

Brdar, Mario (2017): *Metonymy and Word-Formation: Their Interactions and Complementation*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 247 p.

Adisa Imamović, University of Tuzla (adisa.imamovic@untz.ba)

The book *Metonymy and Word-Formation: Their Interactions and Complementation* by Mario Brdar examines numerous ways in which metonymy and word formation interact and complement each other. They both play a very important role in enriching vocabulary. However, both processes have been marginalized to some extent: word-formation in grammar and metonymy in cognitive linguistics.

The book is organized in seven chapters. The first chapter is a brief overview of word-formation processes. Chapter 2 is a detailed account of metonymy, its definitions, approaches and types. Chapter 3 discusses a variety of views on the scope of metonymy in grammar. Chapters 4 and 5 describe the interaction of metonymy with non-concatenative and concatenative word-formation, respectively. Chapter 6 shows how metonymy and word formation complement (or block) each other, and, finally, Chapter 7 gives concluding remarks.

The introductory chapter (1-28) presents an overview of lexicalization processes. The author starts with less common word-formation strategies, such as onomatopoeia, deliberate word manufacture (e.g. *quark* in physics, *cowabunga*, *blurb* etc. (6-7)), and linguistic borrowing. Then he moves on to the word formation processes we use more often, such as affixation and other ways of modifying the morphological and phonological structure of words. An overview of morphemes and morphological processes commonly found in English, such as affixation, compounding, clipping, blending and back-formation is followed by description and examples of several morphological processes found only in some non-Indo-European languages. In addition to description and cross-linguistic analysis, the book also contains explanations about historical development and motivation.

Chapter 2, "Metonymy" (29-64), describes types, functions and roles of metonymy in grammatical processes. This chapter offers an overview of a cognitive-linguistic approach to metonymy, which started with Lakoff & Johnson (1980)

and Radden & Kövecses (1999). These first definitions of metonymy have been questioned these days, as the new studies reveal that metonymy is much more complex than it was initially presented. Nowadays, there is an array of new and diverse definitions and opinions of metonymy, and most of those who write about this phenomenon disagree on a number of issues. This chapter also explains metonymy by contrasting it with metaphor on several levels: number of mappings, domains, directionality and functions. It also discusses diverse approaches to many different types of metonymy and their properties. After this detailed overview, Brdar raises interesting questions regarding these early definitions, as they seem to fail to encompass the complex nature of metonymic processes. New studies show that metonymic processes are much more complex than the simple one-way traffic from the vehicle/source domain to the target domain. The author even raises doubts as to the actual existence of a mapping in a metonymic process. He offers a more complex definition of metonymy, which better explains a number of facts observed in recent research, and captures the dynamic nature of metonymy. According to the author, the focus of the earlier studies of metonymy was predominantly on its referential nature, while its pragmatic and grammatical effects have been disregarded. Although there are numerous studies of the role of metaphor in grammar and metaphorical extensions of grammatical categories, the role of metonymy in grammar has been neglected, partly because of the misconception that metonymy has hardly any impact on grammar. This chapter proves the opposite by providing examples of the effect of metonymy on grammar such as anaphora and change of countability status.

Chapter 3, "Metonymy and Word Formation" (65-72), presents two opposing views on what counts as metonymy in grammar. On the one hand, there is the position represented by Janda, Colman, Anderson, Basilio and Nessel that all affixed lexemes (derivations and inflections) are metonymies. These authors use the term word-formation metonymies, in order to distinguish them from lexical metonymies. On the other hand, there is the central hypothesis in this book, the opposite of Janda's standpoint: metonymic operations and word-formation processes are not simultaneous - metonymy may either precede or follow a word-formation process. Both metonymy and word-formation recycle existing items,

but in different ways. Metonymy and metaphor recycle the existing lexemes in a way that maximizes polysemy. On the other hand, word-formation processes create new lexical items. With word-formation processes, we have more lexical items to store in our mental lexicon. The chapter concludes with the statement that metonymy and word-formation are different phenomena which interact with each other.

Chapter 4, “Metonymy and Non-Concatenative Word Formation” (73-138), deals with metonymy and non-concatenative word formation: abbreviation, back-derivation, clipping, blending, and conversion, which, unlike concatenative processes, can occur at the same time as metonymy. Several views on the relationship between abbreviation and metonymy are presented here: Radden & Kövecses (1999) treat abbreviations as FORM (A) – CONCEPT (A) FOR FORM (B) – CONCEPT (A) metonymy, meaning that two forms are used for the same concept; Barcelona (2005, 2007, 2012), regards these processes as a SALIENT PART OF THE FORM FOR THE WHOLE FORM metonymy, which Brdar considers problematic as some instances of abbreviations (and acronyms) do not fit in. Finally, Brdar concludes that the metonymic link between the abbreviation and the full form is very weak, if it exists at all. When it comes to backderivation, the author criticizes the attitude that backformations are instances of metonymy (e.g. *donation* > *donate* as OBJECT FOR ACTION metonymy). Brdar believes that some conditions for metonymy are not met in this case, one of them being invariance of form. Therefore, similar to derivation, metonymy occurs before or after the process of backderivation. The situation is the same with clipping. Lexical blending is difficult to define and it is difficult to determine its scope. Brdar regards lexical blending as “a cluster of related phenomena exhibiting family resemblance” (105). If metonymy is involved in lexical blends, it occurs on the inputs of blends, before the word-formation process. Another process which is difficult to define and whose scope is problematic is conversion. One of the problems with analysing conversions is that sometimes it is difficult to determine which word was an input and which one was derived. Many studies have proved that conversions are often motivated by metonymy.

Chapter 5, “Metonymy and Concatenative Word Formation” (139-196), examines the interplay between metonymy and concatenative word-formation processes –

compounding and suffixation. The author's standpoint in this respect is that metonymy and concatenative word-formation processes cannot take place simultaneously, as some linguists claim. In his opinion, metonymic shifts take place either before suffixation or compounding or after – or both. The author first discusses the relationship between metonymy and compounds. His discussion of endocentric compounds shows how metonymic processes either prepare the ground for compounding or follow it. The analysis of exocentric compounds focuses on *baruvrihi* compounds, in which neither constituent nor its head refer to the entity named, but the relationship between the constituents and the referent can be explained by metonymy. Metonymic operations take place either at the level of compound constituents or at the level of the composite expression as the whole word, i.e. before or after compounding. The discussion about the relationship of metonymy and suffixation is largely a criticism of Janda and some other authors (e.g. Nessel, Colman, and Anderson), who believe that suffixation, prefixation and compounding are all instances of metonymy. Brdar believes that this approach would lead to an unconstrained use of the notion of 'metonymy'. He agrees with Koch (2001) that a precondition for metonymy is morpho-lexical invariance, which in these cases is not met. According to him, morphological processes such as derivation, compounding and inflection are instances of contiguity relations, but not metonymy. Brdar explains how Janda came to regard instances of suffixation as metonymy by reformulating Kövecses and Radden's (1999) definition of metonymy and uses the words with the prefix *un-* to prove her wrong. According to Brdar, it is not suffixes that exhibit metonymy, and produce polysemy, but whole words (either words functioning as bases or derived words). According to Brdar, Janda also fails to notice that metonymies come in networks, and are organized in sequences with nodes that may branch out at certain points. Suffixes may come to be seen as polysemous or polyfunctional as a result of generalization, because specific complex words containing them are polysemous or polyfunctional. Brdar gives a number of networks of polysemy to illustrate this. In conclusion, the author says that there is substantial evidence that concatenative word formation processes such as affixation and compounding interact in interesting ways with metonymy, but they are not simultaneous (196).

While Chapters 3-5 show how metonymy and word formation can interact and facilitate each other, Chapter 6, “How Metonymy and Word-Formation Complement Each Other” (197-218) deals with the ways in which metonymy and word formation complement (or block) each other. In this Chapter, Brdar uses cross-linguistic analyses to illustrate how metonymy can be blocked by affixation or compounding. He first gives an in-depth cross-linguistic analysis of nouns denoting meat of animals, fish, and parts of animals in order to show various strategies languages use. This analysis is followed by a cross-linguistic analysis of metonymic uses of nouns denoting different kinds of metal, which shows how some derivation and compounding processes block metonymy in some languages, while this metonymy is freely used in others. While some word-formation processes can block metonymy, the opposite is also possible. In the end, Chapter 7, “Concluding Remarks” (219-221) briefly summarizes the conclusions of the previous chapters.

The central hypothesis of the book is that conceptual metonymy and word formation do not work in unison, and that one does not automatically trigger the other. Word-formation and metonymy do interact with each other, but they are different phenomena. The author supports his arguments using data, mainly from the English language. The English data is complemented with data findings from Slavic, Romance, Germanic, Uralic, and other languages. In this way, this predominantly English-oriented study is enriched by a cross-linguistic perspective. The findings and the ideas expressed in this book challenge some established standpoints found in linguistic literature about word formation processes and metonymies.

For readers relatively new to the topic, the book has a very valuable chapter about metonymy. It presents the definitions of metonymy, and its types and functions found in the most recent cognitive-linguistic studies. The readers who are informed about the developments in this field will find interesting new perspectives, as the author challenges some widely accepted definitions of metonymy. He believes that the existing definitions do not properly cover its complex nature.

Descriptions of meanings and uses of words resulting from lexical processes are meticulous, precise and detailed, and they include different varieties and regional dialects of English. The in-depth semantic analysis of word formation in English is enriched with cross-linguistic perspectives.

The study of the role of metonymy in developing new meaning of words and borrowing process uses both historical data and latest development in word formation. The author discusses a lot of theoretical and methodological issues regarding definition and categorization of word-formation processes, presenting many approaches, and gives critical evaluation of some prominent writers.

To conclude, the book is a systematic and well-developed account about the interaction of metonymy and word-formation. It provides a solid theoretical framework and new insights into the problem, and opens a number of questions challenging some established and widely accepted views. I believe that linguists interested in metonymy and grammar will find this book an inspiring literature for their future research.

References

- Basilio, Margarida (2009): "The role of metonymy in word formation: Brazilian Portuguese agent noun constructions", in: Panther, Klaus-Uwe/Thornburg, Linda L./Barcelona, Antonio (eds.): *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 99-109.
- Barcelona, Antonio (2005): "The multilevel operation of metonymy in grammar and discourse, with particular attention to metonymic chains", in: Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José/Peña Cervel, M. Sandra (ed.): *Cognitive Linguistics: Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction*, Berlin/New York, 313-352.
- Barcelona, Antonio (2007): "The multi-level role of metonymy in grammar and discourse: A case study", in: Kosecki, Krzysztof (ed.): *Perspectives on Metonymy: Proceedings of the International Conference 'Perspectives on Metonymy', held in Łódź, Poland, May 6-7, 2005*, Frankfurt am Main u.a., 103-131.

- Barcelona, Antonio (2012): “Metonymy in, under and above lexicon”, in: Martín Alegre, Sara/Moyer, Melissa/Pladevall, Elisabet/Tubau, Susagna (eds.): *At a Time of Crisis: English and American Studies in Spain. Works from the 35th AEDEAN Conference*, Barcelona, 254-271.
- Colman, Fran/Anderson, John (2004): “On metonymy as word-formation: With special reference to Old English”, in: *English Studies* 85, 547-565.
- Janda, Laura A. (2010): “The role of metonymy in Czech word-formation”, in: *Slovo a slovesnost* 71, 260-274.
- Janda, Laura A. (2011): “Metonymy in word formation”, in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 22, 359-392.
- Koch, Peter (2001): “Metonymy: Unity in diversity”, in: *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2, 201-244.
- Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago/London.
- Neset, Tore (2010): „The art of being negative: Metonymical morphological constructions in contrast“, in: *Oslo Studies in Language* 2, 261-279.
- Radden, Günther/Kövecses, Zoltan (1999): “Towards a Theory of Metonymy”, in: Panther, Klaus-Uwe/Radden, Günther (eds.): *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 17-66.