

# Logical metonymy constructions in Czech and Dutch

Martina Vokáčová, Eva Lehečková  
Faculty of Arts, Charles University  
martina.vokacova@ff.cuni.cz, eva.leheckova@ff.cuni.cz

Keywords: logical metonymy constructions, qualia structure, corpus-based analysis, Dutch, Czech

The paper surveys distribution and constraints of the use of one type of predicative constructions usually labelled *logical metonymy constructions* (lmc) within Cognitive Linguistics, cf. English example sub (1) below. These constructions represent a source-in-target type of metonymy (Littlemore 2017) because they induce a conventionalized interpretative shift from object- to event-complement in order to fulfil the verb's argument structure by feature unification (Michaelis 2015). Recently, a growing number of cognitively-based studies devoted to lmc emerged (Ziegeler 2007; Sweep 2012): first, they challenge an alternative model of *qualia structure* (Pustejovsky 1995) for being psychologically too costly, and thus inadequate, and second, they show the need for more empirical evidence as well as for the extension of the sample of studied languages. Only few corpus studies have been conducted so far. Most recently, Sweep (2012) investigated German and Dutch equivalents of prototypical English examples of logical metonymy (i.e. *begin*, *finish* and *enjoy*). Our goal is to contribute to the corpus-based investigations of lmc by conducting a contrastive study of Dutch and Czech adopting the method applied in Sweep (2012).

Therefore, we focused on lmc containing all aspectual verbs previously attested in lmc, namely equivalents of English verbs *begin*, *complete*, *continue*, *finish*, *postpone* and *start* in both languages. A balanced random sample of 1200 concordances extracted from a parallel synchronic corpus of the respective languages (InterCorp v10) was manually coded for (i) 10 morphosyntactic and semantic features of NP and VP (e.g. preferred morphological properties of both predicate and its object, the degree of concreteness and action meaning of the object, the range of various events activated by the object etc.), and (ii) 4 syntactic and discourse features of the whole sentence (clause type, complexity measured in number of words, genre and register).

Enriching the pool of evidence with previously understudied Czech data, our results support the preceding findings that the model of qualia structure fails to capture all relevant properties of lmc and all situations where these constructions are used. There is a cross-linguistic similarity between Dutch and Czech mirrored in similar categories of nouns, which occur in lmc, and in similar context in which these nouns are used. As predicted by Littlemore (2015) for the metonymy in general, the more conventionalized the lmc-pattern is (including the predictability of the omitted event), the more likely it will be shared by the two languages. The outliers in the sample reflect cultural and situational specifics that are discussed in order to detect the potential limits of the use of lmc as well as the possibility for its idiosyncratic expansions. Finally, in these border examples, more action names appear as complements of the studied verbs, making the action meaning more explicit and thus weakening the metonymic interpretation of the construction.

## Examples

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (1) <i>Butch finished his lunch.</i>  |   |
| (2) <i>Wanneer ben je begonnen met stenen?</i><br>when are-AUX.2SG you begin-PTCP with stones | 'When did you start with stones?'       |
| (3) <i>Ted' začnu s jedním záhonkem.</i><br>now begin-PRS.1SG with one-INS garden_bed-INS     | 'I will start with one garden bed now.' |

## References

- Český národní korpus - SYN2015. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha 2015.
- LITTLEMORE, Jeanette, 2015. *Metonymy*. Cambridge University Press.
- LITTLEMORE, Jeanette, 2017. "Metonymy." In B. Dancygier (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 407–422.
- MICHAELIS, Laura A., 2015. "Constructions License Verb Frames." In J. Rudanko, J. Havu, M. Höglund and P. Rickman (eds.), *Perspectives on Complementation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 7–33.
- PUSTEJOVSKY, James, 1995. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- SWEEP, Josefien, 2012. *Metonymical object changes: a corpus-oriented study on Dutch and German*. Utrecht: LOT.
- ZIEGELER, Debra, 2007. "Arguing the case against coercion." In G. Radden, K.M. Köpcke, T. Berg and P. Siemund (eds.), *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 99–123.