a person occur in all three languages. Otherwise, the difference lies in extralinguistic reality.

The study was based on 7 metonymies with body part terms, which are presented with 27 examples retrieved from *Metaphors We Live By* and its translation into Russian and Czech. There were also additional examples from various dictionaries and English, Russian and Czech corpora. The analysis showed that these metonymies exist in three languages, although some of them have different realizations depending on linguistic or cultural characteristics. Since English is an analytical language, there were found metonymies with compounds, while in Russian as a synthetic language affixation is sometimes used to produce metonymy.

Metonymies with the most prototypical body parts terms (*face, head, hand*) are encountered in English, Russian and Czech and they even have been lexicalized, i.e. fixed in the dictionaries. However, there are also specific cases involving prototypical and less prototypical body part terms in each language .

The former usually applied in particular functional style (*face* and *blood* in African-American slang, *юридическое/ физическое лицо* in legal language), while the latter may differ in meaning when used metonymically (*body* in English and Russian) or dissimilar body part terms can be used to express the same metonymy (*longhair* in English, *бритый затылок* in Russian and *holé lebky* in Czech). In some cases (BUTT FOR PERSON metonymy) a metonymic meaning is borrowed from another language together with some idiomatic expressions (ex. *Get your butt over here*).

The reason for different manifistions of such metonymies may be the cultural differences in perception and conceptualization of reality, which may also be indicated in the sentence (ARM FOR PERSON metonymy in the frame BASEBALL GAME). They usually determine the conditions for producing metonymic relationships between source and target domain. Even

59

though the premodifiers were studied in combination with the body part terms, the analysis of the frame activated by the whole sentence was outside the scope of this study and could be the focus of further research.

7. České resumé.

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá druhem metonymie, kdy je význam přenesen z části na celek, tj. ČÁST ZA CELEK, a jejím využitím v angličtině, ruštině a češtině. Cílem této práci je ukázat na příkladech slov označujících části lidského těla, že metonymie je jazykový prostředek používaný v každodenní komunikaci.

Teoretická část práce se věnuje zkoumání fenoménu metonymie z pohledu tradičních věd. V literatuře je metonymie považována za literární figuru (trop), v níž jde o pojmenování na základě věcné souvislosti (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*, *Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, *The Glossary of Literary Terms*, *The New Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Hrabák). Navíc metonymie se považuje za jev, který je charakteristický spíše pro krásnou literaturu, než pro běžnou řeč. Tradiční lingvisté (Filipec a Čermák, Galperin, Cruse) také vnímají metonymii jako trop, ovšem jejich pohled je zahloubanější. Tito vědci se přiklánějí k myšlence, že metonymie je přenosem významu (transfer of meaning) jednoho slova na druhé na základě souvislosti jejich významů.

Kognitivní přístup k metonymii, který je vyvíjen především Lakoffem a Johnsonem (Croft, Radden and Kövecses, Janda) spočívá v tom, že metonymie je definována jako kognitivní proces, jenž se projevuje v běžné řeči. Podle jejich názoru, lidé často používají slovo, jenž patří k určité zdrojové oblasti (source domain) za účelem označení, tj. identifikace, cílové oblasti (target domain), která s tímto slovem souvisí a asociuje. To lze ukázat na příkladu konceptuální metonymie VÝROBCE ZA VÝROBEK, kdy je výrobce použit namísto výrobku. Mluvíme-li o literárním díle, používáme spíše jméno autora než název jeho díla (např. *Hrozně nerad čtu Heideggera*).

Tradiční a kognitivní přístupy se však shodují na tom, že považují jeden z druhů metonymie (patternů) za základní a nejvíce rozšířený. Tímto druhem je ČÁST ZA CELEK. Literarní teoretikové a i někteří kognitivní lingvisté využívají pro jeho označení pojem "synekdocha". V kognitivní lingvistice však existuje názor, že synekdocha je založená na taxonomii — umělém systému. Jenže metonymie je založená na meronymii — vztahu části a celku, který vychází z lidské zkušenosti, a proto se nabízí možnost vlivu extralingvistických, především kulturologických faktorů. Jako příklad může sloužit rozdělení člověka na části těla.

Praktická část této diplomové práci zkoumá jíž zmíněný druh metonymie s využitím slov, která označují části těla v ruštině, češtině a angličtině a která se používají místo přímého pojmenování člověka. Na základě toho, že jsou pojmy pro označení jednotlivých částí těla v těchto jazycích stejné, se dá předpokládat, že metonymie s využitím těchto pojmů budou podobné, avšak za podmínky, že extralingvistické (kulturologické) faktory nejsou příliš odlišné.

Nutno dodat, že díky různým typům daných jazyků mohou mezi nimi existovat lingvistické rozdíly.

Pro analýzu v praktické části byly vybrány příklady z knihy *Metaphors We Live By* od Lakoffa a Johnsona (1980) a z jejího ruského a českého překladu. Především byly vybrány příklady označené Lakoffem a Johnsonem jako ČÁST ZA CELEK, ve kterých pojmy částí těla zastupovaly člověka. Během zkoumání byly zároveň uvedeny i příklady citované z korpusů a slovníků. Celkem bylo nalezeno 7 metonymií, které zařazovaly takové části těla jako *hlava, obličej, tělo, ruka, krev, vlasy, zadek.* Důležitou složkou analýzy je volba části těla, protože tato volba determinuje na jakou charakteristickou vlastnost člověka zaměřujeme, tj. stanovuje oblast zdůraznění (highlighted domain).

Bádání prokázalo, že metonymie s těmito částmi těla existují ve všech třech jazycích a také to, že mají vlastní lingvistické nebo kulturologické specifičnosti. Metonymie, ve kterých angličtina, ruština a čeština používají prototypické části těla (*hlava*, *ruce*, *tvář*), jsou podobné nejen svým přímým překladem (tj. slova jsou přímými ekvivalenty), ale i svými charakteristikami, které jsou spojené s určitou části těla (hlava, mozek — intelekt; ruka — fyzická síla, tvář — zevnějšek). Zajímavé je, že občas taková charakteristika může být označená ne pomocí části těla, ale pomocí přídavného jména, které tuto část těla přemodifikuje (*nová tvář* – nový člověk, *cizí tvář* – neznámý člověk, *pěkná tvářička* – pěkný, hezký člověk).

V některých případech může být vznik metonymie ovlivněn extralingvistickým kontextem, který je ve větě přítomen. Je to dobře vidět v případech, kdy se mluví o sportovních hrách: v angličtině slovo *ruka* (*arm*) může být použito místo hráč baseballu, v češtině slovo *noha* může symbolizovat fotbalistu nebo hokejistu. Ovšem, pojmy prototypických částí těla mohou mít nejen obvyklý metonymický význam, ale mohou se používat v metonymiích, které existují pouze v jednom jazyce - tudíž jsou vyhovující pro určitou kulturu. Například, v angličtině slovo *hlava* se také používá místo narkomana, v ruštině právnický termín *fyzická osoba* zní jako *fyzická tvář*.

Ostatní části těla, které se méně využívají v řeči, mají více odlišné významy, když jsou součásti metonymií. Kupříkladu, podstatné jméno *tělo* charakterizuje silného člověka, ale v ruštině se stejné slovo používá, když se mluví o opilém, ale i o nemocném nebo unaveném člověku. Metonymie TYP VLASU ZA ČLOVĚKA má rozmanité asociace ve všech třech jazycích. Zaprvé se používají odlišné části těla, které jsou s vlasy spojovány (*longhair* v angličtině, *holá lebka* v češtině, *бритый затылок* v ruštině). Zadruhé jsou zdůrazňovány různé rysy člověka nebo jeho preference: hipík, beatnik, milovník klasické hudby v angličtině, politický extremista v češtině, vězeň nebo voják v ruštině.

Z analýzy vyplynul i velmi zajímavý jev — vznik metonymie působením angličtiny na ruštinu. Neformálního a sprostého lexika, včetně slova *задница* (*zadek*), které se běžně v angličtině používá, se začalo využívat častěji i v ruském jazyce, což posloužilo jako impuls ke vzniku metonymie ZADEK ZA ČLOVĚKA.

Kromě toho, zároveň byly zaznamenány některá lingvistická specifika, která jsou charakteristická pro tyto typy jazyků. V anglických příkladech byla použita slova složená (*longhair, methhead, farmhand*), která jsou příznačná pro analytické jazyky. Naopak v ruském a českém jazyce byly zpozorovány případy metonymií, ve kterých slova byla změněna pomocí afixace (*личико, tvářička*), což je zase charakterističtější pro flektivní jazyky.

Celá analýza v praktické části tedy potvrzuje názor kognitivních lingvistů, že metonymie je kognitivní proces, který je typický pro rodilé mluvčí uvedených jazyků a možná i množství jiných. Je však zapotřebí dalšího zkoumání lingvistického a kulturního kontextu, který bezpochybně má vliv na vznik metonymie a její fungování v řeči.

8. References.

Abrams, M. H. 1999. *The glossary of literary terms*. 7th ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Baldick, Chris*. 1991. The concise Oxford dictionary of literary terms.* Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Black, Henry Campbell et al. 1991. *Black's Law Dictionary*. 6th ed. St. Paul, Minn: West Publishing.

Campbell, Lyle. 2013. *Historical Linguistics. An Introduction*. 3th ed. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Croft, William. 2006. "The Role of the Domains in the Interpretation of Metaphors and Metonymies." In *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter. 269-301.

Croft, William and Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, Alan. 2006. *Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cuddon, J. A. 1999. *Penguin dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. 4th ed. London: Penguin.

Filipec, Josef and František Čermák. 1985. *Česká Lexikologie*. Praha: Academia.

Fillmore, Charles. 1975."An alternative to checklist theories of meaning." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 1: 123–131.

Fillmore, Charles. 2006. "Frame Semantics." In *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter. 373-399.

Galperin, I. R. 1971. *Stylistics*. Moskwa: Vysšaja škola.

Hrabák, Josef. 1977. *Poetika*. Praha: Československý spisovatel.

Jakobson, Roman. 1956. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances."
In Jakobson, Roman and Morris Halle. *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague, Paris:
Morton. 67-96.

Janda, Laura A. 2011. "Metonymy in word-formation." In *Cognitive linguistics 22*, no.2. 359-
392.

Koch, Peter. 1999. "Frame and Contiguity: On the Cognitive Bases of Metonymy and Certain
Types of Word Formation". In Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Radden, Günter (eds.) *Metonymy
in language and thought.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 139-168.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the
Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University
Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2002. transl. Mirek Čejka. *Metafory kterými žijeme*. Brno:
Host.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2004. transl. Baranov, A. N. and Morozova A.V.
Метафоры, которыми мы живем. Moskwa: Editorial URSS.

Langacker, R. W. 1993. "Reference-point construction." *Cognitive Linguistics 4*, no.1. 1-38.

Mokienko, V. M. 1994. "Русская бранная лексика: цензурное и нецензурное." *Русистика 1*,
no.2. 50-73.

Norrick, Neal R.1981. *Semiotic Principles in Semantic Theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia:
Benjamins.

Peirsman, Yves and Dirk Geeraerts. 2006. "Metonymy as a prototypical category." In *Cognitive
Linguistics 17*, no.3. 269-316.

Peprník, Jaroslav. 2001. *English lexikology*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

Prohorova, N. M. 2012. *English lexikology*. Moscow: Flinta.

Radden, Günter and Zoltán Kövecses. 1999. "Towards a Theory of Metonymy". In Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Radden, Günter (eds.) *Metonymy in language and thought.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17-60.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. "Figure and Ground in Language" in *Towards a Cognitive Semantics.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics. 1993. ed. by Alex Preminger and et al. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Seto, Ken-ichi. 1999. "Distinguishing Metonymy from Synecdoche". In Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Radden, Günter (eds.) *Metonymy in language and thought.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 121-138.

Zhelvis, V. I. 2001. *Поле брани. Сквернословие как социальная проблема*. Москва: Ладомир.

Dictionaries
Oxford English Dictionary. 1989. 2nd ed. 20 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Also available at <http://www.oed.com>.

Толковый словарь русского языка. 2010. Ожегов С. И. and et al. Москва: Мир образования. Also available at <http://www.ozhegov.ru>.

Словарь русского арго. 2000. ed. Elistratov V. S. Москва: Русские словари. Also avaliable at <http:// www.gramota.ru>.

Slovník spisovné češtiny. 1989. ed. Havránek et al. Praha: Academia. Also avaliable at <http:// www. http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/>.

Corpora

Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)

Davies, Mark. (2008-) The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 450+ million words, 1990-present. Available online at <http://www.americancorpus.org>.

National Russian Corpus (НКРЯ)

Национальный корпус русского языка. Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН, Москва 2004. Avaliable online at <http://www.ruscorpora.ru>.

Czech National Corpus (ČNK)

SYN2010: žánrově vyvážený korpus psané češtiny. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha 2010. Available online at <http://www.korpus.cz>.

Web pages

BabyCenter Editorial Team. 2013. "Is it safe to take aspirin during pregnancy". Babycenter.com <http://www.babycenter.com> (accessed June 27, 2014)

Wiktionary. "Задница". Wiktionary.org. <http://www.ru.wiktionary.org> (accessed July 10, 2014).

Белоиван, Лора. 2009. "Я умею куролесить". Livejournal.com. <http://www.livejournal.com> (accessed July 1, 2014).

Кравчиня, Наталка. 2011. "В квартире было празднично и пустынно". Litprom.ru. <http://www.litprom.ru> (accessed June 1, 2014).

Хан, Александр. *Порт-Саур*. E-readings. <http://www.e-readings.ws> (accessed July 7, 2014).

9. Anotace.

Příjmení a jméno autora: Anastasia Ukolova

Název katedry a fakulty: Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci

Název diplomové práce: PART FOR WHOLE metonymy in English, Russian and Czech

Vedoucí diplomové práce: Mgr. Michaela Martinková, PhD.

Abstract: Metonymy is an actively functioning communicative tool, however it has been considered for a long time as a figurative device used for artistic purposes. The theoretical part of this thesis illustrates traditional approaches to metonymy presented in literature and linguistics. It also examines the views of cognitive linguists on metonymy in terms of its definition, classification and differentiation from other similar phenomena like metaphor and synecdoche. The practical part focuses on PART FOR WHOLE metonymies with body part terms, retrieved from *Metaphors We Live By* and its Russian and Czech translations. The analysis of the examples aims to find out whether body part terms refer metonymically to a person in a similar way in the languages under consideration and if there is any linguistic and/or cultural difference in their usage. Metonymies are organized according to the body part term in separate sections, which include additional examples from monolingual dictionaries and corpora.

Key words: metonymy, metaphor, synecdoche, contiguity, metonymic pattern, PART FOR WHOLE, body part term, source domain, target domain, highlight, dictionaries.

Anotace: Metonymie je aktivně užívaný komunikativní prostředek, přesto byla dlouhou dobu považována za literární figuru používanou pro umělecké účely. Teoretická část této magisterské práce se zabývá tradičními přístupy k metonymii v literatuře a lingvistice. Zároveň zkoumá názory kognitivních lingvistů na metonymii z hlediska její definice, klasifikace a jejího odlišení od metafory a synekdochy. Praktická část práce se zaměřuje na druh metonymie ČÁST ZA CELEK ve spojení s pojmy označujícími části lidského těla. Tyto metonymie byly převzaty z publikace *Metaphors We Live By* a z ruského a českého překladu této knihy. Cílem analýzy příkladů je zjistit, zda pojmy pro části těla, použité metonymicky, stejným způsobem označují člověka v uvedených jazycích. Případné lingvistické a/ nebo kulturologické rozdíly v jejich použití jsou rovněž analyzovány. Příklady metonymie jsou roztříděny podle názvů částí těla na jednotlivé sekce, které obsahují také příklady ze slovníků a korpusů.

Klíčová slova: metonymie, metafora, synekdocha, souvislost, metonymický model, ČÁST ZA CELEK, část těla, zdrojová oblast, cílová oblast, zdůraznění, slovníky.