The growing stature of metonymy

Michael WHITE

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

In 1956, Roman Jakobson made the following claim «... nothing comparable to the rich literature on metaphor can be cited for the theory of metonymy» (p. 47). This has an uncanny present-day ring as it is precisely what researchers have been repeating over the past few years[1]. The consensus at the moment is that, in the half-century that has elapsed since Jakobson's statement, metaphor studies have witnessed unprecedented attention and advances while metonymy has been greatly undervalued and largely neglected. As I stated in a recent review (White 2002:309), concerted attempts to redress this situation have been spearheaded by Goossens (1990, 1995), Dirven (1993) and conferences or theme sessions in 1996 and 1997 which spawned two referential works, namely Panther and Radden (eds) (1999) and Barcelona (ed.) (2000). Along with these, we must hail the appearance of the first monographic book (as opposed to multi authored edited works) on metonymy within the cognitive paradigm, namely that by Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez and Otal Campo (2002). The volume under review features much of the earlier work by significant authors in the field (many of whom contributed to the two edited books just mentioned). Such work is here heavily revised and reworked in the context of the overall aim of the book which is to plot as rigorously as possible the nature and interrelationship of both conceptual devices. In this respect the editors are to be congratulated for having fostered such an extensive inter-discussion among the different authors, something

---

[1] Suffice the following examples as representative:

Traditionally viewed as just one of the many tropes, and clearly subservient in most scholars' minds to the master trope of metaphor, metonymy shapes the way we think and speak... (Gibbs 1999: 61)

Up until now, the field of cognitive semantics has witnessed an overwhelming interest in the role of metaphor ... Although the notion of metonymy was never entirely absent, it was mostly relegated to the secondary status of being introduced or mentioned in an essentially metaphorical context. (Feyaerts 1999: 309)

Metonymy has received much less attention from cognitive linguists than metaphor, although it is probably even more basic to language and cognition. (Barcelona 2000: 4)

Whereas research on metonymies has been rather neglected until quite recently, cognitive linguistics has from its very beginnings been interested in the way metaphors are conceptualised and used. (Niemeier 2000: 195).

which results in a wealth of cross-referencing that tightens the argumental structure in a manner that is rarely if ever achieved in a publication comprising of as many as 17 different contributions. Thus, practically all authors confront their ideas with those of fellow authors, comparing and contrasting, often agreeing but at times breaking into lively disagreement if not polemic.

The book opens with a very comprehensive introduction by René Dirven which situates the aims within the broader field of cognitive linguistics research, explains the reasons for the 4 sub-divisions and extensively summarises and interrelates the individual contributions. The first chapter to follow is a reprint of Jakobson's 1956 work, «The metaphorical and the metonymic poles» and this notion further characterises the first structural division of the book. René Dirven (p. 41) claims that «Roman Jakobson is probably the last *homo universalis* in the human sciences» and indeed the latter's article bears out this claim. Setting out from what scrutiny of aphasia can reveal about language and behaviour in general, Jakobson sweeps through different arts and cultural and historical periods showing the relevance and use of metaphor and metonymy, understood as distinct poles, to an understanding of these periods and their art and science and indeed human life itself. The chapter is highly suggestive in numerous ways but its particular importance for the present book lies in its conception of the devices as opposing poles. Jakobson particularly stresses the opposing facets of the poles but what is particularly of interest to *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast* (henceforth MMCC) is that this polar framework implies a continuum between either pole.

Many of the ensuing contributions set out to articulate how this continuum (or if not continuum, at least overlap or interrelation) could operate, attempting to achieve a principled way of both distinguishing the two mechanisms where possible and of showing how they coincide or overlap in other cases or when seen from different readings. While different authors will provide different windows on these issues, to a large extent they end up giving us a coherent panoramic view.

The article by Renate Bartsch focuses on metaphor and metonymy from within polysemy, particularly singling out their potential for generating new meaning and claiming that they «involve a shift in perspective which makes possible the mappings from one domain to the other by selecting suitable aspects of the source network» (pp 50-51). While she clearly distinguishes the two devices, the reader will find a detailed and principled analysis of how such cases as *cold* colour and temperature in relation to emotional feelings or a father who is considered *a real mother* can be given both a metaphoric and a metonymic reading.

René Dirven's chapter takes Jakobson's work as its starting point, linking the latter's distinctions with «the syntagmatic and paradigmatic potential of language» (p. 75) and with the work of French structuralists, particularly Levi Straus, while, at the same time, expressing his surprise that this work was ignored within the Anglo-Saxon linguistic tradition. At the very outset (p. 79-80), he also strikes a death blow to the standard idea of metonymy giving an example where neither the traditionally held conditions of meaning

shift nor that of substituting one expression for another holds. His evidence leads him to refine the definition of metonymy (p. 80) and to establish not just one, but three types. Simultaneously, this discovery enables him to show up the limitations of the syntagmatic/paradigmatic dichotomy which misses out on significant differences within the syntagmatic axis (p. 84-85). Despite the main focus on metonymy up to this stage in his article, disputable areas in the metonymy/metaphor divide have been surfacing and these occupy centre stage henceforth as the author first feels the need for more rigorously refining the crucial terms of «domain» and the «contiguity/similarity» dichotomy and in this process the term «contrast» gains new methodological stature, initially in metaphor but extending into metonymy and leading him to hypothasize that «metaphor and metonymy may be two different realisations of one common underlying principle» (p. 92) and hence the notion of continuum arises as a logical analytic framework for understanding not only the metaphor/metonymy relationship but also the extension of that continuum to embrace the non-figurative at one extreme.

As Dirven further teases apart metaphor and metonymy, his evidence leads him to conclude that the crucial differences lies in the fact that they are different mental strategies pursuing different functions, metonymy primarily being referential and metaphor expressive and as such are characteristically employed in different art movements (p. 43-44 & p. 105). The article delves in many subtle distinctions which I cannot here go into but in general terms it can be said that it is a concerted effort at establishing a comprehensive continuum embracing not only the non-literal but also the literal. Furthermore, being a continuum, differences obviously shade into one another, yet, the author is able to stake out cogent differentiating points along that continuum, backed up by concrete examples analysis (p. 107).

Beatrice Warren not only takes issue with traditional views but also claims that the standard cognitivist approach fails to «account for important syntactic, semantic and functional differences between metaphorical and metonymic expressions» (p. 114). Although for her, until recently, research has only considered referential metonymy which she distinguishes from propositional metonymy where truth conditions are not violated (p. 114-116). She next charts out six important differences between the devices before singling out the pillars of her own approach which is to understand metaphor as «a property-transferring semantic operation» and metonymy as a «syntagmatic construction» (p. 118) of modifier-head combination where the head is implicit in the target. In the frequently quoted *The kettle is boiling*, the target contains the implicit head linking up with the explicit part of the modifier in the source: that is «(that which is in) the kettle» (p. 118). This analysis also allows her to show how metonymic expressions are non-hypothetical and how modifiers «can anonymously be made topics» (p. 121), something which empowers the device. The author goes on to tease out many further illuminating ways in which metaphor and metonymy differ, deriving especially from her notion of the former as a semantic operation while the latter is syntactic. There are, nevertheless for her, important nuances which allow metonymy to be used for semantic

purposes. In this respect, she also highlights an aspect of metonymy all to often ignored which is its rhetorical force and its expressive role.

Cognitive linguistics may boast of a very extensive body of research on language and emotion and the first article of the two-domain subsection of the book, by three distinguished authors in the field – Kövecses, Palmer and Dirven— deal with this subject, particularly from the angle of how conceptualisation meshes with physiology and culture. Their declared aim is to offer a synthesis of the «experientialist and social constructionist approach to emotion and that synthesis will involve, on the one hand, «the universality of some emotions which are metonymically related to the experience of the physiological function and, on the other, cultural influence» (p. 135). This in itself is laudable since either approach can all too easily turn its back on a wealth of research in the other. At the level of «words and emotion», the authors claim the existence of three types of terms: expressive, descriptive and figurative, pointing out that the latter far exceeds the former two and has nevertheless «received the least attention» (p. 138). Not surprisingly, it is in this area where the two approaches collide: the authors show the nonconstructionist focus as carried out in cognitive linguistic research to find emotion bodily motivated and hence participating to some extent in universalism while the social constructionist view, exemplified by Lutz (1988) disparages such ideas. The authors' stance calls for a role for both: «emotion concepts represent a blend of experiences originating in both these spheres» (p. 143). Differences also arise in so far as the role of metaphor, particularly the authors claim that some metaphors not only reflect emotions but can contribute to how they are constituted (p.147). In fact metaphoric and metonymic evidence of a physiological nature, and thus backing up universalist stances, is mentioned in Lutz's own evidence (p. 148). The final section (p. 147-153) gives an excellent synthesis and detailed enumeration of how both approaches could be seen to work together.

William Croft's 1993 article is next reprinted with very slight revision which seems to me a pity: it could have been fruitful to hear the author's ideas on the many comments this most highly quoted article has elicited over the intervening years. There are, however, a few welcome additions in this respect in the notes to the present printing. Croft's article has indeed been referential since its first appearance, being particularly lauded for showing in detail the relevance of Langacker's work to metaphor and metonymy studies and for his exhaustive and principled analysis of the elusive term «domain». This is particularly so in his discussion of, firstly, the key concept of domain which he defines as «a semantic structure that functions as the base for at least one concept profile» (p. 166) and secondly of «domain matrix» which may comprise different domains. This provides the setting for seeing metonymy as characterised by domain highlighting «since the metonymy makes primary a domain that is secondary in the literal meaning» (p. 179). In this respect, it is for him clearly marked off from metaphor which is characterised by inter domain mapping. Croft goes on to examine many examples of metaphor and metonymy from the vantage point of this framework, further relating them to significant concepts in Langacker, namely, the former to «dependence» and the latter to «autonomy» (p. 191 ff.)..

If one objective of MMCC as a whole is to provide a state of the art of the metaphor/metonymy discussion at the present moment, the chapter by Antonio Barcelona can be considered a veritable state of the art within a state of the art since he develops his argument in constant dialogue with the work of no fewer than eleven of his fellow authors with citations or references to their chapters outnumbering 50. At the same time, he provides us with a sustained theoretical discussion, tackling particularly problematic areas in microscopic detail and pushing forward an idea he has been developing over several years, namely the utter pervasiveness of metonymy in thought and language. Having given an overview of the standard cognitive view of metaphor and metonymy, Barcelona then focuses on metonymy explaining where he coincides and differs from other authors (contributors to MMCC in many cases) specifically claiming that metonymy «is not only a matter of highlighting or activation but also of mapping» (p. 225). He points out that in metonymy, the source is foregrounded while the target is backgrounded (p. 226). For Barcelona, it is necessary to distinguish a continuum within metonymy itself, ranging from what he calls «schematic» metonymy, through «typical» metonymy and onto «prototypical» metonymy. While the latter involves most limiting requirements and comprises of «the 'classical' instances of undisputed metonymy» (p. 228) at the other extreme, «schematic» metonymy would be an extremely broad view with minimal limitations and would mean in practice an enormous proliferation of what would be classified as metonymy. Some might consider this to be too comprehensive, making metonymy so inclusive as to have little discriminating value. However, a counter objection could be raised to such a view in the sense that, if there are theoretical grounds supporting such extensive scope in metonymy as a cognitive mechanism, then it is not proper to ignore them. Rather, what would be called for is a principled, systematic framework distinguishing the different types and where prototypicality would provide the key guideline and this is what the author sets out to undertake. As did Croft, Barcelona takes great pains to clarify tricky aspects of the nature of domains and grants great importance to pragmatic function (p. 237) in distinguishing metaphor from metonymy. Fruit of all this discussion, the author is now in an authoritative position to establish comprehensive definitions of both metaphor and metonymy (p. 246). Having established his theoretical position, he then provides a 25 page application in a practical analysis which minutely disentangles in sequential steps, the metaphoric and metonymic structures underlying an excerpt from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* (II.3.61-68) and particularly the lines «... Young men's love then lies/ Not truly in their hearts, but in their eyes.» Here, the author convincingly shows that multiple metaphors and metonymies can operate and interact in a single linguistic expression. As he does so, he brings to life such important issues in the field of the literature on these cognitive devices such as «metaphorical composition», «metonymic chaining», the «metaphoric motivation of metaphor» or the interpretation of the use of metaphor in context.

The thrust of the work by Klaus-Uwe Panther and Linda L. Thornburg is very well known to cognitive linguists but may come as a surprise in other linguistic circles pursuing as it does the

manifold roles of metaphor and metonymy in grammar. As they themselves point out regarding the potential of metaphor and metonymy for new meaning creations: «... this phenomenon has been extensively studied for content words, but relatively little work has been done on the metonymic and metaphoric meaning extensions of 'grammatical' elements such as derivational morphemes» (p. 283). Their chapter in MMCC focuses on -*er* nominals, with their starting point being to «propose that the present-day -*er* suffix is a polysemous symbolic unit whose meanings are conceptually related through metaphoric and metonymic links.» (p. 285) They carry out an exhaustive analysis of a multitude of these -*er* nominals (both deverbal and nonverbal), well integrated with central issues in cognitive linguistics such as event structure, referential and propositional metonymy, overlapping metaphoric and metonymic analysis of the same expression, semantic roles (such as agent, experiencer, instrument, location). The formidable number of instances of -*er* nominals, from the more conventionally established to the more novel, and the analysis to which they are subjected enable the authors to establish principles and patterns in their behaviour which turn out to be a very convincing way of applying order in this disperse area, apparently recalcitrant to such order.

A chapter from John Taylor's referential book (1989/1995) is next reprinted practically intact. As with Croft's chapter, the inclusion of this contribution places such referential work at the fingertips of the researcher of the current discussion. Furthermore, both authors see the stance adopted at the time of initial writing basically still valid. Particularly, Taylor's view of metonymy, as he himself states, went far beyond traditional rhetoric and raised the point dealt with by many of the contributors of MMCC, namely, its contribution to meaning extension, so that «on this broader view, metonymy turns out to be one of the most fundamental processes of meaning extension, more basic, perhaps, even than metaphor» (p. 325). Taylor also made use of Langacker concepts such as «active zone» and «perspectivisation» and he stresses the need for identifying general processes and patterns constraining metonymic extension since «a word cannot be extended to mean anything at all» (p. 329). In this respect, «preferred patterns» (p. 309) seem to be available and this is very evident in the case of prepositions (pp. 329-333). Taylor's discussion of metaphor contributed to establishing many ideas which became firmly established throughout the 90s and particularly relevant was how he showed the interrelation between metaphor and metonymy in cases which began as metonymy (e.g. quantity and verticality where physicality was concerned) and dovetailed into metaphor where the scenario is one of greater abstraction.

Unquestionably one of the pioneers in claiming qualitatively greater attention for metonymy in cognitive linguistics, Louis Goossens not only coined the term «metaphtonomy» to designate the interaction between the two cognitive devices, but he also plotted concrete ways in which they did interact and which he labelled as «metaphor from metonymy» and «metonymy within metaphor». Moreover, his theoretical claims rested on a corpus data base circumscribed to the use of body-part and body-related terms for linguistic action. Making interesting distinctions between the behaviour of nominals, verbials and

adjectivals, Goossens shows that the boundary lines between pure metaphor and pure metonymy are hazy. At the same time, the cross domain mapping of the metaphor cases show an underlying metonymic saliency and «it is that metonymic reading which is the basis for the metaphorical use» (p. 361). In his «metonymy within metaphor» category, he notes that both domains of the metaphor involve a «built-in metonymy», that is, a «body-part which is a shared element in both domains» (p. 363). While there are many other nuances, the above structure clearly predominates in his data, allowing him to claim that this is the pattern of metaphor/metonymy interaction. His chapter concludes with a postscript in lively disagreement with the ideas of the ensuing chapter. In both articles, it is interesting to see how diachronic evidence can illuminate synchronic linguistic paradoxes and that metaphor and metonymy are particularly relevant in this respect.

Nick Riemer, basing his analysis on a «percussion/impact» data base around the idea of «hit» in different languages, is not convinced by how metaphor and metonymy tend to be demarcated on a basis of inter- and intra-domain. He devotes a lot of attention to this issue pointing out indeterminacy and ambiguity in different analyses by different authors and supporting his claims from his own evidence. He particularly disagrees with Goossens' analyses (p. 389-395), claiming that conventionalisation processes have superseded so that such cases are no longer metaphors nor metonymies. For these cases, he adopts the term post-metaphor and post-metonymy, using his own data to claim that the present contexts of use have overshot the original motivating context (p. 394. But see Goossens' counter argument, p. 372-377). Nevertheless, this does not, for Riemer, in any way eliminate the relevance of the metaphor and metonymy analysis, but, according to him, to be rigorous, we need to affirm that rather than original instances of these devices, they are now a «conventionalisation or generalisation» (p. 402) of them.

Gunter Radden has been defending the notion of a metaphor/metonymy continuum for quite some time and his chapter in MMCC further substantiates these claims with very detailed evidence focused around metonymy-based metaphors from four different sources. The experientially based source enables him to show how metonymy cements thought and language by typically appearing in correlated and complementarity relations, by strengthening such links as causality and contiguity and by enabling metaphors. His analysis of examples from experiential sources, as those focused on pragmatics, also allow him to relate his metonymy-based metaphor analysis to Grady's concept of «conflation» and «deconflation». Completing his analysis with sources deriving from taxonomies and cultural models, he is able to conclude that focusing on that area where «metonymy shades over into metaphor» is also useful in «reconciling the conflicting views laymen and experts ... have about metonymy» (p. 431), reminding us that the naïve speakers of a language «were the ones who developed metaphors in the first place» (p. 432).

Dirk Geeraerts directs his attention to Dutch composite expressions, examining the interaction between their syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes along which he charts the

metaphoric and metonymic interaction. The opaque nature of idiomatic meaning and the quest for transparency motivations, the complex bi-directional interrelationship of the constituent parts and the expressions as a whole are both minutely analysed by the author. Historical or cultural changes and underlying metaphors or metonymies, largely or totally ignored by the main body of the speakers of a language, often uncover transparency motivation for synchronically opaque expressions. Moreover, the lively Dutch examples provide a refreshing contrast to the recurrent English examples predominating in the literature. For the non-Dutch reader, the surprise factor of these expressions has the effect of heightening awareness both of the component structure of the composites as of the expressions as a whole: amongst many others, *droogkloot* = «dry testicle», meaning boring person; *schapenkop* = sheep's head, meaning stupid person; *met spek schieten* = «to shoot with bacon», meaning to boast, to tell a tall story; *de lakens uitdelen*» = «to hand out the sheets», meaning to run the show, to be the boss. Geeraerts analyses these according to the «prismatic» model he has developed and which very neatly shows both metaphoric and metonymic analysis of the same expressions. For the author, the in-between area of the metaphor/metonymy continuum comprises of three basic cases: consecutive interaction of metaphor and metonymy, parallel presence of metaphor and metonymy and interchangeability of metaphor/metonymy analysis. The author points out similarities and differences (particularly wider scope) of his framework with Goossens' analysis.

Crucial to Turner and Fauconnier's conceptual integration or blending theory is the notion of emergent structure in the blended space which is not present in either source or target input spaces and may even be at odds with these inputs. How this apparently paradoxical process operates is not easy to explicate since in some cases not only are there non-correspondent counterparts but even contradictions. In their chapter, these authors set out to demonstrate that, under such circumstances, metonymies play a vital role in facilitating the blends. Thus, they show that a succession of metonymic connections greatly empower the metaphors they analyse by anchoring the relevant selections and relations in the projection. This is spelled out in great detail in the grim reaper metaphor, the Clinton/Titanic counterfactual, the printing press/car metaphor and the severed head and trunk of Dante's Bertran de Born. The significant point is that all these are made possible by metonymy: «...in metaphor-metonymy interactions, the blend can combine non-counterparts, provided the appropriate metonymic connections are in place» (p. 484).

Ruiz de Mendoza and Diez Velasco's chapter, extensively cross referenced with the work of fellow contributors, tackles such questions as conceptual interaction, domains and metaphor/metonymy distinctions in highly rigorous and technical ways. They point out their similarities but also raise certain differences with Lakoff, with Turner and Fauconnier and with Croft, amongst others, presenting reasons which «argue against regarding referential quality of metonymy as part of its definition» (p. 494) or showing that domain highlighting may also operate in some kinds of metaphors. They also take issue with Turner and Fauconnier on one

of the very fundamental pillars of blending, namely that the blended space can contain structure not provided by the input spaces or even contradictory with those spaces. The chapter authors find it more cognitively economical to focus this issue from pragmatics, particularly relevance theory, positing an extra input space, simply provided by the contextual implications. This is indeed a significant innovation. They then set up their own analytic patterns giving a more comprehensive account of domains and establishing two basic types of metonymy: source-in-target and target-in-source, using a graphic system developed in earlier work by Ruiz de Mendoza. To my mind, the great advantage of this system of notation (also adopted in MMCC by Panther and Thornburg) is the clarity with which it delimits intra-domain metaphor and metonymy content, showing precisely what is then mapped across domains and how such interaction operates in one and the same linguistic expression. A principled analysis of the different interaction possibilities the authors consider possible and the patterns they evidence are dealt with at great length (p. 507-528).

Starting with a point often discussed in the literature, namely the large amount of source domain structure often completely ignored in mapping (= «gap», p. 534-535), Grady and Johnson argue for a new approach which considers factors of «less detail» and «more experientially basic» (p. 535) than the traditional domains as crucial to the experiential motivation of metaphor. They thus favour parsing experience into smaller units, what they call «subscenes» and «primary scenes», where the experiential components or «chunks» (p. 544), and the source/target associations are so tightly related that the resultant primary metaphors exhibit no «gaps». These notions, being developed over recent years by these authors, constitute new theoretical tools in metaphor analysis not only allowing for developments at this level but in other respects such as language acquisition: as the authors show, certain subscene differentiation may be what provides easy access to metaphorical learning in child language acquisition.

The final chapter in the book is an attempt by Brigitte Nerlich and David D. Clarke to situate the developments in cognitive linguistics over the past two decades within the broader philosophical, linguistic and psychological traditions of the past two centuries. Among other considerations the radical break of cognitive linguistics with the dominant paradigm of a couple of decades ago (although we are not to ignore the then existing work in functionalism and pragmatics), the enormous drive it triggered, the sheer quantity of publications it engendered and the analytic machinery and meta-language it developed in the process may easily blind us to the rich historical heritage which preceded it. Pioneering work in vindicating that tradition had already been done by Olaf Jäkel (1996,1999) and is cited by the chapter authors but unfortunately missing from their truly impressive bibliographical reference list. As the authors remind us:

> All these 'new' approaches [i.e. different developments in cognitive linguistics over the past couple of decades] to word and sentence meaning were explored during the 19th and early 20th

centuries, and are not just the outcome of a critique of modern objectivist, componential, compositional, and truth-conditional semantics. However, it was only by opposing itself to such theories of meaning, that the new cognitive semantics (as opposed to its 19th century predecessor) could become a new paradigm (p. 561).

It is impossible to do this chapter a minimum of justice in a paragraph or two, so I will merely state that it is most impressive in its scope, in the historical evidence the authors adduce, in their skill at relating the diachronic and synchronic and in the aptness of their citations ranging over such figures as Vico, Locke, Kant, De Marsais, Gerber, Whitney, Wegener, Erdmann, Bühler, Stählin, Weinrigh to mention but a sample. In like manner to what René Dirven said of the work by French Structuralists, many of these authors' languages not being English has also meant that their work has not received a fraction of the recognition it deserves.

The reader of this review will have gathered that MMCC as a whole provides us with a macroview, state of the art of metaphor and metonymy studies within cognitive linguistics at the present moment. The fact that many of the key figures of preceding work here revise, or iron out their views and compare or contrast them with the other contributors provides us with a mature work where ideas are well tested in such a furnace of refinement. However, the end result is in no way monolithic but rather it is flexible. It is both an arrival and a point of departure: the former because it gives a comprehensive state of the art appraisal of the field, the latter because the principles and processes it lays out provide working apparatus and goals for future research. In more concrete terms, MMCC definitively vindicates the stature of metonymy as a conceptual device, it provides a sharper understanding of the components of metaphor and metonymy and establishes key intra-metaphor and intra-metonymy distinctions which in turn affect how these devices interact. In so far as interaction itself, this is no longer a mere statement or claim since quite a number of contributors provide theoretical and practical ways in which this interaction operates, spelling out via practical exemplification how it happens, affording a variety of interaction frameworks, terminology and graphic notations which facilitate comprehension. So, the book can unquestionably stake a claim as a referential work in the field. In this respect, however, a more comprehensive subject index would have made such an extensive work more operative for the researcher. Finally, while metonymy is definitively raised to the status of a cognitive shining light, in case there were any doubt, MMCC shows the pervasive contribution of metaphor and metonymy to meaning extension, to language itself and to communication: all of which is fittingly captured in Rene Dirven's own latter day adage «in the beginning was the word and then came metonymy and metaphor» (p. 38).

References

BARCELONA, Antonio (ed.)

   2000   *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin/New York: Mouton
              de Gruyter.

DIRVEN, René.

   1993   Metaphor and metonymy: different strategies of conceptualisation, *Leuvense Bijd agen*, 82:1-28.

FEYAERTS, Kurt

   1999   Metonymic hierarchies: The conceptualisation of stupidity in German idiomatic expressions. In Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Günter Radden (eds.) (309-332).

GIBBS, Raymond.

   1999   Speaking and thinking with metonymy. In Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Günter Radde n (eds.) pp. 61-76.

GOOSSENS, Louis

   1990   Metaphtonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 1, N°.3:323-340.

GOOSSENS, Louis; p. PAUWELS, B. RUDZKA-OSTYN, A-M. SIMON-VANDENBERGEN and J. VANPARYS

   1995   *By word of mouth. Metaphor, Metonymy and Linguistic Action in a Cognitive Perspective.* Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

JAKEL, Olaf

   1997   European predecessors of a cognitive theory of metaphor. In Smieja, B. and M. Tasch (eds.). *Human Contact through Language and Linguistics.* Frankfurt/New York/Paris/Wien: Peter Lang., pp. 69-86.

   1999   Kant, Blumberg, Weinrich: Some forgotten contributions to the cognitive theory of metaphor. In Raymond Gibbs and Gerard Steen (eds.) *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 9-27.

LUTZ, Catherine A.

   1988   *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and Their Challenge to Western Theory.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

NIEMEIER, Susanne

   2000   Straight from the heart - metonymic and metaphorical explorations. In: Barcelona, Antonio (ed), 195-213.

PANTHER, Klaus-Uwe and RADDEN, Günter (eds.)

   1999   *Metonymy in Language and Thought.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBAÑEZ, Francisco J. and OTAL CAMPO, José Luis

   2002   *Metonymy. Grammar and Communication.* Granada: Editorial Comares.

TAYLOR, John

   1989/1995   *Linguistic Categorization.* Oxford: Clarendon.

WHITE, Michael

   2002   Review of Barcelona, Antonio (ed). 2000. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective.* In *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, Vol 10 (2002) 309-315.