

BARCELONA, Antonio (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000, 356 pp + X, ISBN 3-11-016303-9, hardback.

The reader who picks up a book or article on metaphor nowadays most frequently comes across words in the opening pages such as “burgeoning”, “mushrooming”, “seminal”, “flowering”, “blossoming”, “explosion” as attempts to capture the sheer quantity of work being produced in the field. Even before this boom following the “cognitive turn” (Steen 1994: 3), Wayne Booth had ironically stated that by the year 2039 “there would be more students of metaphor than people” (quoted in Gibbs 1999:29). Antonio Barcelona thus takes on a formidable challenge in setting out to provide a volume which can competitively claim a niche amid such an abundance of work.

Antonio Barcelona has been attempting to redefine the field of metaphor and metonymy for some time (Barcelona 1997) and the first steps towards the book under review were taken at different conferences in 1997 where he organised theme sessions on the issue in question. The papers presented at these sessions, together with specially invited contributions, have clearly undergone extensive post-conference elaboration and editing which enrich the necessarily disparate individual contributions with significant cross referencing. This factor underscores common threads and gives the book a cohesive unity while not pre-empting some more individual contributions. The title, *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, (henceforth MMC) raises certain expectations: if we are at a crossroads, decisions must be taken and if decisions must be taken, sufficient information is a prerequisite and this is what we are led to expect from the book. Let us now examine how it lives up to such expectations and what route its evidence might suggest we take.

The editor’s own introductory article provides a synopsis of the main ideas as well as an extensive appreciation and discussion of the different contributions and will thus serve the reader as a useful road map in his/her journey through the volume. What is the main contribution of MMC to the vast literature in the field? As the editor points out in his opening pages: “Metonymy has received much less attention from cognitive linguists than metaphor, although it is probably even more basic to language and cognition” (p. 4). There is thus a concerted effort to redress this situation and give metonymy due consideration. In this sense, the book may be seen as part of the current drive within cognitive linguistics where numerous articles in specialised journals are devoted to metonymy and full length works on the issue are to be found in, as well as the present volume, the recent publication of Panther and Radden (1999) and the forthcoming book edited by Dirven and Pörings. Pointers in this direction were already evident a decade ago, especially in the very significant article by Goossens (1990) followed by a research project leading to a full length book (Goossens, Pauwels, Rudzka-Ostyn and Simon-Vandenberghe, 1995), as also by an article of René Dirven’s in 1993 resurrecting Jakobson’s work on metonymy. However, whether overshadowed by the dazzle of metaphor or by the sheer strength of the established and entrenched views on metonymy, this work is only now knowing suitable follow up.

MMC has two main sub-divisions, one theoretical and the other applied. The former, entitled “The interaction of metaphor and metonymy, and other theoretical issues” is comprised by articles from Barcelona, Feyaerts, Kövecses, Radden, Ruiz de Mendoza and Turner & Fauconnier. If the classical view of metaphor and metonymy, in existence for over two millennia, clearly demarcated these tropes as distinctly separate, the common denominator of these articles underlines how they interact and overlap. The words of Radden fittingly capture this new situation: “The distinction between the notions of metonymy and metaphor is notoriously difficult, both as theoretical terms and in their application. Thus, it is often difficult to tell whether a given linguistic instance is metonymic or metaphoric” (p. 93). In the light of this difficulty, the same author opts for a metaphor-metonymy continuum, similar to that espoused by Dirven (1993), where at either end of the continuum we would have clearly distinct metaphor and metonymy but in between there would be a large area of overlap. The position taken up by Antonio Barcelona in his second article, in the book under review, is still more radical, namely, that with a broad concept of metonymy as his starting point his hypothesis is “that every metaphorical mapping presupposes a conceptually prior metonymic mapping, or to put it differently, that the seeds for any metaphorical transfer are to be found in a metonymic projection” (p. 31). Barcelona cogently and technically argues in favour of this position and as he does so he musters a commanding knowledge of the existing literature in the field as well as dwelling on counter examples. Underlying this author’s prioritisation of metonymy seems to me to be the idea that the mind functions in an essentially metonymic way. In other words and paraphrasing Polonius’ dictum, “by indirections find directions out”, we could affirm that cognition by parts finds wholes out. How pervasive, if not universal this may be will rest on empirical findings and some technical evidence, both theoretical and practical, is found in the remaining articles of this section.

Feyaerts’ article, based on a corpus of German expressions, is entitled “Refining the inheritance hypothesis: interaction between metaphoric and metonymic hierarchies”. As such a title would warrant, this author takes issue with the existing literature in the field and develops personal ideas of how metaphor and metonymy interact and in what respects they differ. Kövecses circumscribes his article to metaphor but it is interesting to note that as he singles out the “main meaning focus” of metaphor, he is inevitably led on to realise the metonymic implications involved (see footnote 1, p. 91). Ruiz de Mendoza’s article is devoted to metonymy but as he too favours the metaphor-metonymy continuum, he integrates both tropes into his discussion. The article takes many of the classical examples in the literature on metonymy and uses them to produce or exemplify a sustained theoretical discussion of the trope and in this discussion, moreover, he draws on the literature in the field, at times taking issue with it and frequently refining or providing significant nuances. His particular point is the differentiation between two metonymy types –TARGET-IN SOURCE and SOURCE IN TARGET– and this notion is supported by evidence from anaphoric reference, metaphor-metonymy interaction and generic space. As the article’s examples are in many cases classical ones in the literature, it will be interesting to see how his theory stands up to evidence from broader discourse fields and an interesting development in this direction is to be found in Díez Velasco (2000).

The theoretical section of the book closes with an article by Turner and Fauconnier who with, as is their wont, very apropos examples give further evidence in support of their many spaced model. The emergent structure provided by the blend from the appealing counterfactual, 'If Clinton were the Titanic, the iceberg would sink', provides forceful evidence in favour of their model over the simple two space source and target model. Here they show how the blend takes on board "causal and event shape structure" (p. 134) which not only does not come from the source but which is even contrary to the source. The examples from Milton's Satan and Dante's Bertran de Born further reinforce their point as well as showing how metonymic connections are crucial in enabling the metaphoric blends to materialise.

The second section of the book, entitled "Metaphor and metonymy in language structure and discourse" shows the empirical vocation of cognitive linguistics and also evidences how its applications embrace the most diverse of fields: meaning extension, modality shifts and diachronic linguistics (Goossens, Pelyvás, Haser), idiomatic expressions (Niemeier), grammar (Panther and Thornburg), literary criticism (Freeman, M.H.), conversation (Ponterotto), journalism (Sandikcioglu), and, publicity and pictorial metaphor (Ungerer).

Metaphor and metonymy have long been recognised as essential and prolific contributors to meaning extension of lexis (see Sweetser 1991, Dirven & Verspoor 1998). Goossens, however, introduces certain constraints regarding overstating this claim, opting for what he calls "partial sanction". His article provides a wealth of technical synchronic and diachronic data on modals which anybody interested in the field will find rewarding to read. Pelyvás' article limits its treatment of modals to "may" and "must", and this author, drawing on and adding to Langacker, is particularly interested in these from the perspective of "epistemic grounding" which leads him to develop his account on a highly use-sensitive basis. Again those interested in modals will find his nuances and additions to the relevant literature in the field very illuminating in so far as both deontic and epistemic focus on these verbs. A third article which has a diachronic perspective is provided by Haser and is entitled "Metaphor in semantic change". From her perspective, this author coincides with many fellow authors in the book in affirming that "To tease apart the differences between metaphor and metonymy has proved an intractable undertaking" (p. 173). The cross linguistic evidence Haser musters is in itself a veritable *tour de force* and at the same time provides very supportive evidence for the systematicity claims she is putting forward.

Susanne Niemeier's article, being based on body expressions –a metonymic source *par excellence*– provides another perspective from which to tease out the metaphor-metonymy tangle. She also favours the continuum hypothesis and rather than seeing both devices as strategies of equal importance starts with the claim that: "it would appear that metonymies antecede metaphors in language development in that many –if not all– metaphors have a metonymic basis, i.e. are dependent on a conceptually prior metonymic conceptualisation" (p. 195), a claim which is related to Barcelona's, mentioned above. Another point which this author makes and with which I totally agree (see White 1998: 45-49; White 2001: 54-55) is the potential stylistic and communicative role metonymies may play in discourse: "In contrast to 'plain language', these utterances are often endowed with more surprise effects or

expressivity insofar as superficially they appear to say similar things as their neutral equivalents but in addition they ‘colour’ the utterances with nuances of the language users’ inherent worldview.” (p. 197). Her selection of ‘heart’ expressions allows her both to analyse these separately and to discover main meaning clusters which in turn are found to overlap and, moreover, the selection provides her with interesting evidence of metaphor-metonymy co-operation.

Panther & Thornburg apply metonymy in ground, as yet little trodden, namely, as a feasible explanation for apparent grammatical anomalies. These authors note that certain stative verbs in English have curious dynamic uses and at the same time these constructions translated literally into German would prove ungrammatical (the many examples given make the article an interesting contrastive study in itself). Resorting to such pervasive metonymies as EFFECT FOR CAUSE and RESULT FOR ACTION, they are able to show that “this conceptual metonymy has a strong impact on grammatical structure in English” (p. 216). Their approach could herald promising developments as is suggested by the authors’ conclusion that “the systematic investigation of how metonymy and grammar interact is, as we hope to have shown, a fascinating prospect for future research” (p. 230).

While cognitive linguistics initiated its course with a very powerful focus on everyday metaphor and a revaluation of dead metaphor, by now it has produced a sizeable literature on literary works as is attested by the writings of Mark Turner, M.H. Freeman and her husband D.C. Freeman, to mention just a few of the names working in this field. In her article, Margaret Freeman tackles the poems of metaphoric writers *par excellence*, namely Emily Dickinson and Sylvia Plath. She then goes on to examine a forgery attributed to the former author and judged to be authentic by many critics. Freeman’s contention is that cognitive linguistics provides the basis for an adequate theory of literature which would obviously include providing the tools to identify poetic style, a corollary of which would imply not being taken in by a forgery. Regarding the critics and methods which failed to detect the forgery in question, she makes the following claim: “It is not that Dickinson scholars are not sensitive readers or accomplished critics; they are. It is because they don’t have an adequate theory of literature that they were unable to determine that the newly discovered poem was a forgery. On the contrary, cognitive poetics provides a very clear means by which we can read and describe and identify a literary text and its style” (p. 272). Perhaps such a ‘hard sell’ of the cognitive linguistics method would not endear the author to the literary critic from a different school and some qualifications regarding her claims might be pertinent. Nevertheless, all her criteria for an adequate theory of literature are satisfied in her approach and she concludes: “A cognitive poetics reading of the few poems discussed in this paper shows just how powerful the theory of cognitive poetics can be in capturing the power, the effect, and the relevance of poetry” (p. 277).

The cohesive role of metaphor is one quite often mentioned (see White 1997: 242) but given its potential in this respect, it is to my mind an area still very much under-researched. Ponterotto’s article is thus a welcome contribution and, moreover, her focus is on a particularly neglected field, namely, conversation. She examines in detail two text fragments, one a highly scripted conversation from a film excerpt and the other a genuine conversation. From the point of view of empirical validity, her evidence may

be criticised as being rather scant and certainly to reach feasible conclusions one would need much larger texts plus certain selection principles. That said, the close analysis the author carries out on her evidence does provide a viable method for analysing and appreciating cohesion resulting from metaphor and it would be interesting to see her method applied to larger texts.

Sandikcioglu's article revisits the Gulf War, a scene which has received a lot of attention within conceptual metaphor circles ever since George Lakoff's urgently circulated e-mail account during the actual build up to the war (later published in Putz, ed., 1992) and subsequent articles by Pancake (1993) and Winkler (1995). The author's focus is one which cognitive linguistics is very well equipped to handle, namely the whole cultural backdrop to the war, particularly as reflected in the Western news coverage of the conflict. This, according to the author, evidences an overall macro-framework of "Self-presentation versus Other-representation" (the West and Orient respectively) and this in turn leads to a series of micro-frames attested again and again by the metaphors of the news coverage, so aptly exemplified by the author. This reinforces her conviction that "It is very difficult, if not impossible, to see the world around us with different eyes, since we are literally products of our cultures" (p. 302). The author's cultural and linguistic frameworks as well as her evidential support and argumentation is highly convincing. However, if I may raise a collateral issue, I would say the following: the whole debate of the Gulf War has produced an excellent critique of Western presuppositions and how metaphor underpins these, but sadly lacking is a similar critique of an alternative view, both from within and without its respective presuppositions.

The closing article by Friederich Ungerer deals with advertising and integrates the textual and pictorial dimension of this genre. The perennial question in metaphor as to what is carried over and what not takes on crucial importance in this connection since the drive to be effective in the realm of publicity often leads to the discarding of the more obviously hackneyed persuasive techniques and the introduction of novel, sometimes even shocking and apparently revolting features. Since advertising is singularly goal orientated – to persuade – something must be happening which makes such apparently off-putting material end up being successful. Ungerer handles this paradox quite deftly by showing how highlighting and hiding or downplaying, characteristic of all metaphor use, take place in these situations by a process he names "muting". Thus, this type of publicity is very effective as attention getting while the negative, unpleasant or potentially counterproductive aspects are subsequently muted out. Moreover, his article is yet a further instance of the metaphor-metonymy overlap and thus provides a suitable closure, given the theme of the book.

In summary, what does MMC contribute to the literature in its field? In accordance with what we have seen, it may be claimed that it contributes both to theory and application. In so far as the former, it pries deeply into the metaphor-metonymy interrelationship, picking up certain ideas which have had as yet scant effect in the literature and especially pushing forward research in this area. Particularly, a much enriched view of metonymy is developed in the book. It is not that the hitherto prototypical representational role of metonymy based on contiguity will go away – this is obviously not the issue, since that role is a basic of cognition. But, in the first

place, we will gain a deeper appreciation of that role while, secondly, and more importantly, we will realise that, in certain cases at least, cognition itself and metaphor in particular are manifestly sustained by metonymy and it will be the task of empirical enquiry to determine how comprehensive this factor is. The more practical articles of the second section lead the way in this direction as well as showing a wide range of individual applications of interest in their own light. All this will certainly rule out an over mechanical interpretation of metonymy as simply representational and, furthermore, from the ongoing research in the field, “there might emerge a ‘conceptual device’ just as significant and ‘precious’ as metaphor” (Kövecses and Radden 1998:75).

REFERENCES

- Barcelona, A. (1997). Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics. *Atlantis* XIX, N° 1: 21-48.
- Díez Velasco, O.I. (2000). A cross linguistic analysis of the nature of some *Hand* metonymies in English and Spanish. *Atlantis*, XXII, N° 2: 51-67.
- Dirven, R. (1993). Metaphor and metonymy: different strategies of conceptualisation. *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 82: 1-28.
- Dirven, R. and Verspoor, M. (1998). *Cognitive Explorations of Language and Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dirven, R. and Pörings, R. (eds.) (forthcoming). *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Downing Rothwell, A., Moya Guijarro, J. and Albentosa Hernández, J. I. (eds.) (1997). *Patterns in Discourse and Text. Ensayos de análisis del discurso en lengua inglesa*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.
- Gibbs, R. (1999). Researching metaphor. In Cameron, L and Low, G. (1999), *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 29-47.
- Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 1, N° 3: 323-340.
- Goossens, L., Pauwels, P., Rudzka-Ostyn, B., Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M. and Vanparys, J. (1995). *By Word of Mouth. Metaphor, Metonymy and Linguistic Action in a Cognitive Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Z. and Radden, G. (1998). Metonymy: developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9, N° 1: 37-77.
- Lakoff, G. (1992). Metaphors and war: the metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf. In Pütz, M. (ed.) (1992). *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 463-481. (First version circulated via email from December 31st, 1990).
- Pancake, A.S. (1993). Taken by storm: the exploitation of metaphor in the Persian Gulf War. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 8, N° 4: 281-295.
- Panther, K.-U. and Radden, G. (1999). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Pütz, M. (ed.), (1992). *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schiappa (ed.) (1995). *Warranting Assent: Case Studies in Argument Evaluation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Steen, G. (1994). *Understanding Metaphor in Literature*. London: Longman.
- Sweetser, E. (1991). *From Etymology to Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, M. (1997). The use of metaphor in reporting financial market transactions. *Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa*, Vol 6, Nº 2: 233-245.
- (1998) A cognitive linguistics view of the use of metaphor in headlines, leads and news stories. In Downing Rothwell, A., Moya Guijarro, J. and Albetosa Hernández, J.I. (1998): pp. 31-61.
- (2001). Metaphor and Metonymy in thought and expression. In Aguado, G. y Durán, P. (eds.) (2001). *La Investigación en Lenguas Aplicadas: Enfoque Multidisciplinar*, Madrid: Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, pp. 47-63.
- Winkler, C. (1995). Narrative rephrasing of public argument: George Bush's handling of the Persian Gulf Conflict. In E. Schiappa (ed.): pp. 33-55.

Michael White
white@filol.ucm.es
Escuela Universitaria de Estudios Empresariales
Universidad Complutense de Madrid