МЕХАНИЗМ КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНОЙ МЕТОНИМИИ НА УРОВНЕ СТРУКТУРЫ ВЫСКАЗЫВАНИЯ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНЫХ ВЫСКАЗЫВАНИЙ О НЕКОНТРОЛИРУЕМОМ ДЕЙСТВИИ)

Научная статья

Сафина М.Р. *

НГЛУ им. Н.А. Добролюбова, Нижний Новгород, Россия

* Корреспондирующий автор (marinasafina22[at]gmail.com)

Аннотация

В статье приводится короткий обзор существующих точек зрения на концептуальную метонимию. Предметом данной статьи являются особенности реализации механизма концептуальной метонимии на уровне структуры высказываний со значением неконтролируемого действия, под которым подразумевается динамическая неконтролируемая ситуация, в центре которой субъект-псевдоагенс или экспериенцер. Для целей исследования была подготовлена подборка высказываний из современной англоязычной художественной литературы и периодики. В результате исследования были выявлены случаи метонимического выражения прототипических динамических ситуаций посредством структурных схем, соответствующих прототипическим статическим ситуациям (синтаксические концепты «признак объекта» и «местоположение объекта»). Также были выявлены случаи метонимии, реализуемые при участии механизма концептуальной интеграции.

Ключевые слова: структурная схема предложения, концептуальная метонимия, неконтролируемость, синтаксис, пропозиция.

CONCEPTUAL METONYMY IN ENGLISH SENTENCE PATTERNS AS SEEN IN STATEMENTS ABOUT UNCONTROLLABLE ACTION

Research article

Safina M.R. *

Linguistic University of Nizhny Novgorod, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia

* Corresponding author (marinasafina22[at]gmail.com)

Abstract

The article provides a concise overview of the modern discussion of conceptual metonymy and then focuses on the conceptual metonymy mechanism at the level of a sentence pattern of the utterances expressing uncontrollable actions which are understood as dynamic situations with a pseudo-agent or an experiencer. For the purpose of the study a selection of such utterances from modern English literature and media was prepared. The study allowed to reveal cases where action-like situations are expressed with the sentence patterns that are static by nature, that is, the patterns that represent the concepts 'location of an object' and 'attribute of an object'. Cases of metonymy based on the conceptual integration mechanism were also found.

Keywords: sentence pattern, conceptual metonymy, uncontrollability, syntax, proposition.

Introduction

Metonymy as a means of conceptualization was first discussed by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors we live by* [3] and despite its omnipresence in the language, received far less attention from scholars than metaphor [1]. Both conceptual metonymy and metaphor are a mapping from one domain to another, i.e. from a source domain to a target domain. The crucial difference is that in metonymy both source and target are subdomains within the same common domain, while in metaphor they have to be separate domains [1], [2], [5], [9], [12].

In the current literature cases of referential and non-referential metonymy are identified. Referential metonymy relates one entity with another (consider the famous 'ham sandwich' example where the ordered meal is used to refer to the customer: *The ham sandwich is waiting for his check* [3]) and can function syntactically as a nominal (its normal form of expression being a noun phrase). Subjects, objects, even predicative elements can be conceptualized via metonymy, although in case of the latter the term referential may seem a misnomer [6, P. 19-20]. Non-referential metonymies fall into several types which are roughly as follows: predicational (S*he was able to finish her dissertation = she finished her dissertation*), illocutionary (*I don't know where the bath soap is = where is the bath soap?*), and propositional (*I waved down a taxi = A taxi took me there*) [4, P. 494]. All three are sometimes referred to as propositional. However, the term can be considered as not a very happy one since the propositional status of questions and imperative utterances is arguable, so the conventionality of the term shall be probably pointed out. It is without doubt, though, that all the cases of propositional metonymy can and should be considered at an utterance level.

Unlike referential metonymy which tends to violate truth conditions (clearly, it is not the sandwich that is waiting for a check but rather the person who ordered it), propositional metonymy, as it is demonstrated by the above examples, tends to be literally true since the validity of the implicitly conveyed notion depends on the validity of the explicit expression [6, P. 8-10]. Another crucial difference is that referential metonymy is generally intended, easily detectable and hard to cancel while the propositional one can be unintended and easily neutralized by the speaker.

Two approaches can be applied to the analysis of propositional metonymy. The first which also appears to be the most popular one is considering metonyms from purely semantic point of view (see examples above). The other one is considering propositional metonyms from the point of view of syntactic patterns of the utterance. A metonymic shift at the level of

syntactic patterns implies expressing a prototypic situation with a model that is the sign of another prototypic situation [12, P. 6-7].

Purpose

This article aims at studying the use of sentence patterns metonymy in the utterances that express prototypic uncontrollable actions by which we mean dynamic situations with a pseudo-agent or an experiencer.

Methods

As stated above, propositional metonymy is often unintended. Moreover, metonymy as well as conceptual integration, which is closely related to it, can virtually be found in any utterance, as language representation of reality is based on focusing mechanisms and implies a great degree of generalization (a most simple *He drops the cigarette* stands for a series of actions / happenings: the movement of one's hand, the time when the cigarette was in the air falling, the cigarette touching the ground, etc.). We are going to look for the cases where there are clear indicators that the utterance pattern is a metonym and where the primary pattern is more or less traceable.

Obvious signs of a metonymic shift at the sentence pattern level are grammatical anomalies caused by such a shift (e.g. conceptual blends *He sneezed the napkin off the table = He sneezed + the napkin blew away from the table*) [5], [10]. However, to understand that a syntactic pattern is used to express a real-world situation which is not prototypic for this pattern and find some regular pairs of metonymic substitutes, a contextual indicator can be applied, too. An example of such an indicator can be question-answer contexts where the syntactic pattern used in the answer is different from that set by the question (e.g. Location of an object → Attribute (state) of an object (*How is he? — He is in hospital (= He is ill)*) [12, P. 8-9]. Although the question-answer test seems quite a convenient and comprehensive one, other contextual indicators can be singled out, too. By contextual indicators we mean restrictive contexts that prove the use of certain sentence patterns to be metonymical.

Utterances and / or micro-contexts from modern English literature and media selected via the continuous sampling method as well as the OALD and BNC example banks were used for the research.

Results

Since utterances expressing uncontrollable actions are the subject matter of the paper, we primarily searched for the contexts where an action (or whatever looks like it) is expressed by a pattern which is not dynamic per se, i.e. attribute of an object (S+LinkV+Predicative) or location of an object (S+LinkV+Locative). The findings, however, are not limited to just these two patterns.

1. Metonymy links emotions and health to their physiological effects. Such cases can be found in the narrative contexts where the perceiver (observer) describes the behavior of a person other than themselves using various interpretational patterns. Since the observer, unless a telepath, can judge about another person's inner state only by analyzing some perceivable effects of the state, we can assume that in such cases the description of one's behavior is rendered through a supposition of what such behavior can mean (e.g. **She's surprised to see me** *and not in a good way; she can't hide it either (Hannah)*). This phenomenon can be discussed at a semantic level [5, P. 473-475], [8, P. 155]. However, more or less regular syntactic patterns correspondences can be found, too. Considering gestures and action-like symptoms usually translate into syntactic concepts that include a subject, a predicate and, optionally, a direct and indirect objects, we may speak of the following regular shift: Activity of an object, object's action on another object, transfer of an object → Attribute (state) of an object.

2. Patterns expressing location of an object can be used to express one's sudden and unexpected loss of balance, loss of consciousness, fall. They are often introduced with phrases like *the next thing I knew, next thing, next moment,* although the use of these expressions is not limited to expressing undesired occurrences such as falls. *My headache just grew and grew and suddenly the light faded and I could not see a thing. The next thing I knew **I was on the floor** (BNC).* Other ways of expressing the dynamic situation via a static one are possible: *After being "violently" attacked, Travis McMichael fired two shots, the elder man told police. The next thing they knew, **Arbery was lying face down on the pavement** dead (chicagotribune.com).* In this case, however, we can't speak of a metonymy at the level of syntactic patterns.

3. A context that offers a vast diversity of metonymic shifts are the utterances introducing direct speech in the narrative discourse [11, P. 122], [7]. Apart from the reporting structures with *say, tell, inform, etc.* that can be considered traditional as they are speech structures that introduce speech (expressed by S+P+O$_{Dir}$ and S+P+O$_{Dir}$+O$_{ind}$), direct speech can also be introduced by patterns expressing emotional states (*"What had motivated her, then?" **I was desperate to know** (Lodge)* – SP$_{Comp.Nom}$), facial expressions (*"No, he's in bed – teeth brushed, clean pyjamas, room tidied." **She smiles proudly** (Hannah)* – SP), actions (*"Do you see this?" **He pointed to the round object** at the end of the smaller box. "This is called a lens."(Andreeva) – SPA$_{Loc}$*), etc. The speech action and its complement exist simultaneously in a situation and the speaker chooses which element of the situation to highlight. It should be noted, though, that this type of metonymy is a bit different from what was discussed above as there is no clear causative-consecutive relation between the movement, reaction, etc. expressed and the speech action it substitutes. As well as the traditional if-then test won't work here (*If he smiles then he says* obviously doesn't bear any logic). That causative-consecutive relation does not exist at all is not true, however. Such utterances are structurally close to what is called conceptual integration by Fauconnier and Turner where two different sentence patterns are merged into one resulting in a somewhat anomalous entity (see the 'handkerchief' example above). The blend in this case consists of a predicate+object pattern typical of a reporting structure (direct speech serves as an object) and some other kind of pattern such as SP, *SPA$_{Loc}$*, etc. (Consider an anomalous *She smiles that…*).

Conclusion

The study of the metonymic use of sentence patterns appears relevant both in general and with regard to certain semantic types of utterances. Sentence pattern metonymy serves as a means of focusing and a more concise expression of reality. It is also an important expressive mechanism that can help to add dynamism to the description of a situation (or vice versa) or may well be helpful as a tool of the unreliable narrator mode as it allows for an indirect and individualized description of the events. Metonymy at the level of sentence patterns is certainly worth further consideration.

Конфликт интересов	**Conflict of Interest**
Не указан.	None declared.

Список литературы / References

1. Barcelona A. Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: An update / Barcelona A. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 209–277.

2. Croft W. The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies / Croft W. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 161–207.

3. Lakoff, G. Metaphors We Live By / Lakoff, G. Johnson M. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press. – 1980. – 354 p.

4. Ruiz de Mendoza F.J. Patterns of conceptual interaction / Ruiz de Mendoza F.J., Díez O.I. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 489–533.

5. Turner M., Fauconnier G. Metaphor, metonymy, and binding / Turner M., Fauconnier G. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 469–489.

6. Warren, B. Referential metonymy. (Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis) / Warren, B. Kungliga Humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, 2006. – 95 p.

7. Андреева Е.Г. Сопоставительный анализ семантических классов глаголов, вводящих прямую речь (английский и русский языки) / Андреева Е.Г. // Вестник Русской христианской гуманитарной академии. – 2015. – № 16 (1). – С. 362–373.

8. Апресян Ю.Д. Основания системной лексикографии / Ю.Д. Апресян // Языковая картина мира и системная лексикография. М.: Языки славянских культур. – 2006. – С. 33–162.

9. Болдырев Н.Н. Когнитивные схемы языковой интерпретации / Болдырев Н.Н. // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2016. – № 4. – С. 10–20.

10. Козлова Е. А. Метонимия как концептуальная основа функциональной категоризации глагола: дис. … канд. филол. наук. Тамбов. – 2001. – 154 с.

11. Проскурнич О.Д. Концептуализация мимики и механизмы интерпретации мимических движений в языке (на материале русского и английского языков): дис. … канд. филол. наук. Тамбов, 2019. – 208 с.

12. Рахманкулова С.Е. Концептуальная метонимия на уровне структуры высказывания (на материале английского языка) / Рахманкулова С.Е. // Вестник Балтийского федерального университета им. И. Канта. Сер.: Филология, педагогика, психология. – 2018. – № 1. – С. 5–10.

Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Barcelona A. Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: An update / Barcelona A. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 209–277.

2. Croft W. The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies / Croft W. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 161–207.

3. Lakoff, G. Metaphors We Live By / Lakoff, G. Johnson M. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press. – 1980. – 354 p.

4. Ruiz de Mendoza F.J. Patterns of conceptual interaction / Ruiz de Mendoza F.J., Díez O.I. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 489–533.

5. Turner M., Fauconnier G. Metaphor, metonymy, and binding / Turner M., Fauconnier G. // Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Berlin, New York. – 2002. – P. 469–489.

6. Warren, B. Referential metonymy. (Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis) / Warren, B. Kungliga Humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, 2006. – 95 p.

7. Andreeva E.G. Sopostavitel'nyj analiz semanticheskih klassov glagolov, vvodyashchih pryamuyu rech' (anglijskij i russkij yazyki) [Comparative analysis of classes of verbs introducing direct speech] / Andreeva E.G // Vestnik Russkoj hristianskoj gumanitarnoj akademii [Journal of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy], 2015. – No. 16 (1). – P. 362–373. [in Russian]

8. Apresyan Yu.D. Osnovaniya sistemnoj leksikografii [Grounds for the systemic lexicography] / Yu.D. Apresyan // Yazykovaya kartina mira i sistemnaya leksikografiya [Language worldview and systemic lexicography]. M.: Yazyki slavyanskih kul'tur, 2006. – P. 33–162. [in Russian]

9. Boldyrev N.N. Kognitivnye skhemy yazykovoj interpretacii [Cognitive schemes of language interpretation] / Boldyrev N.N. // Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki [Issues of cognitive linguistics] – 2016. – No. 4. – P. 10–20. [in Russian]

10. Kozlova E. A. Metonimiya kak konceptual'naya osnova funkcional'noj kategorizacii glagola [Metonymy as the conceptual basis of the functional categorization of verbs]: dis. … of PhD in Philology. Tambov. – 2001. – 154 p. [in Russian]

11. Proskurnich O.D. Konceptualizaciya mimiki i mekhanizmy interpretacii mimicheskih dvizhenij v yazyke (na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo yazykov) [Conceptualization of facial expressions and mechanisms of facial movement interpretation in the English and Russian languages]: dis. … of PhD in Philology. Tambov. – 2019. – 208 p. [in Russian]

12. Rakhmankulova S.E. Konceptual'naya metonimiya na urovne struktury vyskazyvaniya (na materiale anglijskogo yazyka) [Conceptual metonymy at the utterance structure level (English)] / Rakhmankulova S.E. // Vestnik Baltijskogo federal'nogo universiteta im. I. Kanta. Ser.: Filologiya, pedagogika, psihologiya [Journal of the Baltic Federal University of I. Kant. Series: Philology, pedagogy, psychology]. – 2018. – No. 1. – P. 5–10. [in Russian]