



UDC 811.163.6'373.612

Jerica Snoj

Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, Ljubljana

METONYMIC MEANINGS: SYNTAGMATIC ASPECT

In lexicological treatments of metonymy the syntagmatic criterion is generally cited as constitutive for metonymic transfers of meaning. Individual scholars (A. Vidovič Muha, A. Birix, E. L. Ginzburg, Ju. D. Apresjan) focus on different planes on which this criterion is realized in the metonymy. In typologizing metonymic meanings of nouns, the focus is on changes in the structure of semantic components and on the agreement of the metonymic semantic relations with the relations between proposition components.

V leksikoloških obravnavah metonimije je sintagmatsko načelo splošno navajano kot konstitutivno za metonimične pomenske prenose. Posamezni razpravljavci (A. Vidovič Muha, A. Biriš, E. L. Ginzburg, Ju. D. Apresjan) posvečajo več pozornosti tej ali oni ravni, na kateri se to načelo uresničuje v metonimiji. Pri tipologiziranju samostalniških metonimičnih pomenov sta v ospredju zlasti raven sprememb v pomenskosestavinski zgradbi in raven ujemanja metonimičnih medpomenskih razmerij z razmerji med sestavinami propozicije.

Key words: metonymy, semantic component, lexical meaning, proposition, syntagmatics

Ključne besede: metonimija, pomenska sestavina, slovarski pomen, propozicija, sintagmatika

1 Lexicological definition of metonymic semantic transfer

1.1 Metonymy as lexicalized semantic transfer in lexicological literature differs from other methods of semantic derivation with relatively stereotypical quotation of certain characteristics. The motivating and the motivated meanings are conceptually connected, i.e., this connection reflects the objective connection in the reality that they denote. Between the motivating and the motivated meanings there is a logical relation of inclusion and implication; the motivated meaning includes the motivating meaning (e.g., *šola*: 'institution providing education' → 'building of this institution'); the motivating meaning with its structure allows the derivation of the motivated meaning (*šola* as 'institution' provides the appropriate space for conducting the appurtenant activity). In other words, the metonymic semantic relation is described as the transfer of meaning »by vicinity« or as the transfer of meaning »with respect to proximity«. Further typological characteristic of metonymy are the common semantic components, predictability or regularity and the presence of the type-metonymic semantic relations within entire semantic groups. The regularity of metonymic links between meanings allows us to establish the analogy between the semantic derivation and word derivation.

1.2 Numerous, partially different, descriptions of metonymy in lexicological literature can be summarized as follows: Metonymy as a type of inter-semantic derivation includes logical connection between the content of the original meaning and the

derived meaning. The logical connection is the complementary opposite of the associative connection between the meanings in the metaphoric semantic transfer. This kind of definition of the metonymy is based in content; it has extra-linguistic origin, which makes it similar to the definition of metonymy as textual phenomenon in literary theory. On the other hand, the definition of metonymy as a lexical-semantic, thus linguistic-systemic concept must be focused on and restricted to the relation between the lexical meanings connected in the derivation, i.e., the motivating, original meaning → the motivated, derived, formed meaning. The definition of the lexical meaning and the selection of the point of view from which to uniformly analyze all relations between meanings within words are crucial; within those, individual types of lexicalized semantic derivations may be determined.

1.3 The possibility of this type of definition of metonymy seems to exist in structurally conceived model of lexical meaning. According to this model, the lexical meaning is described as hierarchical structure of semantic components, i.e., of the syntactically superordinate classifying semantic component (CSC) and syntactically subordinate distinctive semantic components (DSC) (Vidovič Muha 2000: 53). The types of relations between derivationally connected meanings differ on the level of typological changes arising in the structure of semantic components when a new meaning is derived (121–154). The typological change characteristic of metonymy is that a new CSC enters the motivated meaning, while the semantic components of the motivating meaning are preserved on the level of semantic distinctiveness, i.e., distinctive semantic components (Vidovič Muha 2000: 136–142). Example: *šola*: 'institution providing education' → 'building' (= new CSC) belonging to the institution providing education. In such DSC, the semantic components of the motivating meaning are entirely preserved, including their syntagmatic sequence. The relation between meanings within the lexeme is thus typologized on the basis of the change in the structure of semantic components, which is the result of the semantic derivation, in fact, of the new CSC. The derived meaning therefore depends on the way in which the semantic components of the motivating meaning are combined into a new meaning after the new CSC has been entered. The determined method of semantic derivation clearly shows that the constitutive basis of the metonymic semantic derivation is in the syntagmatic ordering principle.

2 Treatments of metonymy with respect to the differences in considering the syntagmatic principle

2.0 The survey of lexicological treatments of metonymy shows that is precisely the syntagmatic linguistic systemic principle what allows the metonymy as a type of semantic derivation. Usually this characteristic of metonymy is not specifically mentioned, but, rather, it is implied in the characteristics of metonymic transfers. It would then be logical to compare the treatment of metonymy by some scholars, particularly with regard to the levels on which the syntagmatic determination of the metonymic semantic transfer is mentioned.

2.1 The concept of syntagmatics basically refers to the linear relations between the elements in the word or phrase, i.e., on relations between the elements of the syntactic unit (Crystal 1997: 438). In accordance with that, syntagmatics is predictably the center of attention in phonology, morphology, word derivation, and syntax, where linear relations between materialized elements of syntactic unit are essential. In semantic derivation, the syntagmatic principle works on the level of ordering of linear relations between semantic components, i.e., between the elements without their own expression. Generally, we are less aware of the significance of syntagmatics as abstract linguistic-systemic ordering principle in semantic derivation.

2.2 In structural linguistics the opposite concept of syntagmatics and paradigmatics are effectively present mostly through the conceptions of R. Jakobson, who considers them the basic ordering linguistic-systemic axes. Within the linguistic system he differentiates two different types of semantic relations: Given content may lead to another content either because they are connected by similarity (*hut* → *is a poor little house*; *koča* → *je uborna majhna hiša*; Jakobson 1956: 77) or by association, complementation (*hut* → *burnt out*; *koča* → *je pogorela*). The former connection is founded in the paradigmatic axis and the appropriate term for it is metaphoric connection. The latter connection corresponds to the syntagmatic axis and the term for it is metonymic connection. The metaphoric connection is characterized as substitutive, metonymic as predicative (Jakobson 1956: 76–82). In this binary interpretation of semantic relations on the level of linguistic system one can see the basis of the systemic distinction of semantic transfers, which allows further and narrower typologizing of semantic derivations. The resulting typologies depend on the size of the analyzed material and on the individual views of a particular scholar. By way of illustration we comparatively summarize the findings presented by some authors in more extensive treatments of lexical metonymy.

2.3 A. Vidovič Muha in her definition of metonymic semantic derivation stresses the operation of syntagmatic rule on the level of the semantic component structure, i.e., changes in this structure occurring in the process of derivation of metonymic meaning.¹ The metonymically motivated meaning is created with the entrance of a new CSC; the entire motivating meaning including the original semantic component structure gains the role of the distinctive semantic feature (Vidovič Muha 2000: 136–142). Example: *šola*: 'institution providing education' → 'building (new CSC) belonging to the institution providing education'. In some derivatives with derivative meaning, A. Vidovič Muha also finds the realization of the syntagmatic rule on the propositional level. In some deverbatives, the meaning of non-primary actant or circumstance is metonymically derived from the meaning of action. The relation between metonymically connected meanings corresponds to the relation between the propositional components, e.g., *pisanje*: 1. 'formation of letters, numbers on a smooth

¹ Ada Vidovič Muha, *Slovensko leksikalno pomenoslovje, Govorica slovarja*, Ljubljana, Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete, 2000, 136–142.

surface' (*zmotiti se pri pisanju*) → 2. 'what results from formation of letters ...' (*zbri-sati pisanje*) = 'that is written' → 'what is written' = 'action' → 'result of action' (Vidovič Muha 2000: 137–138).

2.4 In his monographic treatment of the metonymy in Russian, **A. Birih** places the syntagmatic principle on extra-linguistic level, as he finds the connections between neighboring *denotata* to be the basis of metonymic derivations.² While presenting a comprehensive and detailed overview of various views of the metonymy, he chooses traditional paths in treating this semantic transfer. He describes the systemicity of metonymic semantic transfers on the level of denotative meaning. According to that he assigns the central significance to the regular appearance of a given metonymic change within a semantic group. The affiliation of words with individual semantic groups, in A. Birih's opinion, particularly clearly show the relations between objects in reality. The authors thus decides on the classification of metonymies with respect to the types of relation between neighboring/proximate *denotata*. He establishes six main types of metonymic transfers: partitive, causal, temporal, local, attributive, and quantitative. Further, narrower, typologizing includes grouping of words with metonymic meanings into different categories with respect to what categorial semantic features (countability, humanness, animacy, etc.) are included in original meanings and motivated meanings. While he does not explicitly discuss the syntagmatic principle as being basic for metonymy, he recognizes it indirectly when he describes the differences between the synecdoche and metonymy. He notes that metonymy has semantic-syntactic character, since it is a result of the compression of the phrase.

2.5.0 From our point of view, the treatment of metonymy in **E. L. Ginzburg's** *Konstrukcii polisemii v russkom jazyke* is particularly promising.³ In the introduction it promises to treat the metonymy as a kind of polysemy, particularly from the point of view of its »agreement with the basic syntactic-semantic relations« (Ginzburg 1985: 3).

2.5.1 The author in his points of departure emphasizes the systemicity of the structure of lexical units. In the systemicity, the concepts »construction of polysemy« and »metonymic construction« as a sub-variety of polysemy are based. The systemicity of semantic derivation is determined and binding to the extent that the differentiation between metonymic meanings, metonymic semantic nuances, and a one-time metonymic use of the word – compared to the systemic determination of the metonymic semantic derivation itself – negligible (53; 65). Ginzburg rejects as insufficient the definition of the metonymy in which metonymic semantic derivations are based on the relations between the denoted realities or on the relations between the corresponding concepts (55–56). The assumption that metonymic constructions as formulas accord-

² Aleksandr Birih, *Metonimija v sovremennom russkom jazyke*, Munich, Verlag Otto Sagner, 1995.

³ E. L. Ginzburg, *Konstrukcii polisemii v russkom jazyke, Taksonomija i metonimija*, Moskva, Nauka, 1985.

ing to which the individual metonymic semantic derivations are realized, cannot exist on the level of lexical units (expressive-semantic units). Metonymic constructions exist on the level of semantic components that correspond to the categories of lexical meanings, and not on the level of individual lexical units. Metonymic connections between meanings are not a method of connecting the realities to which these meanings are referring. If we wish to establish general classes into which to place metonymically connected meanings, these meanings must be outside the level of denotative meanings. The existence of the metonymic formula is possible only on the level of syntactic oppositions reflecting the inclusion of lexical meanings in the text; in other words, the existence of the metonymic formulas is only possible on the level of the sentence-syntactical meanings (59).

2.5.2 Further Ginzburg's discussion of the metonymic formula can be, with the inclusion of lexicographic material, summarized as follows: The metonymic formula can be introduced only into relations of the sentence syntax (»syntactic oppositions reflecting the inclusion of lexical meanings in the text«). The material with metonymically connected meanings convincingly shows that the motivating and metonymically derived meanings are in such a relation that, together with the appropriate predicate, they constitute a minimal message (64). Example:

A lexical item including a metonymic motivated meaning: *žaganje*-a neut.

Motivating meaning: *žaganje₀* 'producing pieces, parts by pulling saw back and forth or by its moving leaf'

Motivated meaning: *žaganje_{Md}* 'what results from this action'

⇒

Message that motivating and motivated meanings constitute: *žaganje_{Md}* [**is the result of**] *žaganje₀*.

Ginzburg finds that the predicative components have a special role in the metonymic transformation of the motivating meaning. They allow a special typology of the metonymic constructions, which is particularly evident in metonymic derivations in depredicatives. In these cases the meaning of the predicative components is additionally transparent from the derivative, which can appear as a synonym in place of the metonymic meaning (e.g., *žaganje_{Md}* = *žagovina*). Depredicatives represent the central part of metonymy; the definition of predicate components is supported with the possibility of parallel derivational connections with the motivating verb or adjective (e.g., *razsad*: 'that the plants are being transplanted' = *razsaditev*; → 'the result of the fact that the plants are being transplanted' = *razsajene rastline*).

2.5.3 As a special question, Ginzburg treats the means of description of metonymy (68-70). He points out that for typological description the generalization of meanings into classes of denotative meanings is not sufficient (e.g., *kitara*: 'music instrument' → 'performer on this instrument'); rather, for a complete typology of metonymic semantic derivations it is necessary to find formulas on the level of the sentence-syntactic categories. A part of the description of the metonymic relations is also the comparison of the metonymic relations with the relations between the base word and

the derivative (*kitara* 1 'instrument' : *kitara* 2 'performer' = *kitara* 1 : *kitarist*). This proves the analogy between the word derivation and the semantic derivation and it confirms the requirement that the metonymic formulas be established equally to word-derivational formulas on the sentence-syntactic level, rather than on the level of denotative meaning (68–69).

The result of the effort to find the fundamental typology of the metonymic constructions that includes all metonymic derivations with all their heterogeneity, is the list of opposition types (81–82):

(1) resultative construction with the predicates [is result], [is consequence], [originates from], [is from] and causal construction with the predicates [is cause], [is motive], etc.;

(2) instrumental construction with predicates [serves as], [is tool], [is manner], [is means], [is for] and final construction (of goal, objective) with predicates [is used], [is goal], [is tool], [is purpose], etc.;

(3) local construction with the predicates [to be in], [to be located in], [to take place in space/time], [to participate in], [is the feature] and the possessive construction with the predicates [is location], [has].

2.6.0 The syntagmatic principle of metonymic meanings is described most explicitly in the work of **Ju. D. Apresjan**, i.e., he treats polysemy as an area within word derivation in the broader sense (Apresjan 1995: 164–215).⁴ He emphasizes that this understanding of polysemy originates in the fact that polysemy and derivation equally allow synonymic transformations of sentences. Example:

Synonymic transformation based on word derivation:

Tkanina je bila bleščeče bela. 'The fabric was glowingly white.'

Belina tkanine je bila bleščeča. 'The whiteness of fabric was glowing.'

Synonymic transformation of sentence based on polysemy:

Poimenovanje predmetov poteka nepredvidljivo. 'Naming of object is carried out unpredictably.' ... **poimenovánje** –a neut. M1 'action'

Predmeti nepredvidljivo dobijo svoja poimenovanja. 'Objects unpredictably get their names.' ... **poimenovánje** –a neut. M2 'result of action'⁵

2.6.1 Synonymic transformations of sentences on the level of word derivation are made possible by some types of nominal syntactic derivatives, i.e., the nouns meaning

⁴ Jurij Derenikovič Apresjan, *Leksičeskaja semantika*, Moscow, Vostočnaja literatura RAN, 1995. – Apresjan presented some of his views on the connection between polysemy and word derivation for the first time in the article *Regular polysemy* in the journal *Linguistics* 142, 1974, 5–32. Since in the second, revised, edition of the work *Leksičeskaja semantika* (1995), they were presented with improvements, this edition is used for our purpose.

⁵ Apresjan calls the synonymic transformation of the sentence *isosemantic transformation* and the occurrence of these sentences *isosemantics*, differentiating between the semantic equality of lexical units, for which the term synonymy is established, and the semantic equality (equivalence) of the sentence. The term *isosemantics*, in accordance with Apresjan's understanding of the lexical meaning (the semantics of the sign) emphasizes the independence of the denotative semantic features, which with the identical configuration in the base word and in derivative, in fact, allows the synonymy of the sentence.

action or state (e.g., *delo* ← *delati*), nouns meaning the result of action (*preboj* *stene* ← *prebiti* *steno*), nouns meaning the quantity of action (*poklon* ← *klanjati* *se*), nouns with actant or circumstantial meaning (agent, object, location, instrument, means, method of action; Apresjan 1995: 165–168). It is evident from the aforementioned types that these are nominal derivatives with derivational meaning, i.e., derivatives that are transformationally linked to the components of the proposition (Vidovič Muha 1988: 1–17, 175–181). Apresjan does not explicitly mention the notion of proposition, but in the fundamental treatment of semantic relations and basic differentiation between syntagmatics and paradigmatics he lists basic syntagmatic relations. These relations are reflected in the type-meanings of the noun. Apresjan calls them *substantive lexical parameters*: *Si* = type-name of the first actant, *Sinstr.* = type-name of the instrument of action, *Sloc.* = type-name of the location of action, *Smod* = type-name of the manner of action, and *Sres* = type-name of the result of action (Apresjan 1995: 48). Apresjan finds that the processes of word derivation and semantic derivation are analogous on the levels of regularity and productivity, both of which are originally characteristic of word derivation, but are equally present in semantic derivation.

2.6.2 From Apresjan's finding of the equal role of word formation and polysemy in the synonymic transformations of sentences, another analogy between the two levels is evident, i.e., the relation between the motivating word and the derivative is from the point of view of the result (synonymic transformation of the sentence) equal to the relation between the motivating meaning and the motivated meaning:

motivated word : derivative ≡ motivating meaning : motivated meaning

bel -a -o adj. : *belina* -e f. ≡ *poimenovanje* -a 1 ('action') : *poimenovanje* -a 2 ('result of action')

Based on this, Apresjan claims that numerous types of regular polysemy (semantic pairs within lexemes) are analogical to some syntactic derivatives on the level of the relation between the derivative vs. motivating word.⁶ The possible conclusion is that in the case of polysemy, the motivated meanings may be connected to the meanings of the propositional components, analogically to the way in which the derivatives are connected to the meanings of the propositional components via derivational meanings:

poimenovanje -a 1 : *poimenovanje* -a 2 = motivating meaning : metonymically motivated meaning = ('action') : ('result of action').

2.6.3 While discussing the analogy between derivation and polysemy, it is important to consider that Apresjan emphasizes the independence of the derivation and polysemy as two separate levels of the language system. For instance, the polysemy of the word *stráža* -e f. refers to the meanings (1) 'action concerning protection, defense, overseeing of somebody/something;' (2) 'a person, group of people performing this action'. The meanings are connected in terms of derivation by the type 'action' – 'performer of action;' the emphasis is on the metonymic character of the connection,

⁶ The literal realization of the equation requires us to take Apresjan's conception of lexical meaning into consideration. Cf. Apresjan 1995: 56–69.

while the derivation from the same derivational base (*stražiti*: (1) → 'that one **guards**'; (2) → 'who **guards**') is not relevant. The semantic relations of regular polysemy within lexical items should thus be discussed without differentiation between derivatives and non-derivatives.

Polysemic deverbal nouns that clearly include the meaning 'action' in their affix, i.e., one of the predication meanings (predicate as the obligatory part of proposition), predictably fulfill the expectation that one of the semantic relations within the lexical item agrees with one of the relations between the propositional components (cf. the quoted examples *poimenovanje* -a neut., *straža* -e f.).⁷ This raises the question to what extent this is possible to determine in non-derivatives, which do not have derivative affix and thus lack a formally realized connection between the meaning and the propositional element. Apresjan claims that they are in terms of polysemy equal to derivatives. Following is a brief outline of an attempt to test this position on the examples of metonymic semantic derivations of Slovene nouns.⁸

2.6.4.1 If one tries to discern one given fact that, in determining the connection between the propositional meanings, is equally relevant in derivatives as in non-derivatives, this fact is the given semantic relation, the given metonymic semantic relation; in this element the polysemy of the non-derivatives does not differ from the polysemy of the derivatives. In determining whether the semantic relation $\{M_m : M_{Mn}\}$ corresponds to the relation between the components of the proposition $\{\text{Pred} : A/C\}$ one has in mind the abstract proposition in which the two different meanings connected within a lexeme, M_m and M_{Mn} , can be realized simultaneously as a semantic relation. This abstract proposition would yield – with the introduction of the metonymically polysemic noun *noša* -e f. (1. 'clothing, vestments, typical of the inhabitants of certain area, period, representatives of certain class,' 2. 'person dressed in such clothing') on the positions of both propositional elements connected within the lexeme, i.e., the predicate and the actant – the sentence **Noša ('person') si je slekla nošo ('clothing')*. Since it is possible to talk about the proposition only if the presence of the predication is confirmed, in the given semantic relation of the polysemic word one lexical meaning must allow predication ($P(\text{Pred})$), while the other must correspond to the non-predicational part, i.e., actant or circumstance (of place or time) ($P(A/C)$):

$$\{M_m : M_{Mn}\} \equiv \{M(\text{Pred}) : M(A/C)\}$$

2.6.4.2 This raises the question which meanings of the non-derived nouns are possible as predication meanings if we exclude the nouns with the meaning 'action,' which do not exist among non-derived words. It is possible to predict that these are mainly nominal lexical meanings, which at least in terms of deep structure allow predicative use and thus allow the possibility of the following propositional structure:

Pred (auxiliary verb + noun 'characteristic', 'state') + A 1 ('carrier of characteristic', 'carrier of state') / C(p/t)

⁷ Cf. the typologization of this kind of metonymies in deverbal nouns in Vidovič Muha 2000: 137–138.

⁸ For a more detailed description of this attempt see Snoj 2004: 86–102.

Let us take, for example, the noun *nóša* -e f., which is in the Dictionary of Standard Slovene explained with metonymically connected meanings: 1. 'clothing, vestments, typical of the inhabitants of certain area, period, representatives of a certain class,' 2. 'person dressed in such clothing'; typologized metonymic relation expressed with the hypernym is: M_m 'clothing' – M_{Mn} 'person dressed in this clothing'.

The motivated metonymic meaning 'person dressed in this clothing' is with the gained categorial semantic property (CSP) human+ (during metonymic change) within the given semantic relation appropriate for the position of A1, i.e., as the type-meaning 'carrier of characteristic'. The motivating meaning 'clothing' allows the use of the noun in the predicate function, which is on the structural level confirmed in the syntagmatic phrases *biti oblečen v nošo*, *biti v noši*, *hoditi v noši*. In these phrases the noun *nóša* -e f. as the nominal part of the predicate, i.e., as a realization of predication in which the noun *nóša* -e f. corresponds to the component of the meaning 'characteristic' (Ch = **oblečen v nošo**). This way the meaning 'dressed in this clothing' with CSP human+ is simultaneously confirmed as the actant meaning 'carrier of characteristic' (CrCh), which in addition to the predication realizes the second necessary component of the proposition.

2.6.4.3 The original equation $\{M_m : M_{Mn}\} \equiv \{M(\text{Pred}) : M(A/C)\}$ can be, based on these findings, translated into: $\{M_m : M_{Mn}\} \equiv \{Ch : CrCh\}$. The relation between the potentially possible or, in some uses, demonstrated meaning 'characteristic' and metonymically derived meaning 'carrier of characteristic', as demonstrated by the metonymically connected meanings of *noša* – e f., widely broadens the area of metonymic semantic derivations that correspond to propositional relations. Among these are particularly numerous the nouns derived from adjectives in -ost (*absurdnost*, *aktualnost*, *majhnost*, etc.), other de-adjectival nouns denoting characteristics (*dobrina*, *nagota*, *teža*, *toplina*), and derived nouns without lexicalized meaning of characteristic (*sedmica*: 'number' – 'vehicle (bus) marked with that number'; *preteklost*: 'time' – 'existing in that time,' etc.), as well as some non-derived nouns (*sever*: 'direction in the sky' – 'wind from this direction').

3 The typology of metonymic meanings as reflection of syntagmatics in semantic derivation

3.0 Metonymic semantic transfer is, by comparison with complementary metaphoric semantic transfer, distinctively defined with syntagmatic change in the structure of semantic components: the entire motivating meaning as a distinctive feature is added to the new classifying semantic component in the motivated meaning (e.g., *šola*: 'institution providing education' → 'building (new CSC) belonging to the institution providing education'). A comparative survey of the treatment of the metonymy in some lexicological works shows how the syntagmatic principle is realized in the metonymic semantic transfers on other levels as well. Despite partial disagreements in various interpretations it is clear that systematizing of metonymic semantic derivations is in all cases one way or another related to the search for types of syntagmatic connections between lexical meanings or semantic components.

In typologizing of metonymic meanings of Slovenian polysemic nouns a three-fold typology emerged directly from the lexicographic material, i.e., based on the types of syntagmatic semantic relations on three levels: (1) on the level of the semantic component structure of denotative meaning; (2) on the level of the semantic component structure of the categorial meaning; (3) on the level of semantic relations in terms of their agreement with the relations between propositional components (Snoj 2004: 103–160). The criterion of the agreement with the relations between the propositional components (*pisanje*: 'action' → 'result of action') divides all metonymic meanings of nouns into two large groups: into propositional metonymic meanings (agreement with propositional relations) and non-propositional metonymic meanings. Both groups allow further typologization, i.e., with respect to the belonging of the denotative meaning to a semantic group (e.g., *skodela*: 'smaller, low, round dish for serving food' (*razbiti skodelo*) → 'the contents of this dish' (*pojesti skodelo do konca*) ⇒ 'dish' → 'contents of dish') and typologization with respect to the alteration of the categorial semantic features (e.g., *železo*: 'substance' (*predmeti iz železa* (–count)) → 'object made of substance' *Železo ga je udarilo v nogo* (+count)).

3.1 Syntagmatic relations on the level of the semantic component structure of the denotative meaning allow the typology in which the relations are classified depending on the semantic groups to which the meanings belong (e.g., *šola* -e f.: 'institution' → 'building', *hiša*: 'building' → 'inhabitants', *skodela*: 'dish' → 'contents,' etc.; Snoj 2004: 126–138). This typology includes all regular metonymic semantic connections. It is most commonly cited in lexicological literature and it does not differ from the typology used in literary theory for textual metonymic semantic transfers. As it is based on the generalization of denotative meanings into semantic groups, it is closest to the denoted reality and to the connections existing in extra-linguistic reality. The total number of these metonymic types is unlimited: every new regular metonymic semantic relation can potentially be a new type. Delimitation between individual types and subtypes of semantic relations in this typology cannot be unambiguous; the level of generalization of a given metonymic connection towards conforming to a semantic group is left to the individual judgment of the author. For instance, the metonymic connections in the words *kozarec* ('dish' – 'contents of the dish'), *kuhinja* ('room' – 'furniture in the room'), *gimnazija* ('institution' – 'group of people belonging to the institution'), *mesto* ('settlement' – 'inhabitants of the settlement') can be considered different types, but they can also be merged into a more general connection 'space' – 'what is located in that space'.

3.2 The framework of the typology of metonymic meanings with respect to the categorial semantic features are three different possibilities in which the categorial semantic properties (CSP) can behave in the metonymic derivation of the motivated meaning: (1) the metonymic semantic transfer does not involve change in CSP; (2) the metonymic meaning involves predictable change in CSP; (3) the metonymic meaning involves partially predictable change in CSP. This type of typologizing is interesting particularly as an addition to typologized propositional metonymic meanings (Snoj

2004: 124–125, 139–141). For example, CSP –count is preserved without any change in the metonymic types ‘action’ – ‘time of action’ (*žetev*, *pletev*, *košnja*, etc.), but it changes obligatorily (– count into +count) in the derivations like ‘action’ – ‘place of action’ (*dovoz*, *izstop*, *izvoz*, *odvoz*, *prehod*, etc.). A predictable change of CSP –count into CSP +count is involved in the relations ‘action’ – ‘agent’, ‘state’ – ‘carrier of state,’ and ‘characteristic’ – ‘carrier of characteristic’, in which the change –count → +count implies the change to +human.

3.3.0 The classification of metonymic meanings based on the criterion of the semantic relations within lexeme that agree with the relations between propositional components, best fulfills the requirements that the typology be linguistic-systemic and independent of extra-linguistic connections. The agreement of the given semantic relation within the word with one between the components of the proposition is established directly on the given relation between motivating and metonymically motivated meaning. Example: In the word *pisanje* -a neut. the two meanings are, from the point of view of polysemy, metonymically linked: ‘forming letters, numbers on smooth surface’ (*zmotiti se pri pisanju*) → 2. ‘what is the result of forming letters ...’ (*zbrisati pisanje*) = ‘action’ → ‘result of action’ (the propositional components of predication and non-first actant). The relation agrees with the derivative meanings: ‘that one writes’ – ‘what is written’, which from the point of view of polysemy is not relevant. The criterion for connection with the propositional components must be independent of the derivation of the word and the derivational meaning, in order to fulfill the requirement that the propositional metonymic meanings be established in derivatives as well as in non-derivatives.

3.3.1 The common feature of the nouns with the propositional metonymic meaning is that they include the predicative meaning (‘action’, ‘characteristic’, ‘state’), mostly as motivating meaning. The majority of them are deverbal nouns (*grabež*, *vodstvo*; *dokumentacija*, *argumentacija*, *razlaga*, *rešitev*, *zamenjava*, etc.); by including the meaning ‘action’ as the key predicative meaning represent a noticeable and distinctive group within all nominal metonymies.⁹ Furthermore, all propositional connections are attested in metonymic meanings of Slovene nouns: ‘action’ – ‘agent’ (*grabež*), 2. ‘action’ – ‘object for the action’ (*dokumentacija*), 3. ‘state’ – ‘carrier of state’ (*eksistenca*), 4. ‘state’ – ‘cause of state’ (*razočaranje*), 5. ‘characteristic’ – ‘carrier of characteristic’ (*grdoba*), 6. ‘characteristic’ – ‘object carrier of characteristic’ (*neumnost*, *belina*, *mehčava*), 7. ‘action’ – ‘object of action’ (*razsad*, *doživetje*), 8. ‘action’ – ‘second object of action’ (*dopolnitev*), 9. ‘action’ – ‘result of action’ (*žaganje*, *asociacija*), 10. ‘action’ – ‘means of action’ (*dovod*, *premaz*), 11. ‘action’ – ‘manner of action’ (*govor*, *hoja*), 12. ‘action’ – ‘place of action’ (*dovoz*, *izstop*, *prehod*), 13. ‘action’ – ‘time of action’ (*žetev*), 14. ‘state’ – ‘time of state’ (*vojna*, *mrak*, *življenje*). Several types have

⁹ For Slovene, the metonymies with the motivating meaning ‘action’ in deverbal nominal derivatives have been discussed with regard to the connection between metonymy and word-derivational meaning. Cf. Vidovič Muha 2000: 137–138.

the meaning 'action' as the motivated meaning: 1. 'agent' – 'action' (*šola*: 'institution' – 'activity'), 2. 'object of action' – 'action' (*pesem*: 'composition' – 'performance of composition'), 3. 'tool' – 'action' (*viola*: 'instrument' – 'playing of instrument'), 4. 'means of action' – 'action' (predominant relation 'means of visual representation' – 'artistic creating with these means' (*ogljje*)).

3.3.2 The propositional metonymic type 'characteristic' – 'object carrier of the characteristic' (*neumnost*, *čudaštvo*, *ljubeznivost*, *mehčava*, *modrost*, etc.; cf. Snoj 2004: 114–117) is particularly interesting from the point of view of the assumption that any metonymic connection within a lexeme is potentially a realization of the proposition (Ginzburg 1985: 64). Based on the relation 'characteristic' – 'object carrier of characteristic' it is possible to interpret metonymically derived meanings of some non-derived words, e.g., 'number' – 'object, marked with that number' (*sedmica*: 'number' – 'bus'), 'basic unit for measuring something' – 'measuring device being the size of that unit' (*meter*), 'unit for measuring something' – 'reality having the extension of that unit' (*ura*), 'extension' – 'reality having that extension to the considerable degree' (*globina*), 'monetary unit' – 'banknote, coin for that unit', 'direction' – 'the side of sky in that direction', 'direction' – 'wind in that direction', 'time' – 'existing in that time'. Similarly, some words in which the motivating meaning 'action' is not evidently derived from the verb, belong to the type 'action' – 'result of action.' Such examples are metonymic connections 'artistic visual representation in a particular manner' – 'work of art created through that representation' (*akvarel*, *olje*, *akvatinta*, *enkavstika*, *grafika*, *gravura*, *gvaš*, *kolaž*, *lepljenka*, *litografija*, *olje*, *praskanka*, *sgraffito*, *trganka*, *arhitektura*, *poezija*, *glasba*, etc.) and 'weaving with respect to the way the threads are interwoven' – 'fabric created in that weaving' (*atlas*, *cirkas*, *kanava*, *keper*, *empir*, *barok*).

4 Conclusion

An attempt to typologize metonymic meanings of the Slovene nouns cogently shows that the syntagmatic principle as constitutive for the metonymy is reflected in three general characteristics of metonymically derived meanings: (1) In metonymically derived meaning, a complete motivating meaning is added to the new classifying semantic component, according to the syntagmatic principle. (2) The relation between the motivating meaning and the metonymically derived meaning in nouns often agrees with the relation between the proposition constituents. (3) From the point of view of the function in synonymic transformation of the sentence, the analogy was established between the procedures of word derivation and semantic derivation, which is the basis for comparing semantic derivation to word derivation.

The possibilities of metonymic semantic derivation are predictable to a relatively high degree based on the structure of the motivating meaning, particularly by including all possible connections between the propositional components. The syntagmatic organization of the semantic components makes metonymic semantic transfers predictable, i.e., parallel to word derivation. The definition of metonymy in the realiza-

tion of the syntagmatic principle allows clear differentiation of metonymic semantic transfers from the paradigmatically defined metaphoric semantic transfers.

V angleščino prevedla
Marta Pirnat Greenberg.

REFERENCES

- APRESJAN, Ju. D., 1995: *Leksičeskaja semantika*. Moscow: Vostočnaja literatura RAN.
— 1974: Regular Polysemy. *Linguistics* 142. 5–32.
BIRIH, A., 1995: *Metonimija v sovremennom ruskom jazyke*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner.
CRYSTAL, D., 1997: *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: University Press.
FILIPEC, J., ČERMÁK, F., 1985: *Česká lexikologie*. Prague: Academia.
GINZBURG, E. L., 1986: *Konstrukcii polisemii v ruskom jazyke. Taksonomija i metonimija*. Moscow: Nauka.
GORTAN PREMČ, D., 1997: *Polisemija i organizacija leksičkog sistema u srpskome jeziku*. Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
JAKOBSON, R., 1956: The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles. *Fundamentals of Language. Janua Linguarum* 1. Gravenhage: Mouton @ Co. 76–82.
OREŠNIK, J., 1992: *Udeleženske vloge v slovenščini*. Ljubljana: SAZU.
Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika: Elektronska izdaja v 1.0, 1998. Ljubljana: DZS.
SNOJ, J., 2004: *Tipologija slovarske večpomenskosti slovenskih samostalnikov*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
ŠMELEV, D. N., 1973: *Problemy semantičeskogo analiza leksiki (na materiale russkogo jazyka)*. Moscow: Nauka.
UFIMCEVA, A. A., 1986: *Leksičeskoe značenie. Princip semiologičeskogo opisaniya leksiki*. Moscow: Nauka.
VIDOVIČ MUHA, A., 1988: *Slovensko skladenjsko besedotvorje ob primerih zloženek*. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga.
— 2000: *Slovensko leksikalno pomenoslovje: Govorica slovarja*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete (Razprave Filozofske fakultete).
— 2000a: Čas v besedi (Tipologija leksikalne večpomenskosti). *36. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 85–109.

POVZETEK

Vsebinska določitev metonimije z zunajjezikovnim izhodiščem poudarja, da je za metonimijo značilna logična povezanost med vsebino izhodiščnega pomena in izpeljanega pomena. Določitev metonimije kot jezikovnosistemske danosti pa se mora usmeriti in omejiti na razmerje med tvorbo povezanih slovarskih pomenov: motivirajoči, izhodiščni pomen → motivirani, izpeljani, tvorjeni pomen. Pri tem ima odločilno vlogo opredelitev slovarskega pomena in izbira stališča, s katerega se enotno obravnavajo vsa znotrajleksemska medpomenska razmerja. Možnost tovrstne določitve metonimije se kaže v okviru strukturalno zasnovanega modela slovarskega pomena, po katerem se slovarski pomen opisuje kot hierarhizirana zgradba iz pomenskih sestavin, in sicer iz skladenjsko nadrejene uvrščevalne pomenske sestavine (UPS) in iz skladenjsko podrejenih razločevalnih pomenskih sestavin (RPS) (Vidovič Muha 2000: 53). Tipi razmerij med tvorbo povezanimi pomeni se ločujejo na ravni tipskih sprememb, do katerih pride v pomenskosestavinski zgradbi pri izpeljavi motiviranega pomena (121–154). Za me-

tonimijo značilna tipska sprememba je, da v motivirani pomen vstopa nova UPS, motivirajoči pomen v celoti (vključno z izhodiščno razvrstitvijo pomenskih sestavin) pa prevzame vlogo razločevalne lastnosti v novem pomenu. Motivirani pomen je torej odvisen od tega, kako se motivirajoči pomen ob vstopu nove UPS v skladu s sintagmatskim načelom z njo družijo v novi pomen.

Pojem sintagmatike se v osnovi nanaša na linearna razmerja med elementi v besedi ali besedni zvezi, tj. na razmerja med elementi skladenjske enote (Crystal 1997: 438). V strukturalnem jezikoslovju sta opozicijska pojma sintagmatike in paradigmatske učinkovito prisotna zlasti preko pojmovanja R. Jakobsona, ki ločuje znotraj jezikovnega sistema dva tipa pomenskih povezav: Dana vsebina lahko vodi k drugi vsebini bodisi zaradi njune medsebojne povezanosti po podobnosti (*hut* → *is a poor little house*; Jakobson 1956: 77) bodisi zaradi njune medsebojne povezanosti preko družljivosti, dopolnjevalnosti (*hut* → *burnt out*). Prva povezava je utemeljena v paradigmatski osi in zanjo ustrezno poimenovanje je metaforična povezava; druga ustreza sintagmatski osi in poimenovanje zanjo je metonimična povezava (Jakobson 1956: 76–82). V tej binarni interpretaciji pomenskih povezav na ravni jezikovnega sistema je mogoče videti temelj sistemske ločljivosti vseh pomenskih prenosov.

Sintagmatska določenost metonimičnih pomenskih prenosov je v leksikoloških obravnavah metonimije načelno splošno sprejeta, pri čemer posamezni razpravljavci individualno posvečajo več pozornosti tej ali oni značilnosti, povezani s sintagmatskim načelom. V definiciji metonimične pomenske izpeljave pri A. Vidovič Muha (2000) je delovanje sintagmatskega načela izpostavljeno na ravni pomenskosestavinske zgradbe oz. na ravni spremembe v tej zgradbi, do katere pride pri izpeljavi metonimičnega pomena. Poleg tega pri nekaterih tvorjenkah z besedotvornim pomenom A. Vidovič Muha ugotavlja uresničenost sintagmatskega načela na propozicijski ravni. Pri nekaterih izlagalskih tvorjenkah je namreč iz pomena dejanja metonimično izpeljan pomen neprvega delovalnika ali pomen okoliščine. Npr.: *pisanje*: 1. 'delanje črk, številčk na gladki površini' (*zmotiti se pri pisanju*) → 2. 'kar nastane pri delanju črk ...' (*zbrisati pisanje*) = 'to, da se piše' → 'to, kar je napisano' = 'dejanje' → 'rezultat dejanja' (Vidovič Muha 2000: 137–138). – A. Birih (1995) sistemskost metonimičnih pomenskih prenosov opisuje na ravni denotativnega pomena in pripisuje osrednji pomen regularnemu pojavljanju dane metonimične spremembe v okviru pomenske skupine. O sintagmatskem načelu kot temeljnem za metonimijo eksplicitno ne razpravlja, ugotavlja le, da ima metonimija semantično-sintaktični značaj, saj je rezultat strnitve (kompresije) besedne zveze. – E. L. Ginzburg (1985) zavrača kot nezadostno določanje metonimije, pri katerem se metonimične pomenske izpeljave utemeljujejo bodisi s povezavami med poimenovanimi realijami bodisi s povezavami med njim ustrezajočimi pojmi (55–56). Po njegovem mnenju metonimične formule ne morejo obstajati na ravni leksikalnih enot, pač pa samo na ravni propozicijskih pomenov. Gradivo metonimično povezanih pomenov prepričljivo kaže, da sta motivirajoči pomen in metonimično izpeljani pomen v takem razmerju, da z ustreznim predikatoma tvorita minimalno sporočilo. Primer: *žaganje*_{Mn} 'snov' [je rezultat] *žaganje*_o 'dejanje'. Za celovito tipologijo metonimičnih pomenskih izpeljav je potrebno poiskati formule na ravni povednoskladenjskih kategorij. K opisu metonimičnih razmerij spada tudi vzporejanje metonimičnih razmerij z razmerji med podstavno besedo in tvorjenko (*kitara* 1 'instrument' : *kitara* 2 'izvajalec' = *kitara* 1 : *kitarist*). – Najbolj eksplicitno je sintagmatski princip metonimičnih pomenov opisan v delu Ju. D. Apresjana (1995): večpomenskost obravnava kot področje znotraj besedotvorja v širšem pomenu besede. To pojmovanje večpomenskosti ima izhodišče v danosti, da večpomenskost in besedotvorje enakovredno omogočata sopomenske pretvorbe povedi. (Primer: Pretvorba na osnovi besedotvorja: *Tkanina je bila bleščeča bela. Belina tkanine je bila bleščeča*. – Sopomenska pretvorba povedi na osnovi večpomenskosti: *Poimenovanje predmetov poteka nepredvidljivo (poimenovanje -a s P1 'dejanje')* – *Predmeti nepredvidljivo dobijo svoja poimenovanja (poimenovanje -a s P2 'rezultat dejanja')*) Iz te ugo-

tovitve je nadalje razvidna še ena analogija med besedotvorjem in večpomenskostjo: razmerje med motivirajočo besedo in tvorjenko je enakovredno razmerju med motivirajočim pomenom in motiviranim pomenom: *bel* -a -o prid. : *belina* -e ž \equiv *poimenovanje* -a 1 ('dejanje') : *poimenovanje* -a 2 ('rezultat dejanja'). Iz vzporednosti motivacijskega razmerja v besedotvorju in motivacijskega razmerja pri večpomenskosti je mogoče sklepati, da se metonimične pomenske povezave ujemajo s povezavami med propozicijskimi sestavinami analogno temu, kot se s sestavinami propozicije ujemajo pomeni tvorjenke preko besedotvornih pomenov. Gradivo slovenskih samostalnikov to domnevo potrjuje.

Sistematiziranje metonimičnih pomenskih povezav je v vseh primerih vezano na iskanje tipov sintagmatskih povezav med slovarskimi pomeni oz. pomenskimi sestavinami. Neposredno v gradivu slovenskih samostalnikov se je potrdila trojna tipologija, utemeljena v tipih sintagmatskih znotrajleksemskih pomenskih povezav na treh ravneh: 1. na ravni pomenskosestavinske zgradbe denotativnega pomena, 2. na ravni pomenskosestavinske zgradbe kategorialnega pomena in 3. na ravni ujemanja metonimičnih pomenskih povezav z razmerji med propozicijskimi sestavinami. Tipologija, ki temelji na merilu ujemanja metonimičnih pomenskih povezav z razmerji med propozicijskimi sestavinami, najbolj ustreza zahtevi po tipologiziranju, neodvisnem od zunajjezikovnih povezav.

Sintagmatska organiziranost daje metonimičnim pomenskim prenosom značaj predvidljivosti, po kateri se pomenotvorje lahko primerja z besedotvorjem. Možnosti metonimične pomenske izpeljave so v razmeroma visoki stopnji predvidljive na osnovi zgradbe motivirajočega pomena, zlasti ob upoštevanju vseh možnih povezav med propozicijskimi sestavinami. Sintagmatska določenost metonimije omogoča nedvoumno ločevanje metonimičnih pomenskih prenosov od paradigmatično določenih metaforičnih pomenskih prenosov.