

Contents

Preface — V

Acknowledgements — VII

List of Figures — XV

List of Tables — XVII

List of Abbreviations — XIX

1 Introduction — 1

1.1 Subject — 1

1.2 Structure and Main Insights — 3

2 Mentally Representing the World — 7

2.1 Concepts — 8

2.2 Constructed Mental Representations — 9

2.3 Types of Mental Representations — 10

2.3.1 MR Types and Noun Types — 11

2.3.2 Linguistic Symptoms of MR Types — 13

2.4 Combinations of Mental Representations — 14

2.5 Conclusion — 16

3 Frames: A Recursive Format for Mental Knowledge Representation — 17

3.1 Capturing Flexible Knowledge Structures — 17

3.2 Frames as Attribute-Value Structures — 17

3.2.1 Properties as Attribute-Value Pairs — 18

3.2.2 Frames Represented as Directed Graphs — 19

3.2.3 Attributes and Values — 19

3.3 MR Types in Frames — 21

3.4 MR Combination and Modification in Frames — 22

3.5 Conclusion — 23

4 Meaning: Stability and Flexibility — 25

4.1 Concepts, Lexical, and Intralingual Meanings — 25

4.2 Meaning, Underspecification and Construction — 27

4.2.1 Meaning Construction — 28

4.2.2	Levels of Meaning Construction —	30
4.2.3	Mechanisms of Meaning Construction —	32
4.3	Conclusion —	34
5	Metonymy —	35
5.1	Rhetorical Tradition and Cognitive Turn —	35
5.2	Metonymy as Substitution or Ellipsis —	36
5.3	Metonymy and Synecdoche —	37
5.4	Metonymy as a Conceptual Shift or Domain-Internal Highlighting —	38
5.5	The Conceptual Relation Underlying Metonymy —	40
5.5.1	Contiguity —	40
5.5.2	Salience —	41
5.5.3	Contingency —	41
5.6	Metonymy and Conceptual Distance —	42
5.7	Metonymy and Reference —	43
5.8	Metonymic Relations —	44
5.9	Metonymy and Discourse —	46
5.10	Metonymy and Grammar —	46
5.11	Metonymy and Language Change —	47
5.12	Conclusion —	48
6	A Way of Analysing Metonymy in Frames —	49
6.1	Metonymic Shifts and Metonymic Change —	49
6.2	The Data —	51
6.2.1	Sources —	51
6.2.2	Differences in Internal Complexity of the Examples —	52
6.3	The Method —	53
6.3.1	Relevant Invariants of Lexicalization —	53
6.3.2	Reconstruction —	54
6.3.3	Example Reconstruction —	55
6.4	Conclusion —	58
7	Integrating Received Knowledge of Metonymy into Frames —	59
7.1	Definition —	59
7.2	Metonymy and Reference in Frames —	61
7.2.1	The Conceptual Base of Referential Shifts —	61
7.2.2	Referent-Sensitive Metonymies in Frames —	62
7.2.3	Non-Referent-Sensitive Metonymies in Frames —	65
7.3	Availability of Attributes in Frames —	67

7.4	Traditional Types of Metonymy in Frames —	70
7.4.1	Metonymic Classes and Reversibility —	70
7.4.2	Metonymic Classes and Attribute Labelling —	72
7.5	Conclusion —	74
8	Source Focus versus Target Focus —	75
8.1	Metonymy: Ubiquitous and Hard to Narrow Down —	75
8.2	Metonymic Continuum: the Word Formation Pole —	77
8.3	Metonymic Continuum: the (Quasi-)Literal Pole —	81
8.4	A (Tentative) Scale of Metonymic Phenomena —	95
8.5	A Model of Metonymic Focus Placement —	100
8.5.1	The Basic Conceptual Distinction —	101
8.5.2	Linguistic Reflexes of the Distinction —	103
8.5.3	Arguments for MFP —	105
8.5.4	Why Source Metonymy is Metonymy —	106
8.5.5	Why Source Metonymy is Referent-Sensitive Metonymy —	107
8.5.6	Benefit and Function of Referent-Sensitive Metonymy —	108
8.6	Conclusion —	109
9	Metonymy and Directionality: Patterns in Non-Relational Frames —	111
9.1	The Directionality of the Metonymic Link —	111
9.1.1	The Uneven Dependency between Source and Target —	111
9.1.2	Potential Constellations in Terms of Attribute Links —	112
9.2	Bidirectionality —	113
9.2.1	Examples of Bidirectional Metonymies —	114
9.2.2	Potential Objections —	115
9.2.3	Arguments in Favour of Necessary Bidirectionality —	117
9.2.4	Bidirectionality with Source and Target Focus —	119
9.2.5	Identical (Non-)Uniqueness of Source and Target —	119
9.3	Counter-Directionality —	120
9.3.1	Why Bidirectionality Is not (Always) Necessary —	121
9.3.2	Examples of Counter-Directional Target Metonymy —	122
9.3.3	Examples of Counter-Directional Source Metonymy —	130
9.4	Necessity of the Counter-Directional Attribute —	136
9.4.1	Why the Counter-Directional Attribute is Inevitable —	137
9.4.2	Discussing Some ‘Impossible Examples’ —	138
9.5	What about Non-Referent-Sensitive Metonymy? —	141
9.6	Non-Relational Metonymy in Frames: Overview —	141
9.7	Conclusion —	144

10	Metonymy and Directionality: Patterns in Relational Frames — 145
10.1	(Non-)Relationality in Metonymy — 145
10.1.1	Metonymy in Frames with No Open Arguments — 145
10.1.2	Metonymy in Frames with Additional Open Arguments — 146
10.1.3	Metonymy that Shifts an Open Argument — 146
10.1.4	Shift to the Possessor? — 148
10.1.5	Shift from Possessor to Attribute? — 152
10.1.6	Conclusion — 153
10.2	Pre-Argument Metonymy — 154
10.2.1	Argument-Directed Metonymy — 154
10.2.2	Argument-Averted Metonymy — 159
10.3	Cross-Argument Metonymy — 162
10.3.1	Conditions of Cross-Argument Metonymy — 162
10.4	What about Non-Referent-Sensitive Relational Metonymy? — 167
10.5	Relational Metonymy in Frames: Overview — 170
10.6	Conclusion — 172
11	Conceptual Distance in Metonymy — 173
11.1	The Notion of Metonymic Distance — 173
11.2	Views on Metonymic Distance — 174
11.3	Chained Metonymies versus Metonymic Distance — 176
11.4	The Peculiarity of the Frame Perspective — 177
11.4.1	Starting Point — 177
11.4.2	Value (De)Composition — 179
11.4.3	Attribute (De)Contraction — 180
11.4.4	Attribute Reduction — 182
11.5	Metonymies across Different Distances — 184
11.6	Conclusion — 192
12	Summary and Discussion — 195
12.1	The Frame Perspective on Metonymy — 195
12.2	The Metonymic Continuum — 196
12.3	Functional Relations in Metonymy — 197
12.4	The Source Is a Function of the Target — 198
12.5	The Target Can Be a Function of the Source — 199
12.6	Contentious Cases — 202
12.7	Metonymy and Choice of Expression — 203
12.8	Specifying Metonymic Contiguity — 204

13 Conclusion — 205

References — 207

Index — 217