

BARCELONA, A. (Ed.) (2000), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A cognitive perspective*, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, (356 pgs.)

González Macías, Miguel Ángel

*Universidad de Cádiz. Dpto. Filología Francesa e Inglesa
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. Avda. Gómez Ulla, nº 1. 11003 Cádiz.
Tlf.: 956 015852, Fax: 956 015501. E-mail: miguel.macias@uca.es*

(Recibido, abril 2001; aceptado, junio 2001)

BIBLID [1133-682X (2000-2001) 8-9; 443-446]

This volume is the result of a selection of papers presented at two scholarly meetings organised in 1997¹, and several invited contributions. The book is structured into two main parts: *The interaction of metaphor and metonymy, and other theoretical issues*, including six articles, and *Metaphor and metonymy in language structure and discourse*, with nine articles divided into two sub-parts: *Metaphor and metonymy in language structure* and *metaphor and metonymy in discourse*.

The appearance of the book is not accidental; it is the result of a change of scope in the studies of metaphor and metonymy in the last years. This change, according to the editor, is reflected in three main points; firstly the fact that the cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy (CTMM using the author's acronym) is "at a turning-point in its evolution as a theory" (p. 1); secondly, the interaction between the notions of metaphor and metonymy; and, thirdly, the appearance of new forms of application of these theories and notions.

In the introduction the editor states the basic notions of the CTMM. From the meaning of a *cognitive approach* to the new trends in the CTMM and the problems that these new trends pose. The definition of the notions of metaphor ("a cognitive mechanism whereby one experiential domain is partially *mapped* [...] onto a different experiential domain, so that the second domain is partially understood in terms of the first one" (p. 3)) and metonymy ("a conceptual projection whereby one experiential domain (the target) is partially understood in terms of another experiential domain (the source) included in the same *common experiential domain*" (p. 4)) are also basic ideas in this introduction.

The first part of the book, devoted to the theoretical analyses of the nature of metaphor and metonymy, includes the contributions of Barcelona, Feysaerts, Kövecses, Radden, Ruiz

1 A theme session on the metonymic motivation of metaphors in the 5th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference at the Free University of Amsterdam, and a seminar on the cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy in the 4th Conference of the European Society for the Study of English, held at Lajos Kossuth University, Debrecen, Hungary.

de Mendoza and Turner and Fauconnier. The interaction between both phenomena is the main issue in most of these papers. Antonio Barcelona in "On the Plausibility of Claiming a Metonymic Motivation for Conceptual Metaphor" claims that every metonymy is a conceptual prerequisite for (motivates) metaphor. To illustrate this claim, the author reviews some recent research including examples of metonymy-based metaphors, although, unlike the author, these papers do not claim that *every* metaphor is motivated by metonymy. Opposed to this claim, Barcelona offers some *apparent* counterexamples posed by John Taylor in which metaphors are not motivated by metonymies. These examples involve synesthesia and pitch and smell. Barcelona concludes that all the metaphors under these two categories proposed by Taylor are motivated by metonymies, and he identifies and characterises two different types of motivation. The author then explores the affinities between his hypothesis and the Invariance Hypothesis formulated by Lakoff in these terms: "Metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology (that is, the inherent image-schematic structure) of the source domain in a way consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain²". Barcelona claims that the concept of Invariance "in its *classical* formulation" implies a metonymic constraint on metaphor. The author proves the connection between both hypotheses with the examples previously used. He concludes arguing that there seems to be enough proofs to claim that metaphorical mappings are necessarily based on metonymy, basing this assertion in four different points: (i) There are many metonymy-based metaphors. (ii) Metaphors do not always focus on every aspect of the target (i.e. they are *partial*). (iii) There are cases in which conventionalised metonymies motivate metaphors. This process implies experience as a base for metaphors. In other cases metonymic-based metaphors depend on our sensory experience in both domains. And (iv) the fact that perception and mental activation of domains are also *partial*, and provokes the metonymical selection of "the aspects of the target domain to be *elucidated* by means of a metaphor, and the main subdomains of the source to be mapped onto the target." (p. 52).

Kurt Feyaerts in "Refining the Inheritance Hypothesis: interaction between metaphoric and metonymic hierarchies", proposes a new interpretation of George Lakoff's *Inheritance Hypothesis*³ based on the idea that the meaning of a linguistic expression depends on the interaction of metaphoric and metonymic hierarchies. To demonstrate his hypothesis, Feyaerts uses the analysis of German idiomatic expressions which conceptual domain (the concept STUPID) proves to be metonymically structured. Metaphor is "the (partial) mapping of two concepts belonging to different knowledge domains onto each other" (p. 60) and, thus, the source concept helps to understand the target concept. In this sense, he uses the term *metaphtonymy* coined by Louis Goossens in 1990⁴. This term explains the interaction between metaphor and metonymy and, thus, Feyaerts argue that Lakoff's hypothesis can be rephrased to include metonymical mappings, and that metaphorical and metonymical hierarchies overlap in a particular structure (what the author calls a metaphtonymic hierarchy).

2 LAKOFF, George (1993) "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor" (p. 215) quoted by Barcelona (p. 44).

3 "Metaphorical mappings are organised in complex hierarchies, so that subordinate mappings *inherit* all the details of superordinate mappings" (Barcelona: 16-17)

4 "Metaphtonymy", originally printed at *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 323-340, has been recently reprinted in GOOSENS, Louis et al. (1995), *By Word of Mouth*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 159-174

Zoltán Kövecses in “The scope of Metaphor” deals with the answer to the following question: ‘How many and what kind of target domains does a single source concept apply to?’ (p. 80). This is, basically, the ‘scope of metaphor’ he refers to in the title. Analysing several examples from the metaphorical source domain of buildings, the author poses that this source domain applies to a variety of distinct targets that belong to the category of *complex abstract systems*, creating a new generic-level metaphor of the type *COMPLEX ABSTRACT SYSTEMS ARE BUILDINGS*. With the help of this generic metaphor, Kövecses identifies some main meaning foci in the source domain, and thus, more than one central mappings. The analysis of the metaphors of fire leads the author to state that there must be two types of metaphors: complex and simple ones. Simple metaphors make up complex ones by way of the capture of central submappings, and so, we can say that simple metaphors constitute mappings in complex ones.

Günter Radden’s “How metonymic are metaphors?” studies the analytical category of metonymic-based metaphors. By way of the analysis of metonymy-based metaphors, the author proposes a classification into four subclasses: (i) the common experiential basis of target and source (the two metaphorical domains), (ii) conversational implicatures, (iii) the category structure (metaphors based on metonymic relationships) and (iv) metaphors based on cultural metonymical models.

Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez in “The role of mappings and domains in understanding metonymy” explains the differences between what he calls “one-correspondence” metaphors with one central mapping and one central implication, and “many-correspondence” metaphors with several central mappings and central implications. The author claims that metonymic mappings are very similar to the mappings for one-correspondence metaphor, although the former are domain-internal, while the latter are achieved across domains. Ruiz de Mendoza describes two classes of metonymies, the source-in-target and the target-in-source, analysing their roles in several semantic phenomena. He concludes with a new definition of metonymy: “a one-correspondence conceptual mapping within a domain where, if the target is part of the source, the target is not a primary or central subdomain of the source” (130).

“Metaphor, metonymy and binding” by Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier considers the authors’ theory of blending (conceptual integration), defined as “a basic mental operation whose uniform structural and dynamic properties apply over many areas of thought and action, including metaphor and metonymy” (133). Through the analysis of five case-studies the authors claim that the blend creates structures and inferences of its own, which are not present in the source or in the target.

The second chapter, “Metaphor and metonymy in language and discourse” is divided into two parts. The section devoted to “Metaphor and metonymy in language structure” includes the articles by Goosen, Haser, Niemeier, Panther & Thornburg and Pelivás.

Louis Goosen’s “Patterns of meaning extension, ‘parallel chaining’, subjectification and modal shifts” identifies the changes of meaning of English modal verbs. He claims that neither metaphor nor metonymy can account for these shifts. The author concludes that the analysis of various data proves that there is a great amount of subjectification in the development of central modals.

Verena Haser in “Metaphor in semantic change” investigates the metaphorical shifts that account for the polysemy of a wide range of words in languages belonging to different families of all over the world. To Haser metaphor and metonymy are the main agents of semantic change.

In "Straight from the heart -metonymic and metaphorical explorations" by Suzanne Niemeier, the relationship between metaphor and metonymy in expressions referring to emotions (namely *the folk model of the heart* in the author's words) is explored. After analysing in great detail a large corpus of linguistic expressions involving the heart as a domain in metaphor and metonymy, the author concludes that metaphors involving emotions have a metonymic basis.

The article by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Linda Thornburg "The EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymy in English grammar" focuses on the interaction between conceptual metonymy and grammar. They study two types of the general EFFECT FOR CAUSE metonymies. The RESULT FOR ACTION metonymy has a strong impact on the grammatical structure and is systematically grammaticalised in English. On the other side, the PERCEPTUAL EVENT FOR ITS CAUSE metonymy does not show any detectable grammatical consequences.

Péter Pelivás in "Metaphorical extension of *may* and *must* into the epistemic domain", attempts to characterise the metaphorical projection of modal meanings into the epistemic domain. The author studies Sweetser's proposal¹ of metaphorical extension of modals posing that Sweetser's analysis of the extension of *may* from the deontic to the epistemic domains violates the Invariance Principle. Pelivás promote a proposal which satisfies this principle. The author also criticises Sweetser's analysis of *must* in similar terms.

The last section, "Metaphor and metonymy in discourse" -represented by the contributions of Freeman, Ponterotto, Sandikcioglu and Ungerer-, opens with Margaret Freeman's "Poetry and the Scope of Metaphor: Toward a cognitive theory of Literature". Freeman proposes the development of a "cognitive poetics" based on cognitive linguistics and the cognitive sciences. This new type of poetics allows a new form of text analysis based on the meaning of the text, and the cognitive skills involved in its interpretation. The author states the criteria that an adequate theory of literature must fulfill; it must be descriptive, explanatory, theoretical, predictive, demonstrative, evaluative and elegant.

Dianne Ponterotto in "The cohesive role of cognitive metaphor in discourse and conversation", explains that metaphor has a central role in the structuring of conversation strategies. For the author, conceptual metaphors must be regarded as a fundamental part of cognitive theories of discourse. The cognitive metaphor networks that structure the discourse organization, provide a cohesive force to verbal interaction. In this sense, the author concludes that speech acts when they have figurative grounds, provide the information structures with "more significance, greater elaboration and a sense of uniqueness" (295).

The contrastive study of the coverage of the Gulf War by two American magazines is the core theme of Esra Sandikcioglu's "More metaphorical warfare in the Gulf: Orientalist frames in news coverage". The author bases her study in the Orientalist stereotypes used by the journalists covering this war. Orientalist metaphors justify the war as a way to protect Western civilization.

"Muted metaphors and the activation of metonymies in advertising", Friedrich Ungerer's article, deals with certain strategies to eliminate negative mappings in a metaphor used in advertising. The author also deals with the concept of GRABBING metonymies, activated by these muted metaphors. In these metonymies, grabbing an object stands for desiring it. The VALUE metaphor is also studied. Ungerer ends his article with an account of metaphor, metonymy and muting in trade marks.

5 Eve Sweetser (1990), *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.