UNIVERSITY OF
FORWARD
THINKING
WESTMINSTER⌗

**WestminsterResearch**

http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch

**Text Metaphtonymy: The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse**

**Denroche, C.**

# Metaphor and the Social World

## Text Metaphtonymy: The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse
### --Manuscript Draft--

| | |
|---|---|
| Manuscript Number: | MSW-16011R2 |
| Full Title: | Text Metaphtonymy: The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse |
| Short Title: | Text Metaphtonymy |
| Article Type: | Article |
| First Author: | Charles Denroche |
| Corresponding Author: | Charles Denroche<br><br>London, London UNITED KINGDOM |
| Keywords: | chains, clusters, extended metaphor, extended metonymy, discourse, metaphor, metaphtonymy, metonymy, text |
| Manuscript Classifications: | 10.05.04: Pragmatics; 10.05.05: Semiotics; 10.05.06: Psycholinguistics |
| Abstract: | ABSTRACT<br>This article starts by looking at the various ways metonymic and metaphoric thinking, as independent phenomena, organize text at discourse level. The literature on Metaphor in Discourse is classified under three broad categories, 'metaphor clusters', 'metaphor chains' and 'extended metaphor'; while the less extensive body of research on Metonymy in Discourse is analyzed into parallel categories, 'metonymy clusters', 'metonymy chains' and 'extended metonymy'. The article goes on to look at the ways in which Metonymy in Discourse and Metaphor in Discourse phenomena combine in making meaning at text level. The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse, referred to here as Text Metaphtonymy, is explored under headings adapted from Goossens (1990), namely, 'metaphor within metonymy' and 'metonymy within metaphor'. The ways in which metonymy and metaphor combine at discourse level are shown to be varied and intricate. This has implications for applied linguists working with text. The direction further work in this area might take is indicated. |
| Author Comments: | Dear Editors. Please find submitted here a revised version of this article in response to the second set of Reviewers' comments and a document in which I respond to their comments point by point. Best regards, Charles |
| Order of Authors Secondary Information: | |

Title page

Text Metaphtonymy: The interplay of metonymy and metaphor in discourse

## 1 Introduction

In his 1990 article, Goossens coins the term *metaphtonymy* to refer to the interaction of metonymy and metaphor in linguistic expressions (Goossens, 1990). In that article, Goossens is concerned not with linguistic items which represent intermediate stages on the metonymy-metaphor continuum but with metonymy and metaphor as distinct phenomena, appearing 'in combination' and 'intertwined' (Goossens, 1990:323). For him, metaphtonymy is a phenomenon occurring on the small scale of individual expressions, and not metonymy- and metaphor-led phenomena on the larger scale of the whole text, which is the focus of this article. In the present study, I will be using the term 'Text Metaphtonymy' to underscore this difference and indicate that the focus is the interaction of metonymy and metaphor not within clause-length units but across longer stretches of language.

The purpose of this article is to review the different ways in which figurative thought impacts on discourse at text level. To do so, I demonstrate the various ways in which figurative thought manifests itself in speech/writing. I look first at how metaphor and metonymy organize talk/text when occurring independently, and then look at the same phenomena occurring in combination. Section 2 offers a classification of Metaphor in Discourse phenomena under three broad categories – 'metaphor clusters', 'metaphor chains' and 'extended metaphor'; while Section 3 deals with the less-studied topic of Metonymy in Discourse under three parallel categories – 'metonymy clusters', 'metonymy chains' and 'extended metonymy'. Every one of these six categories is represented in some form in the literature, though often named differently. What I offer is a framework which overviews/arranges the phenomena into a manageable number of categories, named to show up the parallels which exist between the three metaphor

phenomena and the three metonymy phenomena. This involves a fresh look at

terminology but not merely as an exercise in re-naming; the framework is not an end in

itself but, rather, a tool of investigation of the phenomenon at the centre of this study,

Text Metaphtonymy. Section 4 examines Text Metaphtonymy, the co-occurrence of

metaphor and metonymy in talk/text. Section 5 reviews the contribution the article

makes to the field and suggests the direction further research in this area might take.

## 2 Metaphor in Discourse

The sizeable literature on Metaphor in Discourse encompasses a variety of different

approaches to understanding the role of metaphor in meaning-making at text level. They

range from the systematic identification and enumeration of linguistic metaphor in text;

on to noticing local metaphor activity at critical points in texts ('clusters'); on to

observing the patterning of metaphors linking across a text ('chains'); and, finally, to

single metaphors organizing long stretches of text and whole texts ('extended

metaphor').

### 2.1 Metaphor Clusters

A number of invaluable tools have been developed for identifying metaphor in

discourse, such as those devised by Cameron (2003), Cameron & Deignan (2006),

Cameron & Maslen (2010), Pragglejaz Group (2007), Steen (2002, 2007) and Steen et

al. (2010). Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) operationalizes metaphor

identification at word level by identifying words used metaphorically which have a

more basic meaning (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). A modified version of MIP, MIPVU,

includes similes, comparisons and extended comparisons (Steen et al., 2010). In Steen's

five-step procedure for metaphor identification, the clause is the unit of analysis (Steen, 2002, 2007). Metaphor Identification through Vehicle (MIV) analyses discourse for both single and multi-word 'vehicle terms' (Cameron, 1999, 2003), using the full intonation unit as the unit of analysis (Cameron & Stelma, 2004:119, Cameron et al. 2010). The focus on 'emergent' meaning is central to the 'discourse-dynamics approach' to metaphor analysis (Cameron et al., 2009, Cameron & Maslen, 2010). It enables researchers to recognize subtle, locally-occurring and often ephemeral metaphor activity, as well as more stable 'metaphoremes', units which show shared features of form, semantics, affect and pragmatics (Cameron & Deignan, 2006:676).

These identification tools have been helpful in the identification of metaphor 'clusters', concentrations of linguistic metaphors occurring in close proximity at particular points in a text. This uneven distribution of metaphor in discourse is discussed by Darian (2000), Koller (2003), Cameron & Low (2004), Cameron & Stelma (2004), Cameron (2008), Semino (2008) and Kimmel (2010). For Darian, 'clusters' are groupings of metaphoric expressions from the same metaphoric theme, developed over several sentences or paragraphs (Darian, 2000:180-181). For Cameron & Stelma, they involve conventional or novel linguistic metaphors and can derive from one or a number of 'vehicle' domains (Cameron & Stelma, 2004). More usually, 'clusters' refer to concentrations of linguistic metaphors from different domains, as in Semino's definition: "different metaphorical expressions drawing from different source domains in close proximity to one another" (Semino, 2008:226). In the 'mixed metaphor clusters' in newspaper texts which Kimmel discusses, metaphors appear in particularly close proximity, but in spite of being from unrelated sources and therefore lacking obvious coherence, they do not seem to present processing problems (Kimmel, 2010).

Scholars agree as to the function of clusters: they occur where intense or important discourse work is being done. Koller observes that clusters at the beginning of a text will tend to have an ideational function, while the function of clusters mid-text or at the end of a text will tend to be interpersonal (Koller, 2003:120). In the literature reviewed by Deignan et al., clusters are characterized as 'higher than average' concentrations of metaphor, occurring at points in text where the message is "particularly difficult or face threatening" (Deignan et al., 2013:8-9). For Cameron, they "mark points in talk where something complex or unfamiliar needs to be explained or interpreted", occurring on "both micro and macro scales of talk", that is, from three to four intonation units to passages lasting minutes (Cameron, 2008:200). Cameron & Stelma observe bursts occurring at critical junctures in communication, "points where intensive and important discourse work is carried out" (Cameron & Stelma, 2004:135). In the reconciliation encounters considered by Cameron & Stelma, clusters provide a way of presenting 'otherness'; and in the literature on psychotherapist-patient discourse and religious sermons they review, of explaining difficult or unfamiliar topics (Cameron & Stelma, 2004:132-135).

## 2.2  Metaphor Chains

A 'metaphor chain' is a Metaphor in Discourse pattern made up of related metaphors distributed more or less evenly across a text. Koller (2003) and Semino (2008) both use the term 'chain' to describe this type of patterning. For Semino, metaphor chains are made up of (usually conventional) linguistic metaphors from a single source domain, "several related metaphorical expressions throughout a text", and result from a combination of 'repetition', 'recurrence' and 'extension' (Semino, 2008:226). Koller

5

identifies chains deriving from different domains, WAR, SPORTS and GAMES, in the marketing text she analyses (Koller, 2003), and shows how chains can overlap and interact without necessarily creating problems for the reader. In earlier work, Darian uses the term 'recurring metaphor' to refer to the "recurrence of the same image at different places in the text" (Darian, 2000:171), such as patterns deriving from *IMMUNE SYSTEM AS WAR*, *GENETIC TRANSFER AS FAMILY RELATIONS* and *BACTERIA AS HUNTERS* in introductory science texts he considers (Darian, 2000:171-172).

In the example I offer below, an extract from a newspaper article on the relative performance of two currencies, the pound and the euro, orientational/spatial metaphors and metaphors of movement, deriving mainly from BAD IS DOWN, play an important role in framing the message. Vehicle terms relating to the source domain DOWN are shown underlined below:

> The pound's relentless <u>slide</u> towards parity with the euro picked up pace after it <u>plunged</u> to another record <u>low</u> against the single European currency. The latest <u>slide</u> saw sterling worth just 1.022 euros amid expectations for European interest rates to remain <u>higher</u> than in the UK […]. Sterling has lost 13% of its value against the euro this month alone as it <u>sinks</u> to yet more historic <u>lows</u> […] (*Metro*, 29 December 2008 – http://metro.co.uk/2008/12/29/pound-hits-near-parity-with-euro-270090/).

Metaphoric mappings related to BAD IS DOWN have a significant impact across a long stretch of this text; however, the metaphoric senses of the words *slide*, *plunged*, *low*, *higher*, *sinks*, *lows* are conventional, well established meanings in the corpus of the language. The genre also limits choice, so that in this type of news reporting these

words are almost unavoidable. In newspaper reports of the 2008 financial crisis we would no doubt find many other words deriving from BAD IS DOWN, such as *collapse*, *slump*, *dive*, *fall*, *tumble*, used not creatively but in straight-forward reporting, as if, to quote Cameron et al., "the metaphorical way of talking about it has become so conventionalized that it is almost the *only* way to talk about it" (Cameron et al., 2010:127). If the organizing metaphor is a 'primary conceptual metaphor', in other words, one close to our physical experience of the world, such as BAD IS DOWN, a chain of lexical items of this sort typically results. If the organizing metaphor is complex or novel, different lexical patternings emerge for which the term 'chain' is no longer appropriate. These are more likely to be examples of 'extended metaphor' (Section 2.3).

Other terms which have been used to describe chains include 'metaphor theme' (Musolff, 2000), 'metaphor formula' (Kimmel, 2012) and 'recurrent metaphor' (Low, 2008), but the most used and widely discussed term in this context is 'systematic metaphor' (Cameron, 2008, Cameron & Maslen, 2010). Cameron et al. define systematic metaphor as "a set of linguistic metaphors in which connected vehicle words or phrases are used metaphorically about a particular topic" (Cameron et al., 2010:127). "The systematic use of connected metaphors across talk" forms a larger 'trajectory' or 'trace' (Cameron et al., 2009:77), thereby constructing a 'metaphor trajectory' inside the 'discourse trajectory' (Cameron, 2010:84).

This 'discourse dynamics' perspective of Cameron and her co-researchers is concerned with metaphor which is "processual, emergent, and open to change" (Cameron et al., 2009:67), where 'systematic metaphor' is "the dynamic collection of connected linguistic metaphors, a trajectory from one metaphor to the next over the

dynamics of talk" (Cameron et al., 2009:78). We are warned in this approach against over-interpreting data and over-generalizing beyond the text (Cameron et al., 2010:119, 124-125, 138). Systematic metaphors are less generalized than conceptual metaphors, describing choices relating to specific texts and genres (Cameron, 2008:208, 2010:129), coming closest to conceptual metaphors only when "highly conventionalized linguistic metaphors […] fall into highly conventionalized patterns of use" (Cameron et al., 2010:134).

The terms 'conceptual metaphor' and 'systematic metaphor' reflect different priorities and different schools of thought: Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) asks broad questions about metaphor in language in the mind; while Metaphor-led Discourse Analysis (MLDA) asks more specific questions about metaphor in relation to context and the role of mutual relationships, identities and the culture of the participants in a specific speech event (Semino, 2008:31). Semino distinguishes between 'discourse systematicity (of metaphors)' and 'global systematicity (of metaphors)', "the conventional use of a set of related metaphorical expressions" within a specific genre/discourse and across genres/discourses, respectively (Semino, 2008:227, 228). Both generalize about metaphor, but while conceptual metaphors record higher-level generalizations about permanent cross-domain mappings in the conceptual systems in our minds, systematic metaphor describes local use by language participants while 'talking and thinking' in a specific discourse event (Cameron, 2003, Cameron & Maslen, 2010). The typographical convention of writing conceptual metaphors in non-italic SMALL CAPITALS and systematic metaphors in italic *SMALL CAPITALS* (Cameron et al., 2010:117) underscores this difference.

8

## 2.3    Extended Metaphor

The third phenomenon considered in this overview of Metaphor in Discourse, following

the literature, I am calling 'extended metaphor'. This is the novel extension of a single

metaphoric idea across a substantial portion of text, or even an entire text. An example

of this occurring on a small scale is given below:

> We have seen cuts in the health service not improvements, cuts that have not only
>
> gone through the skin but have cut into the flesh and as far as the bone in some cases
>
> ('Today', *BBC Radio 4*, author's transcription).

Scholars who discuss extension include Goatly (1997), Darian (2000), Steen (2007) and

Semino (2008). Darian characterizes 'extended metaphor' as "one or several sequential

paragraphs that embellish on an original metaphor and carry it through several

permutations", such as DNA IS A LIBRARY (Darian, 2000:171). He sees the function of

such metaphors as heuristic, helping the reader 'understand' and 'remember' (2000:168-

169). 'Extension of metaphor' is the third of Steen's 'four dimensions of metaphor in

usage', the others being 'directness', 'signalling' and 'explicitness' (Steen, 2007:319-

323). He observes that 'metaphor extension' is processed differently from 'restricted

metaphor', where metaphor is confined to a discourse unit, in terms of cross-domain

mapping (Steen, 2007:321).

   For Semino, 'extension (of linguistic metaphors)' is the occurrence of "several

metaphorical expressions evoking the same source domain and describing the same

target domain in close proximity to one another in a text" (Semino, 2008:227). The size

of unit extends to whole texts and to groups of related texts in Semino et al.'s discussion

9

of texts drawing on *PAIN CONTROL IS A GATE*, *BERLUSCONI IS A DISEASE* and *HAVING A SPECIAL-NEEDS CHILD IS BEING SENT TO A HOLIDAY DESTINATION YOU DIDN'T CHOOSE* (Semino et al., 2013). They show how the metaphors used to frame the original texts offer possibilities for subsequent 'recontextualization' when contributors develop ('re-frame') the original metaphor creatively through 'use and reuse' in blogs and in online fora (Semino et al., 2013:46-51). Deignan et al., considering metaphor extending across a range of genres and registers, such as climate change, and children and staff in a nursery context, similarly show how *GENE REPLICATION IS COPYING* and *CONTROL OF PAIN IS A GATE* give rise to differently nuanced meanings when taken up in specialized or popular genres (Deignan et al., 2013).

There is a potential overlap between extended metaphor and metaphor chains as they both involve a single metaphoric idea over a long stretch of language. Goatly and Semino both see metaphor chains as manifestations of metaphor extension, and link extension with organizing/systematic metaphor. For Goatly, extension involves different vehicle terms from one domain (Goatly, 1997:264), which, when numerous, form organizing metaphors (systematic metaphors), such as *ANTS ARE SOLDIERS*, and contribute to 'textual structuring' (Goatly, 1997:163).

The example below, a poster which appeared on the London Underground to recruit volunteers for the London 2012 Olympic Games, is unambiguously an example of extended metaphor rather than a chain. It is a particular kind of extended metaphor, though, where a single novel metaphoric idea organizes the whole text, structuring it into a number of clearly defined stages. The metaphor involved is *LONDON IS A FLAT*. In the 'mark-up' below, language relating to the target domain LONDON in shown in **bold** and language relating to the source domain FLAT is underlined:

You know when your mum's coming round to your flat and you give the place a quick tidy? Well that's exactly what we're doing. Except our "flat" **is London** and our "mum" **is the rest of the world** coming round. **So we're cleaning London in time for the London 2012 Olympic Games. But that's a big job so we're asking people like you to lend us a hand. We have litter to pick, graffiti to scrub, and flowers to plant. To help London look its best just go to P&GCapitalcleanup.com. Come on.** Make your mum proud! (advertisement on the London Underground, Jan 2012).

The text starts with language from the source domain, FLAT; there is then a 'transition' containing language from both the source and target in which the metaphor is explained by making certain mappings explicit, even signalling them using quotation marks: flat equals **London**, mum equals **the rest of the world**. It then moves on to language from the target domain, LONDON; and finally there is a brief 'return' to the source domain, *Make your mum proud!* We sense here that this is deliberate metaphor use, one which is 'worked at' consciously in a way rarely achieved in speech, with the result that metaphor does not just pattern lexis but constructs a sequence of clearly identifiable moves: SOURCE-TRANSITION-TARGET-RETURN. The terms 'extended metaphor' and 'systematic metaphor' hardly seem adequate to describe this kind of Metaphor in Discourse phenomenon; a term such as 'text-constructing metaphor' or 'genre-constructing metaphor' might be more appropriate.

Paradoxically, the larger the unit of language organized by metaphoric thought, and, therefore, in a sense, the more important the role of metaphor, the less likely it is that

11

the language will be identified as metaphoric, using tools such as MIP, MIPVU and MIV, or tagging software for automated analysis (e.g. Deignan, 2005a, 2005b, Stefanowistch & Greis, 2006, Kimmel, 2012). These procedures are well suited to the identification of phenomena where metaphor is expressed as linguistic metaphor, such as metaphor clusters, metaphor chains and emergent metaphor, but not so well equipped for identifying metaphoric thought operating on larger units. When metaphor organizes substantial stretches of language, linguistic metaphors may not actually be present, as metaphoric writing does not necessarily contain local metaphor. Because metaphor-identification procedures work at the small-scale end of analysis, when applied to a text such as the *Olympics Games* text discussed above, the overarching metaphor which constructs this text would not be detected; in fact, only two words would be identified as metaphoric, *flat* and *mum*. But if the text is marked up for source and target language (in the way shown above), the entire text becomes highlighted.

Metaphor-identification protocols detect metaphor across discourse by identifying individual metaphoric expressions but metaphor across text is present in other ways. This is not to say that scholars working on the identification of linguistic metaphor are unaware of larger-scale phenomena. On the contrary, Cameron recognises systematicity at three levels: local, discourse and global (Cameron, 1999); while Steen recognizes word, utterance, text and discourse levels of analysis (Steen, 2014). Steen describes text patterns found in education, science, advertising and propaganda, as well as literature, with two clearly defined sections, where "some cross-domain mappings are expressed as a text or section of a text with two different parts, one of which is devoted to the source domain and the other to the target domain" (Steen, 2007:342). He notes also that "extended comparison typically has relatively long stretches of direct language use for

one domain followed by long stretches of direct language use for another domain"
(Steen, 2007:321). It is this sort of 'direct language' which identification procedures are
not well equipped at detecting.

We have seen in this section that systematicity of metaphor use can produce
patterning of language in text of two types; it can result in metaphor chains if the
language and the metaphoric idea involved are conventional, or extended metaphor if
the metaphoric ideas involved are novel. There will inevitably be contexts where the
metaphoric idea is somewhere between the two, producing patterns which are neither
clearly chains nor extensions.

## 3 Metonymy in Discourse

The literature on Metonymy in Discourse, which I overview in this section, is far less
extensive than the literature on Metaphor in Discourse. This reflects the greater interest
in metaphor in studies of figurative language/thought in general and that, historically, it
was metaphor which led the way in driving the 'cognitive turn'. Typically, metonymy
occupies one chapter in books otherwise devoted to metaphor, e.g. Lakoff & Johnson
(1980), Gibbs (1994) and Kövecses (2002). The multi-authored volumes of collected
essays which form the backbone of the Metonymy Studies literature, such as Benczes et
al. (2011), Panther & Radden (1999) and Panther & Thornburg (2003), are rich in their
discussions of clause-level phenomena, but give little attention to metonymy at
discourse level; and collections with 'metonymy' and 'metaphor' in the title, such as
Barcelona (2000), Dirven & Pörings (2003) and Panther et al. (2009), while redressing
the balance by giving plenty of room to discussions of metonymy, give little space to
how metonymy and metaphor interact at discourse level. The literature relevant to the

present study is, nonetheless, far from sparse. In overviewing Metonymy in Discourse, in addition to writings by cognitive linguists, I consider Al-Sharafi's (2004) multidisciplinary, text-linguistics approach, as well as work from semiotics (Jakobson, 1956) and literary linguistics (Lodge, 1977). The headings I adopt mirror the categories in Section 2.

### 3.1 Metonymy Clusters

The term 'metonymy cluster' usually refers in the metonymy literature to points in discourse where linguistic metonymies are found in high density, metonymies of the kind which can be identified using metonymy identification procedures such as those developed by Biernacka (2013) and Deignan et al. (2013). In this section, I am using 'metonymy cluster' in a different sense, referring instead to a group of carefully chosen examples. I am calling these 'metonymies' because they are individual, specific, usually prototypical, instances which convey a more general message. Thus metonymic reasoning is involved but on a larger scale, with the result that the clusters I am identifying would not necessarily involve metonymic language and would therefore not be identifiable using the procedures cited above.

A 'cluster' in my sense usually takes the form of a list; but it is a metonymic list rather than a 'literal' list, such as a shopping list or an inventory. For example, if a text contained an exhaustive list of all the facilities a gym or hotel had to offer, or all the things that take place in a village as part of seasonal festivities, these would be literal lists (checklists), not metonymic lists, and we would expect to process them literally. If, however, a text advertising what there is to do in a shopping mall read as follows, *You can buy a new evening dress, have a teppanyaki meal with friends or attend the premier*

*of a Hollywood film*, this is a metonymic list, a metonymy cluster, as the three examples are not all the possibilities open to a visitor to the mall, and require the reader to process them metonymically. The impact of this cluster is different from a generic phrase, such as *The mall offers retail, dining and entertainment possibilities*. Clusters of this sort are a common and powerful rhetorical device. The effect is to reinforce the argument by bringing the hearer/reader into closer physical proximity with the situation being evoked through a register which is more vivid and real.

The extract below is from a radio interview with a British bishop about the increased use of foodbanks (centres for distributing food to the needy) in the UK. It starts with a metonymy cluster consisting of two sentences (underlined):

**Bishop Walker**: <u>What we're finding is that this is about older people who are forced to choose between having the heating on or having breakfast. It's about children whose mums are faced with deciding who's going to go without a meal that day</u>. Being on the breadline used to be a bit of a political metaphor. For half a million Britons it's now a tragic truth and the report we've just heard simply bears that out ('The World at One', *BBC Radio 4*, 20 February 2014).

The cluster gives two instances of people in society finding it hard to cope, older people and mothers. Again it demands of the hearer/reader that the language involved is processed metonymically, as non-literal; if understood literally, the issue discussed would seem to concern a much narrower topic, just two specific contexts. There are fewer components here than in the earlier shopping mall example, two rather than three,

and they are longer. A cluster may consist of a single instance and one which may be quite extensive.

It is not only the number but also the type of items which acts as a trigger; items in a metonymic lists are prototypical, as in this extract from a newspaper article:

> Compare 2000 London with the thin flame of Sixties Swinging London: then, there were only <u>The Beatles, Carnaby Street, King's Road, Australians in damp Earl's Court basements, and a few thousand people discovering sex and pot</u> (*London Evening Standard*, 12 May 2000, p13).

The choice of items signals that this is a metonymic rather than a literal list. Metonymy clusters exhibit the basic metonymic principle of part-whole relations; the examples are the parts, the more general message is the whole. Our world knowledge tells us there must have been more to London in the 1960s than is contained in the first three items. This is confirmed by the next item being highly specific, *Australians in damp Earl's Court basements*; and finally, *a few thousand people discovering sex and pot*, leaves the reader in no doubt. The more prototypical the examples, the more they signal that the passage is metonymic and, generally, the more powerful the effect.

The impact of figurative thought on the larger scale of discourse gives rise to phenomena which are different in form and nature from those encountered at clause level, with the result that Metonymy in Discourse phenomena are not always immediately recognizable as examples of what most people think of as metonymy. This is not new. Jakobson makes foundational statements about the role of metonymy in communication in his classic paper on aphasia, identifying two distinct 'poles' of

16

communication, one metonymic, the other metaphoric (Jakobson, 1956). In the final

section of the essay, he characterizes prose, cinema and realism as reflecting the

metonymic 'way', and poetry, theatre and surrealism the metaphoric way (Jakobson,

1956:76-79). Lodge takes up Jakobson's distinction, referring instead to metaphoric and

metonymic 'modes' of writing (Lodge, 1977). He makes the important observations that

writing may be metonymic at *text* level but not necessarily at *surface* level, and that

'metonymic writing' does not necessarily contain linguistic metonymies, consisting

instead of 'literal' language and even metaphoric expressions: "It is metonymic writing,

not metaphoric, even though it contains a few metaphors and no metonymies; it is

metonymic in structure" (Lodge, 1977: 98-99).

The independence of metonymic language and metonymic thinking in talk/text has

also been noted by scholars in more recent times. Gibbs distinguishes between

'processing metonymic language' and the 'metonymic processing of language' (Gibbs

1999:69), that is, between recognizing individual expressions as metonymies versus

recognizing part-whole thinking at discourse level; and points out that comprehending

individual expressions which contain 'conventional metonymic language' (what most

people consider metonymy to be) does not necessarily draw on 'metonymic mappings'

(Gibbs 1999:74). "The proper study of metonymy", he writes, "surely extends beyond

looking at metonymic language alone", and that we need to look beyond "metonymy as

a lexical phenomenon […] to discover the ways that patterns of metonymy in language

reflect patterns of metonymic thought" (Gibbs 1999:74). For Gibbs, "speaking and

understanding indirect speech acts involves a kind of metonymic reasoning, where

people infer wholes (a series of actions) from a part" (Gibbs 1994:352). Pragmatic

inferencing has been explored from this perspective by a number of authors (e.g. Panther & Thornburg 2003).

Just as procedures developed for metaphor identification are not well equipped for recognizing 'large scale' phenomena such as extended metaphor, so procedures for metonymy identification are not well suited for recognizing large-scale metonymy phenomena, such as 'clusters' (in the sense that I am using the term), as both require analysis at a macro-level. Biernacka demonstrates that the principle of metonymy is involved not just in processing lexis but also on a larger scale (Biernacka 2013:208). She points out that the system she has developed for the identification of metonymy, operating in a similar way to MIP and MIV by looking for differences between the contextual and basic meaning of lexical items/phrases, does not pick up metonymic thinking on a larger scale, and identifies two phenomena on this larger scale, 'metonymic shifting of pronominal reference' and the 'metonymic processing of scenarios and stories'. Biernacka identifies a section of focus-group data where there is intense activity at the macro-level, which she calls a 'super-cluster', where five metaphor clusters co-occur with a high number of word-level metonymies (Biernacka 2013:153). This is also the point where the most controversial and emotional topics are being discussed.

## 3.2   Metonymy Chains

The idea of a 'chain' of metonymies has two senses in the literature: a 'horizontal' discourse sense and a 'vertical' virtual sense. The vertical sense refers to multiple metonymic mappings initiated by a single lexical item, an inferred chain of concepts, each concept providing the vehicle for the next. Various terms have been used to

describe this: 'chain of metonymies', e.g. *idea-word-page-book-library* (Reddy, 1993:186-187); '(inclusive) metonymic chain', e.g. *head-brain-thinking-mind-intelligence* (Dirven, 2002:98, 103); 'chained metonymies' (Hilpert, 2010); and 'metonymic chaining', e.g. *glasses-goalkeeper-Preston North End football team* (Littlemore, 2015:131). I am concerned instead with the horizontal sense of a chain, a 'linear' sequence of metonymically-related lexical items, linking across a text and serving a discourse function, to which Brdar-Szabó & Brdar give the name 'textual metonymic chain' (2011:229).

Viewing cohesion in terms of metonymic relations has been discussed by Stirling (1996), Al-Sharafi (2004), Brdar-Szabó & Brdar (2011), AUTHOR (2015), Littlemore (2015) and others. There are many ways in which meaning relations between lexical items set up metonymy chains and networks in text, e.g. through meronymy, superordinancy, hyponymy, antonymy, but it is synonymy which I want to use to illustrate metonymy chains in this section. In the theoretical framework of this article, meaning relations between synonyms are seen as metonymic because they involve parts and wholes; synonyms are related to each other metonymically because they share many meaning components, and because recognising relations between synonyms involves metonymic thinking. The extract below from a self-help book explores the relationship between Andrew and Gwen:

Andrew handled his sensitivity and reactivity somewhat differently. Andrew's style was to turn a deaf ear to Gwen. She referred to this as the deep freeze. He was civil, even polite, but completely unavailable. Gwen had learned it was best to leave Andrew alone until he was ready to interact. Trying to talk with him when he pulled

back was like cornering a fox, which will bite when trapped. It was hard for Gwen when Andrew walled her out. (D. Schnarch, *Resurrecting Sex: Resolving Sexual Problems and Rejuvenating Your Relationship*, 2002, p.42).

Each sentence in this passage enriches the message with a new term to describe emotional distance/isolation. A full picture of what being in a relationship with Andrew felt like for Gwen is built up through a chain of synonymous expressions (underlined). The terms are not exact equivalents but metonymically related, overlapping sufficiently for the reader to process them as related.

In Halliday & Hasan's account of cohesion in English, a chain of synonyms is one way 'reiteration' achieves 'lexical cohesion' in text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Using the term 'metonymy chain', rather than adopting Halliday & Hasan's terminology (lexical cohesion/reiteration), emphasizes that the function of this sort of chain is not simply to re-refer, as Halliday & Hasan suggest, but to enrich meaning progressively as the text unfolds. The items in the chain in the 'Andrew and Gwen' text above, *turn a deaf ear*, *unavailable*, (not) *ready to interact* and *pull back*, have different associations, many of them metaphoric, and do not merely represent repetitions.

Metonymy, by its very nature, lends itself to the realization of the progressive enrichment of meaning. Kress maintains that representation is always 'partial', partial "in relation to the object or phenomenon represented", and 'full' "in relation to the sign-maker's interest at the moment of making the sign" (Kress, 2010:71). Seto divides metonymies into those which involve specific-general or 'kind of' relations (C type) and those which involve part-whole or 'part of' relations (E type) (Seto, 1999); while for Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & Diez Velasco metonymies are of two types, SOURCE-IN-

TARGET and TARGET-IN-SOURCE, facilitating, respectively, 'domain expansion' and

'domain reduction' (Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & Diez Velasco, 2002). Thus, at every

point in discourse, metonymy makes available small shifts in meaning at a very basic

level. The possibilities are further increased when discourse is multimodal, each 'mode'

offering new potential for shifting meaning and emphasizing different aspects of a

domain, such as in pictorial material of comics and cartoons (Forceville, 2008:475),

'multimodal metonymy' in advertising billboards and feature films, where visual

metonymies are 'source-in-target' rather than 'target-in-source' (Forceville, 2009), and

'metonymic chains' and 'double metonymies' expressed multimodally in ICT

advertisements (Hidalgo & Kraljevic, 2011). In a corpus of printed advertisements,

Pérez-Sobrino found source and target domains were cued visually, verbally and

verbopictorially, and that metaphtonymy was the most frequently used 'conceptual

operation', metonymy offering a point of access to a domain and metaphor providing

connotational mappings (Pérez-Sobrino, 2016).

Al-Sharafi's cognitive-semiotic approach puts metonymy at the centre of

communication and characterizes 'the sign' itself as metonymic. He considers all

Halliday & Hasan's categories of cohesion, grammatical as well as lexical, to be

metonymic, giving 'texture' through 'surface text ties', while also creating 'deeper'

cognitive metonymic links: "I do not discuss cohesion as a set of surface text ties only,

but from the point of view of its creation by metonymic relations in text" (Al-Sharafi,

2004:110). Al-Sharafi feels that "metonymy accounts for the relations of lexical

cohesion in a more satisfactory way than the term 'lexical cohesion' itself" (Al-Sharafi,

2004:126). Stirling examines cohesion in terms of metonymy but concentrates on

grammatical rather than lexical relations (Stirling, 1996). The term 'metonymic

anaphora' in her work refers to contexts where a pronoun triggers an aspect of a lexical item different from the one initially intended. She illustrates this with an example from a text about *Weight Watchers* (an organization which organizes weight-loss programmes), in which the lexical item *Weight Watchers* has the sense of 'institution', but later in the text the pronoun *they* triggers the sense of 'people' (Stirling, 1996:69). Stirling maintains that inanimate to animate shifts such as these appear to be unproblematic in terms of processing in the studies she reviews (Stirling, 1996:71).

Brdar-Szabó & Brdar see the importance of metonymy in providing cohesion across text in their discussion of 'metonymic chains' (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011). Such chains not only enhance coherence and cohesion but also allow "plenty of conceptual maneuvering room" (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:245-246). Brdar-Szabó & Brdar distinguish between 'textual' and 'conceptual' metonymic chains. In a 'textual metonymic chain' the same lexeme is repeated across a text and different aspects of the lexical item are highlighted each time, allowing 'shifts' "between subdomains within a single domain matrix, picking different target meanings at different points in a text, while using a single lexeme as a metonymic source" (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:238-239). *Ancient Rome* can trigger various meanings – the territory of the Roman Empire, the city of Rome in Roman times, the influence, customs and culture of the Ancient Romans – depending on where it appears in a text (author's example). A 'conceptual' metonymic chain in contrast (similar to my sense of 'metonymy chain'), consists of different lexical items which develop a single mental concept as the reader progresses through the text, a series of different metonymic sources "unified by common metonymic targets" (Brdar-Szabó & Brdar, 2011:232).

Biernacka presents data from focus groups on terrorism to show shifts in meaning of the pronouns 'they', 'we' and 'you' across text, for which she coins the term 'metonymic shifting of pronominal reference', maintaining that a discourse-dynamic approach is needed to reveal the "complex, dynamic, context- and process-dependent nature" of metonymy (Biernacka, 2013:231). Kimmel gives an example of a text in which such a chain is set up within the source domain of an extended metaphor, the lexical items *volte face*, *U-turn*, *withdrawing* forming a chain of metonymically-related items, though Kimmel describes this not as a metonymy chain but "cohesion relations between metaphors" (Kimmel, 2012:34).

## 3.3 Extended Metonymy

The third phenomenon I consider in this overview of Metonymy in Discourse is 'extended metonymy'. I am using the term here to refer to instances where a number of novel linguistic metonymies, all deriving from the same conceptual metonymy, occur together in close proximity. Gibbs calls these 'contextual expressions' and gives an example in which the desirability of future roommates is discussed by drawing creatively on the metonymy POSSESSION FOR PERSON, the individuals being referred to via their possessions, *steam iron*, *stereo*, *electric typewriter*, etc. (Gibbs, 1994:334). If the famous *Ham sandwich wants his check* example were extended within a text to other people in the restaurant, this would be an example of extending the FOOD ORDER FOR PERSON metonymy. Similarly, referring to various people in a hospital ward by the conditions they are suffering would involve an extension of CONDITION FOR PERSON; or if the injuries that players suffer during a football season, such as *knee*, *neck* and *groin*, were used to identify the players via the conceptual metonymy INJURY FOR PLAYER. The

lexical items are novel in the sense that the meanings they have in these contexts would not be reported in any dictionary.

Dancygier & Sweetser, under the heading 'Extended metonymy and viewpoint', consider an example from *Passage to Juneau* by Jonathan Raban in which books on a sailing boat are thrown off the shelves onto the floor during rough seas (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014:194-195). A number of metonymies are involved, BOOK-TITLE FOR THE PHYSICAL BOOK, AUTHOR'S NAME FOR THE PHYSICAL BOOK, BOOK-TITLE FOR IDEAS IN THE BOOK and AUTHOR'S NAME FOR THE AUTHOR AS A PERSON, which then gives rise to metaphoric language such as *unlikely tangle*, *pages gaping*, *jackets half-off* and *chance couplings*.

Extended metonymy involves novel rather than conventional expressions, deriving from the same conceptual metonymy and occurring together in the same section of text; this parallels 'extended metaphor' (Section 2.3), where a number of different linguistic expressions derive from the same conceptual metaphor. There is an important difference, however, as extended metaphor is more easily detected using identification procedures, such as those discussed above, than would be the case for extended metonymy. The reason for this is that conceptual metaphors, such as GOOD IS UP or LIFE IS A JOURNEY, pattern lexis according to specific domains; while the patterns organized by conceptual metonymies, such as OBJECT FOR PERSON or INANIMATE FOR ANIMATE, indicate far more generalized lexical domains. For this reason, metonymy lacks what Handl calls the "creative potential" of metaphor (Handl 2011:89-90), novel linguistic metonymies being the result of novel contexts rather than the exploitation of conventional mappings in novel ways, as is the case for metaphor. Basic level metaphors, such as GOOD IS UP, are closer to image schemas and the direct embodiment

of our sensory experience of the physical world, and often have metonymic origins; but, although 'basic', they pattern lexis in ways which are more predictable than is the case for metonymy. Conceptual metonymies also range from models which are more 'basic' (and closer to image schemas) to those which are less basic, PART FOR WHOLE, for example, being more primary than INJURY FOR PLAYER. The metonymies behind metonymy clusters and metonymy chains are more basic, essentially PART-WHOLE, than those giving rise to extended metonymy.

In this section, I have indicated that metonymic thinking, like metaphoric thinking, frequently plays a significant role not only at, and below, the level of the clause but also in organizing language at the level of the whole text. Not only does metonymy play a powerful role in discourse but it has many different manifestations and functions. It is well established that the relationship between cognitive aspects of metonymy and linguistic manifestations of metonymy are complex and operate at different levels, with the consequence that figurative thought does not always manifest itself as figurative language. Having considered Metaphor in Discourse and Metonymy in Discourse as independent phenomena in this and the previous section, I now go on to look at the interaction of these phenomena in talk/text.

## 4 Text Metaphtonymy

Goossens identifies four types of metaphtonymy, four ways in which metonymy and metaphor 'combine' and 'intertwine' at clause level (Goossens, 1990). These are paired into: *integrated metaphtonymy,* which comprises 'Metonymy within Metaphor' and 'Metaphor within Metonymy'; and *cumulative metaphtonymy*, which comprises 'Metaphor from Metonymy' and 'Metonymy from Metaphor' (Goossens, 1990:338). I

will consider only *integrated metaphtonymy* as it is here that metonymy and metaphor combine but remain distinct. The word 'within' in Metonymy within Metaphor and Metaphor within Metonymy is key, as it pinpoints the salient notion that both metonymy and metaphor are present but that there is a scalar difference between the two elements, that two levels of magnitude are involved. In *cumulative metaphtonymy*, 'from' indicates a process of derivation where either metonymy or metaphor is the 'end product' or 'result' (Goossens, 1990:338). While Goossens is concerned with strings of words of clause length or shorter, I am looking at how metonymy is embedded in metaphor and metaphor is embedded in metonymy on the larger scale of the whole text. For this I am using the term 'Text Metaphtonymy', while retaining Goossens' descriptors 'Metonymy within Metaphor' and 'Metaphor within Metonymy' in the discussion below.

### 4.1 Metonymy within Metaphor

To illustrate Metonymy within Metaphor at text level, I revisit the *Olympics Games* text discussed in Section 2.3. The term 'Metonymy within Metaphor' indicates metaphor organizing a larger unit within which metonymy is present as a smaller unit, or, as Goossens puts it, "a metonymically used entity is embedded in a (complex) metaphorical expression" (Goossens, 1990:336). In the *Olympics Games* text, I am taking the whole text to be the larger unit, organized by the extended metaphor LONDON IS A FLAT, and the smaller unit the 'metonymy cluster' embedded within it, the tasks which have to be carried out before the games begin: *We have litter to pick, graffiti to scrub, and flowers to plant*. The *Olympics Games* text provides an example of a

'metonymy cluster' within an 'extended metaphor', and therefore a 'Metonymy within Metaphor' type of Text Metaphtonymy.

The metonymy cluster in this example consists of three items – *litter to pick*, *graffiti to scrub*, *flowers to plant* – which express the **target** domain of the extended metaphor, LONDON; but a metonymy cluster could equally well draw from the source domain, as is the case in the spoken text below, part of an IT class, where the extended metaphor *TEXT MANIPULATION IS PAINTING* is organizing the text at the whole-text level.

My 'I-beam' is carrying a paint brush, so when I click on the mouse I know I will reformat the highlighted text. There is no point putting the paint brush in the paint and then putting it back in the pot. <u>You want to paint something, a fence, a door, a wall or something</u> (IT training session at a London University, adapted).

The instructor uses the 'metonymy cluster' *You want to paint something, a fence, a door, a wall or something*. The students are told that words in their documents need to be highlighted for the text-formatter tool to work, but the examples in the cluster, *a fence*, *a door*, *a wall or something*, are from the **source** domain, PAINTING, rather than the target domain of TEXT MANIPULATION. The *Olympic Games* and *IT Instruction* texts thus present a further distinction within Text Metaphtonymy, representing two types of 'Metonymy Cluster within Extended Metaphor', one in which the cluster is set up by the target domain, the other by the source domain. A further discourse pattern, 'Metonymy within Metonymy within Metaphor', which involves a second level of metonymy, is illustrated by one of the 'Welcome to Holland!' texts discussed by Semino et al. (Semino et al., 2013:53). Here, a metonymy cluster, *Coliseum*, *Sistine*

27

*Chapel*, *gondolas*, is employed to represent 'Italy', which in turn stands for the larger category of 'all first-choice travel destinations', which in turn cues the source domain TRAVEL of the extended metaphor *PARENTING IS TRAVEL*.

### 4.2 Metaphor within Metonymy

I now illustrate the second of the two types of integrated metaphtonymy, Metaphor within Metonymy, using two examples, one in which metonymy is present as 'metonymy clusters' and the other as 'metonymy chains'. To illustrate the former, I use an example from a poem by the English poet Philip Larkin, *Toads Revisited* (Larkin, P., 1964, *The Whitsun Weddings*, p18-19). In this poem, metonymic clusters are used to evoke a number of different contexts: 'the park', 'the people you find in the park', 'what those people do during the day' and 'the office'. Looking closer, we find there are local metaphors occurring within the larger frame of a metonymy cluster, a phenomenon noted by Lodge, who maintains that most metonymic texts "contain a good deal of local metaphor" (Lodge, 1977:111). The people in the park include 'clerks' and 'outpatients': *hare-eyed clerks with the jitters* and *wax-fleshed outpatients still vague from accidents*. *Hare* to describe 'eyes' and *wax* to describe 'flesh' are words used metaphorically; thus, we have an example of the 'Metaphor within Metonymy (cluster)' type of Text Metaphtonymy.

A further level of complexity becomes apparent when we look at the poem in its entirety. On and above the metonymy clusters there is a further metaphoric layer, the *WORK IS A TOAD* metaphor which organizes the poem as a whole. This gives a hierarchical structure with three layers, the 'metonymy clusters' in the middle serving both as smaller units within the overall metaphoric framework of the poem and larger

28

units in which local metaphors are embedded. The two types of *integrated metaphtonymy*, Metaphor within Metonymy and Metonymy within Metaphor, are found one within the other. Lodge recognizes this triple-decker, metaphor-metonymy-metaphor structure in other Larkin poems, *The Whitsun Weddings* and *Church Going*, where local metaphors are embedded in metonymic writing and the overall framework of the poem is metaphoric (Lodge, 1977:217-218). This we might designate 'Metaphor within Metonymy within Metaphor'.

To illustrate Metaphor within Metonymy where metaphor occurs within a metonymy chain, I return to the *Andrew* text (Section 3.2). In this text, a 'metonymy chain' is set up through a string of synonyms which runs through the extract, establishing cohesion as well as adding to meaning item by item. As some of the items in the chain are metaphoric, i.e. *to turn a deaf ear*, *the deep freeze*, *pulled back*, *walled her out*, we have an example of local metaphor occurring within a metonymy chain. In Goossens' dictionary data, Metaphor within Metonymy is "extremely rare"[1], accounting for only one example, while Metonymy within Metaphor is "quite current" (Goossens, 1990:336). Goossens suggests the reason for this asymmetry is the tendency for metaphor to 'metaphorize' the expression in which it is found: "A metaphor inserted into a metonym would seem to metaphorize the whole, whereas a metonym integrated into a metaphor does not appear to have the power to metonymize the metaphor" (Goossens, 1990:338). At discourse level, however, a different picture emerges: on the larger scale of the whole text, not only does metaphor commonly occur within

---

[1] Metaphor within Metonymy is mistakenly given as Metaphor *from* Metonymy in the Abstract of Goossens' 1990 article, but appears corrected in the 2003 reprint (Goossens, 2003).

metonymic writing, but there does not seem to be a tendency for the metaphoric elements to metaphorize the whole.

## 5  Conclusion

One of the lessons learned from the 'cognitive turn' is that metonymy and metaphor are not just text phenomena but primarily about how we think; and that, if metonymy and metaphor are fundamentally about thought, they can potentially have an impact on any size of unit of language, from the very small to the very large, from short word-strings to long stretches of language, and can also be expressed multimodally. In this article, I have offered a framework for overviewing the various ways figurative thought manifests itself in speech and writing by looking at Metonymy in Discourse in terms of clusters, chains and extended metonymy and Metaphor in Discourse in terms of clusters, chains and extended metaphor[2]. I then used this framework to demonstrate how metonymic reasoning and metaphoric reasoning combine in Text Metaphtonymy and the many forms it can take. Hierarchal metaphor–metonymy–metaphor organizations in text have also been discussed.

The different types of Text Metaphtonymy discussed above involve only three of the Metaphor and Metonymy in Discourse phenomena described in Sections 2 and 3, namely 'extended metaphor', 'metonymy clusters' and 'metonymy chains'. I suggest that many more metonymy-metaphor combinations are possible, though certain combinations offer greater opportunities for Text Metaphtonymy. We have seen that extended metaphor, metonymy clusters and metonymy chains have the capacity for

---

[2] Elsewhere (AUTHOR 2015) I have given four of these phenomena other names as my purpose there was different, to contrast the use of metonymy and metaphor in changing register with their use in patterning lexis. The terms correspond as follows (present article first, then the 2015 publication): Metonymy Cluster = Discourse Metonymy, Metaphor Cluster = Discourse Metaphor, Metonymy Chain = Textual Metonymy, Extended Metaphor = Textual Metaphor.

30

setting up larger-scale structures within text and interactions at discourse level; but there is no reason in principle why the remaining three phenomena, 'metaphor clusters', 'metaphor chains' and 'extended metonymy', could not also form Text Metaphtonymies, though, as they operate on a smaller scale, the interactions will tend to be more along the lines of Goossens' clause-level examples.

I hope the contribution made by the present study may suggest the direction in which further research in this field might take and ways in which these ideas might be applied. Short, and often self-contained, examples have been given in this article for clarity of explanation but the phenomena discussed are to be found operating in longer texts, across whole books and between texts. Text Metaphtonymy is undoubtedly interesting in its own right as a meaning-making phenomenon, and the motivation for the present article has been to investigate it as such, but a further motivation for studying Text Metaphtonymy is to explore the implications it has for training language professionals. What the experienced practitioner does automatically, the novice needs to learn. Those training to be journalists, speech writers, copywriters, text editors, language teachers, translators and interpreters, among others, would all benefit, I feel, from the explicit teaching of the figurative text-phenomena discussed in this article. Further research may then embrace more extensive studies which are both systematic and domain specific.

**REFERENCES**

AUTHOR (2015)

Al-Sharafi, A. (2004). *Textual metonymy: A semiotic approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Barcelona, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Benczes, R., Barcelona, A., & Ruiz de Mendoza, F. (Eds.). (2011). *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Biernacka, E. (2013). *A discourse dynamics investigation of metonymy in talk.* Unpublished PhD thesis. Milton Keyes: The Open University.

Brdar-Szabó, R., & Brdar, M. (2011). What do metonymic chains reveal about the nature of metonymy? In R. Benczes, A. Barcelona & F. Ruiz de Mendoza (Eds.), *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view* (pp. 217-248). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cameron, L. (1999). Identifying and describing metaphor in spoken discourse data. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 105-132)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.

Cameron, L. (2008). Metaphor and talk.  In R. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 197-211)*.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, L. (2010). The discourse dynamics framework for metaphor. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities* (pp. 77-94). London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(4), 671-690.

Cameron, L., & Low, G. (2004). Figurative variation in episodes of educational talk and text.  *European Journal of English Studies, 78*(3)*,* 355-377.

Cameron, L., Low, G., & Maslen, R. (2010). Finding systematicity in metaphor use. In L. Cameron & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities* (pp. 116-146). London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and humanities*. London: Equinox.

Cameron, L., Maslen, R., Todd, Z., Maule, J., Stratton, P., & Stanley, N. (2009). The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led analysis. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *24*(2), 63-89.

Cameron, L., & Stelma, J. (2004). Metaphor clusters in discourse. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 107-136.

Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (2014). *Figurative language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darian, S. (2000). The role of figurative language in introductory science texts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2)*, 163-186.

Deignan, A. (2005a). A corpus linguistic perspective on the relationship between metonymy and metaphor. *Style 39*(1), 72-91.

Deignan, A. (2005b). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Deignan, A., Littlemore, J., & Semino, E. (2013). *Figurative language, genre and register*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dirven, R. (2002). Metonymy and metaphor: Different mental strategies of conceptualisation. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 75-111). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dirven, R., & Pörings, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Forceville, C. (2008). Metaphor in pictures and multimodal representations. In R. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 462-482)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forceville, C. (2009). Metonymy in visual and audiovisual discourse. In E. Ventola & A. Guijarro (Eds.), *The world told and the world shown: Issues in multisemiotics* (pp. 56-74). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gibbs, R. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, R. (1999). Speaking and thinking with metonymy. In K. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought* (pp. 61-76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goatly, A. (1997). *The language of metaphors*. London: Routledge.

Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics, 1*(3)*,* 323-340.

Goossens, L. (2003). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 349-377). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Handl, S. (2011). Salience and the conventionality of metonymies. In S. Handl & H. Schmid (Eds.), *Windows to the mind: Metaphor, metonymy and conceptual blending*. (pp. 85-114). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hidalgo, L., & Kraljevic, B. (2011). Multimodal metonymy and metaphor as complex discourse resources for creativity in ICT advertising discourse. In F. Gonzálvez-García, S. Peña, & L. Pérez (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy revisited beyond the contemporary theory of metaphor*. Special issue of the *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, *9*(1), 153–178.

Hilpert, M. (2010). Chained metonymies. In J. Newman & S. Rice (Eds.), *Experimental*

*and empirical methods in cognitive functional research* (pp. 181-194). Stanford: CSLI.

Jakobson, R. (1956). Two aspects of language and two types of aphasic disturbances. In R. Jakobson & M. Halle, *Fundamentals of language* (pp. 53-82). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kimmel, M. (2010). Why we mix metaphors (and mix them well): Discourse coherence, conceptual metaphor, and beyond. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 97-115.

Kimmel, M. (2012). Optimizing the analysis of metaphor in discourse. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, *10*(1), 1-48.

Koller, V. (2003). Metaphor clusters, metaphor chains: Analyzing the multifunctionality of metaphor in text. *metaphorik.de, 5,* 115-134.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication.* London: Routledge.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Littlemore, J. (2015). *Metonymy: Hidden shortcuts in language, thought and communication.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lodge, D. (1977). *The modes of modern writing: Metaphor, metonymy and the typology of modern literature.* London: Arnold.

Low, G. (2008). Metaphor and positioning in academic book reviews. In M. Zanotto, L. Cameron & M. Cavalcanti (Eds.), *Confronting metaphor in use: An applied linguistic approach* (pp. 79-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Musolff, A. (2000). Political imagery of Europe: A house without exit doors. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 21*(3). 216-229.

Panther, K., & Radden, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Panther, K., & Thornburg, L. (Eds.). (2003). *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Panther, K., Thornburg, L., & Barcelona, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2016). Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in advertising: A corpus-based Account. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *31*(2), 73-90.

Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *22*(1), 1-39.

Reddy, M. (1993). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp. 164-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F., & Diez Velasco, O. (2002). Patterns of conceptual interaction. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 489-532). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schön, D. (1993). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed.) (pp. 137-163). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Semino, E., Deignan A., & Littlemore, J. (2013). Metaphor, genre, and recontextualization. *Metaphor and Symbol,* 28(1), 41-59.

Seto, K. (1999). Distinguishing metonymy from synecdoche. In K. Panther & G.

Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought* (pp. 91-120). Amsterdam: John

Benjamins.

Steen, G. (2002). Identifying metaphor in language: A cognitive approach. *Style*, *36*(3)

386-407.

Steen, G. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage*. Amsterdam: John

Benjamins.

Steen, G. (2014). Why figurative thought and language are not enough: On the crucial

role of metaphor in communication. Paper given at 1st International Symposium on

Figurative Thought and Language. April 25-26, 2014, Aristotle University of

Thessaloniki.

Steen, G., Dorst, A., Berenike Herrmann, J., Kaal, A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T.

(2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries, S. (2006). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and

metonymy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stirling, L. (1996). Metonymy and anaphora. In W. de Mulder & L. Tasmowski (Eds.),

*Coherence and anaphora* (pp. 69-88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.