Mario Brdar
Faculty of Philosophy, Osijek
mbrdar@ffos.hr

Topic–continuity, metonymy and locative adverbials: A cognitive–functional account[1,2]

The goal of the present paper is to show how functional and cognitive linguistic approaches can complement each other in providing external motivation for linguistic facts. Specifically, I claim that cognitive linguistics, if it does not want to doom itself to the status of a partial model, should in this search for motivation take clue from functional linguistics and go beyond its traditional pet topics, human embodiment and socio–cultural environment, and also consider the role of the existing linguistic system. I examine the interplay of metonymic processes and topicalization as a case in point. Much recent research indicates that referential metonymies are relatively unconstrained. However, a corpus–based study on the exploitation of metonymically–used names of capitals in the language of media shows that this type of metonymy is ubiquitous in English and German, but not in Hungarian and Croatian. A detailed analysis reveals that the contrasts can in part be attributed to the fact that English and German metonymically–used locative NPs that function as subjects often find their counterparts in Croatian and Hungarian in locative adverbials (realized as prepositional phrases and noun phrases with locative adpositions, respectively). It is claimed that these locatives, which are also shown to be full–blown referential metonymies, are optimal structural solutions in such pro–drop languages with a rich system of impersonal constructions as far as the complex task of maintaining nominal metonymic topic–continuity while switching between multiple metonymic targets.

---

1. Introduction

The issue of what constitutes explanation in linguistics is largely a matter of ideological position and is determined by one's language philosophy and the actual grammatical model adopted. In a generatively–oriented model, the search for explanation takes the form of establishing the set of possible constructions (sentences, utterances, etc.), and thus indirectly the set of impossible ones, as well. It could also be the other way round – the model may set itself as its goal the specification of the set of constraints which filter out the unacceptable constructions. The explanatory force in such a model resides in the component(s) containing constraints and is internal.

On the other hand, cognitively and functionally oriented linguistic camps, as "two brothers in arms" (Nuyts 2005), seem to have reached a broad consensus on the issue of explanation in the sense that it should be external. They are not so much intent on explanations that have predictive power but rather on answering post hoc the question of 'why'. In other words, they attempt to find some motivation for the facts observed.

There are two specific points concerning motivation that functionalist linguists and cognitive linguists agree upon (cf. Lakoff 1987, Langacker 1987 and 1991, Haiman 1980, 1983). Firstly, motivation is a phenomenon exhibited by a range of linguistic structures that are neither wholly arbitrary nor fully predictable. Motivation is also seen as a matter of degree. Cf. Langacker (1987: 48) and Lakoff (1987: 346 and 493), who speak of levels of predictability and relative motivation leading to restricted predictions, respectively. Secondly, linguistic structures seem to be chiefly motivated by interplay of external factors such as cognitive structures and communicative needs. What the "two brothers in arms" share at the most general level is the concern with the use of language. Both functional and cognitive linguistics are concerned with the environment of the use of language, where the environment is understood as covering both the biological and the social environment. As Lakoff (1987: 539) puts it:

> "People seem to learn and remember highly motivated expressions better than unmotivated expressions. We thus hypothesize that the degree of motivation of a grammatical system is a measure of the cognitive efficiency of that system relative to the concepts the system expresses."

Simplifying things somewhat, one could perhaps say that an important point of difference between cognitive linguistics and functional linguistics is one of perspective and focus. For functionalists the stress is on the social–communicative side of language, while for cognitivists, the stress is on its individual and biological aspects. Langacker (1999: 13) points out that "the movement called cognitive linguistics belongs to the functionalist tradition," and goes on to point out that the "various strands of cognitive and functional linguistics are complementary, synergistically related facets of a common global enterprise" (1999: 13f). The differences between the two approaches have to do with the application of this shared orientation in concrete analyses, one perspective

winning over to the exclusion of the other, making the whole enterprise biased and, possibly, descriptively and explanatory less than adequate.

However, cognitive linguists have always been aware, at least at a declarative level, that the whole story cannot be this simple, for at least two reasons. For one thing, it is not just a matter of choice of the perspective inherent in the model. Cognitive structures and communicative factors need not in fact always work in unison. They are on occasion even likely to work in quite opposite directions. The expressive power of a language, defined informally as "the collection of concepts in that conceptual system that the language can distinctively express" (Lakoff 1987: 539) may be constrained to a degree by some requirements of communication. In this paper I will examine the interplay of metonymic processes and topicalization as a case in point.

Another important point of difference between the "two brothers in arms" has to do with how far one should go in the quest for external motivation. For cognitive linguists, language is primarily motivated by the facts of human existence, i. e. we humans are living beings with bodies that impose certain limitations on what we can do, and we are also beings that exist in a certain sociocultural environment. This emphasis on embodiment and sociocultural environment explains why linguistic facts have as a rule been related to some language–external motivating factors rather than to some other facts in the linguistic system as such. My intention in this paper is to show that cognitive linguistics should take clue from functional linguistics in this respect and consider the role of the existing linguistic system if it does not want to doom itself to the status of a partial model.

Even a brief examination of what is called functional reveals that it is not a homogenous way of thinking about language. Terms such as functional and functionalism are, as demonstrated by Nichols (1984: 98ff), highly polysemous. She distinguishes five different senses, not mutually exclusive. As I am interested here in the affinity between functionalism and cognitive linguistics, we should briefly highlight some of these five senses that seem to be relevant for my purposes, noting that they may be lumped together in actual research, or simply not be distinguished as separate senses at all.

In the first sense that is relevant in the present context function amounts to interdependence, interrelation, or co–variation of certain elements within a larger whole, which may be the whole system, or some subsystem within it. This sense is clearly similar to the mathematical sense of the term. In plain English, if something happens to an element, or changes in it, something also happens with some other element or elements, or changes in some other element of elements. These elements are then seen as forming a functional set that is more or less like a black–box. The point of functional research is to find out which elements are subject to co–variance or interdependence, and which ones function as variables that trigger changes, i. e. effect covariance or interdependence.

On the other hand, functions may arise from the context, e. g. indexing the speech roles, status, etc. of the participants in the speech event, or indexing the discourse organization, e. g. marking backgrounding and foregrounding,

ensuring coherence and cohesion of the text, etc. Functionalists claim that the entire communicative situation, i. e. the purpose of the speech event, its participants and discourse context, "motivates, constrains, explains, or otherwise determines grammatical structure" (Nichols 1987: 97). This is the second sense of the term that is important for us.

If we accept: i. that the essence of functionalism is that language evolved in order to meet communicative needs, and ii. that what is communicated is not only the propositional contents and denotation ("who does what to whom/ /what"), but also, more or less indirectly, the nature and purpose of the speech event as a cultural and cognitive phenomenon, we could then say that, in the most general sense, structure is dependent on function. Putting this in most general words, functionalists seek to provide external motivation/explanation for linguistic facts.

Considering what we have just said about external motivation/explanation of linguistic facts, one may well be puzzled how this squares with those uses of the term function where the intended sense is interdependence, co–variation, etc. among elements within the system, or the relation of a structural element to, or within, a higher–order structural unit. It does, I claim, provided we keep two things in mind.

First of all, linguistic elements are dependent on elements of another order or domain, the ultimate domain being the whole of communicative situation. In a way, functionalists pursue the same type of enterprise regardless of the domain they focus on, and they may, if they choose to do so, proceed all the way up to the ultimate communicative domain, and thus end up with external evidence.

Secondly, we must remember to draw the distinction between external and internal explanation more precisely and distinguish between the object language on the one hand, and the metalanguage, on the other. The distinction between internal and external may apply, quite generally, to metalanguage itself. Explanations are internal if they are based on the more or less pre–wired stipulations explicitly or implicitly contained in the metalanguage. On the other hand, if they are based on the object language or some extra–linguistic information (other than metalanguage), they are external. In this sense, a functional (and cognitive) explanation is external even if we talk about the function of a unit in a larger frame.

Human language (as object language) is not just a cognitive but also a social and cultural artefact that does not exist in a vacuum. It is, too, part of human environment. Though we could assume that it is primarily shaped by cognitive factors that reflect our physical existence, there is no denying that the usage of language can exert certain influence on its own structure by providing input for certain cognitive processes that then, so to say, come full circle in reshaping language. In other words, it is in part shaped and constrained by the givens of the system at a given point in time, e. g. by analogical tendencies.

In the rest of this paper I show that whether a language utilizes metonymic expressions of a given type in order to achieve specific communicative goals may be in a significant measure determined by how other areas of the lan-

16

guage in question are structured, i. e. with the shape of its current grammar (Mithun 1991: 160). This is also in line with Lakoff's (1987: 537f) characterization of motivation in terms of, among other things, global ecological location within a grammatical system. In this paper I will specifically point out the role of some discourse–pragmatic factors in constraining the application of metonymic processes.

2. Metonymy and topic continuity: switching between two or more metonymic targets but maintaining the same metonymic topic source

One of the most important discourse–pragmatic functions of metonymy is to enhance cohesion and coherence of the utterance. It is something that is at the very heart of metonymy as a conceptual operation whereby one content stands for another while both are activated. In other words, metonymy is an efficient means of saying two things for the price of one, i. e. two concepts are activated while only one is explicitly mentioned (cf. Radden & Kövecses 1999: 19). This necessarily enhances the cohesion of the utterance because two or more topical concepts may be referred to by means of a single label.

This phenomenon of simultaneously activating more than one topical concept, viz. a metonymic source, and one or more metonymic targets, is ubiquitous. It can also be illustrated on the metonymic use of geographical proper names. In addition to their primary, literal use to refer to locations, e. g. in utterances specifying where a state of affairs obtains, geographical names can be used metonymically in a number of ways. For example, names of capitals are frequently used to refer to various political institutions, most notably to the institution invested with the executive political power, viz. the government of the country in question, as the capital is its official seat:

(1)a. At a recent Politburo–level meeting, according to versions reaching *Washington*, President Jiang Zemin counseled a low–key, cautious approach toward the new administration.
   b. If *Beijing* doesn't get anything substantial from Bush at the summit in Shanghai, such as a reaffirmation of U. S. support for the one–China policy; it might harden its policy toward *Washington* and Taiwan.

In addition to these, names of capitals can be found in metonymic uses that are also characteristic of other place names, i. e. to refer to branches of companies and museums, tribunals, stock exchanges, events, etc.

(2)a. *Arusha* depends mostly on witnesses for evidence, many of them illiterate farmers who could not record their impressions at the time. *The Hague* enjoys intelligence intercepts from western armies, satellite photographs and other high–tech methods of collecting more durable evidence.

b. The world's stock exchanges seem to have been engaged in an elaborate mating dance for the past eight years, ever since *London*'s first ill–fated attempt to merge with *Frankfurt*.

c. As Dudayev is well aware, the transformation of Grozny into another *Sarajevo* would provoke a wave of sympathy for the Chechen cause.

d. First, there's an almost morbid interest in my "depression" after *Paris*. People must have thought I was taking the laces out of my shoes. Then there's the goings–on in Wales and how it will affect their performance in Dublin.

As pointed out above, these place names can be used to switch between more than one metonymic target. The following excerpt – part of a newspaper article – contains two occurrences of *Beijing*. The first appears to be an unambiguous instance of the CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT type of metonymy. Notice that there is later in the text explicit mention of the metonymic target – the Chinese government, which is in the same sentence juxtaposed to the US government. The second occurrence of *Beijing* is, however, somewhat less clear. It is just possible to interpret it again in the same way, but it is far more likely that it is used to refer indirectly to the upcoming Olympics, to be held in Beijing in 2008, which is thus an instance of the PLACE–FOR–EVENT metonymy:

(3)   After months of detention amid widespread condemnation from Capitol Hill and US academics, Li's swift court proceedings and promised release just hours after the Olympics vote leave an appearance of tit–for–tat justice, raising questions about whether Li and other detainees with US ties are being used as bargaining chips by *Beijing*, observers said. Li was "a hostage in the Olympics bid," said Frank Lu, director of the Hong Kong–based Information Center for Human Rights and Democratic Movement in China, which tracks arrests and harassment of dissidents and activists. "We know that just two weeks ago the Chinese government told the US government that if the US voted against *Beijing*, they wouldn't release him." (Boston Globe, July 15, 2001, A1)

A preliminary study on the availability of metonymically used names of capitals (Brdar–Szabó and Brdar 2003) showed that this particular type of metonymy is ubiquitous in English and German, while less so in Hungarian and Croatian. Extending this study by adding new texts to the corpus yielded similar results, as shown below. Below I present the data in both the absolute form (in terms of types and tokens), as well as in a normalized form (giving the frequency of tokens normalized to the standard basis per 1,000 words). This procedure makes it possible to offset any relative differences in the number of articles and their relative length across papers and languages. The difference between English and German is not so conspicuous, but is nevertheless not unimportant. On the other hand, both Croatian and Hungarian, while close to each other in terms of the frequency of metonymies in question and the number of tokens, are well below what could be considered the average value.

18

Language	Papers	Subcorpus size (number of words)	CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT–metonymy		
			Tokens		Types
			In absolute numbers	Number of tokens per 1,000 words	
English	Financial Times Guardian	57,606	163	2.82	26
German	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung Süddeutsche Zeitung	62,560	166	2.65	24
Croatian	Vjesnik Večernji list	38,380	71	1.85	16
Hungarian	Népszabadság Magyar Nemzet	47,278	84	1.77	18
	Total	205,824	484	2.35	

Table 1. The use of CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT metonymy in international news in English, German, Croatian and Hungarian dailies (in seven issues on random days between September 2001 and November 2006)

The above numerical data do not cast doubts on the universality of this metonymy in the sense of its existence in a wide range of languages, but it is intriguing that this metonymy should be conspicuously underused in some languages under certain circumstances. Assuming that metonymy is at least as universal and ubiquitous as metaphor, we should expect hardly any cross–linguistic differences, and where they nevertheless turn up they should be due to differences in cultural models. If we restricted ourselves in the search for an explanation of the above distribution to just the facts of embodiment and sociocultural environment in the strictest sense of the word, we would meet with some success but would nevertheless not be able to account for all the differences there obtain (cf. Brdar 2006). There are apparently many factors at play here, but in the present paper I concentrate only on some cases of interaction between conceptual and structural, i. e. grammatical factors in the sense of typological givens of a language.

Part of the difference between the two pairs of languages can be attributed to the fact that English and German metonymically used place names that function as subjects often find their counterparts in adpositional phrases in Hungarian, as in (4), and in prepositional phrases Croatian, as shown in (5). These are used as adverbials of place:

19

(4) | Brüsszelben, | Washingtonban | úgy | vélték, | a |
| Brussels–in | Washington–in | so | thought–3PL | DEF |

| Magyarok | (csehek) | a | nemzeti | büszkeség, | a |
| Hungarians | Czechs | DEF | national | pride | DEF |

| szuverenitás | jelképeként, | presztízsből, |
| sovereignty | symbol–GEN–as | prestige–of |

| és | nem | tényleges | védelmi | szükségleteik |
| and | not | genuine | defence | needs–GEN–3PL |

| kielégítésére | vásárolták | a | gépeket. |
| satisfaction–of | purchased | DEF | machines |

'It is thought in Brussels and Washington that Hungarian (Czechs) purchased the machines not because of any genuine defence needs but because as a symbol of sovereignty and prestige'

(5) | Odluka | je nezakonita, | smatraju | u | Sarajevu,... |
| decision | is illegal | consider–3PL | in | Sarajevo–LOC |

'It is considered in Sarajevo that the decision is illegal'

Metonymically used names of capitals are of course more natural as subjects in English and German, and comparable constructions, while not impossible, are relatively infrequent in English (6), and German (7), if the capital is intended as a metonym:

(6) South Korea's President Roh Moo–hyun's first meeting with George W. Bush, his US counterpart, in Washington on Wednesday was hailed *in Seoul* yesterday as a happy ending to a period of turmoil in relations between the military allies. [Financial Times, May 16, 2003]

(7) | Nach | mehr als | zwanzig | Jahren | Krieg | sei | es | äußerst |
| after | more than | twenty | years | war | is–SUBJ | it | extremely |

| schwierig, | einen | Neuanfang | zu finden, | heißt | es | *in* |
| difficult | a | new start | to find | said–is–3SG | it | in |

Islamabad.
Islamabad
[Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, December 7, 2001]

'It said in Islamabad that after more than twenty years of war it is extremely difficult to make a new start'

The question that we should turn our attention to now seems to be: why do some languages such as Croatian or Hungarian exhibit a systematic pattern of replacement of metonymic NPs by locative PPs? In the remaining part of the present paper I will argue that the observation about the replacement pattern of subjects is nevertheless non–trivial because it is one of several strategies available to solve the problem of the preservation or maintenance of the topic–continuity in the flowing discourse in the case of metonymic subjects.

While topics may persist for longer or shorter stretches, they eventually need to be maintained before they decay. This usually happens by means of a co–referring pronoun (anaphor), i. e. by repeating the expression in question, or by using a related expression (e. g. a synonym). So–called pro–drop languages can in general tolerate quite long stretches without any explicit maintenance work apart from agreement features (number, person, gender), unlike English or German, which obligatorily require at least pronominals to fill the subject slot.

The replacement pattern of subjects that we observe above is one of the five strategies available to solve the problem of the preservation or maintenance of the topic–continuity in the flowing discourse in the case of metonymic subjects. This is in fact, in my opinion, the most natural option in languages such as Croatian and Hungarian because they:

(i)   have prominent systems of impersonal constructions, and
(ii) belong to the pro–drop type of languages with rich agreement systems.

The second option would be to avoid metonymy altogether, while the third, the least natural in the case of Croatian and Hungarian, would be to produce a whole string of repeatedly used metonymies. A fourth strategy would be to alternate between the metonymy types, i. e. between the CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT type and the COUNTRY–FOR–GOVERNMENT type, more or less tantamount to "elegant variation" through synonymy. This strategy is found in many languages. Cf. the following English example:

(8)   Diplomats here said they had hoped that the strange tale of the Portuguese ambassador, Antonio Tanger de Correa, would create a model. *Portugal* is the current president of the European Union, a six–month term that ends with June, and *Lisbon* asked Belgrade to approve the appointment before the war and Mr. Milosevic's indictment.

This is also attested in language such as Croatian and Hungarian. What is more, as shown in Brdar–Szabó (2002) and Tomka (2003), COUNTRY–FOR–GOVERNMENT metonymies are more productive than the CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT type in Hungarian and Croatian. As will be shown below, such "elegant variation" is nevertheless of limited help.

Finally, another unnatural solution would be the use of anaphoric pronouns agreeing in gender and number either with the metonymic target or with the metonymic source. This is unnatural, or at least very marked, because it almost invariably leads to the breakdown in the continuity of the topic, as such pronouns in subject position are then very frequently interpreted as introducing new topical referents/concepts.

It appears now that the availability of metonymic NPs depends on how easily a language can maintain such double–barrelled metonymic topics. It appears that English, with its quite flexible system of co–referring pronouns (cf. the use of plural or singular pronouns in coreference with collective terms), but relatively rudimentary agreement system can achieve a relative longevity

of such double–barrelled and ambiguous topics without incurring at the same time unbearable processing costs.

An attempt to use anaphoric pronouns in pro–drop languages like Croatian or Hungarian in order to maintain such metonymic topics – the most marked or unnatural solution of the four we mention above – would yield odd results. For example, regardless of whether we choose a pronoun according to the gender of the capital, i. e. neuter *ono* 'it' for *Sarajevo*, or masculine *on* 'he' for *Berlin*, or *London*, or *Washington*, etc. or whether we choose the feminine pronoun *ona* 'she' compatible with the target, i. e. the feminine noun *vlada*, 'government', there seems to obtain a break in the topic continuity, because the switch from a double–barrelled topic seems to be too abrupt. Even with more straightforward referents, it is usually assumed that a pronoun in subject position is quite likely to introduce a new topic, or effect a backshift to one of the topics mentioned before the last one. With metonymic double–barrelled nouns, such a shift becomes intolerable. The same happens sooner or later in the case of elegant variation between capital and country names, as the nouns can be of different gender, too.

Hungarian, of course, has a rudimentary gender system, but nevertheless such a switch to an overt 3rd person personal pronoun would be unusual, if not felt to be impossible, and is not once attested in our corpus. The third person singular personal pronoun seems to be used exclusively for animate antecedents, while the 3rd person demonstrative pronoun is mostly used for inanimate objects (*azt*, 'this–ACC'). This virtually leaves us with zero pronoun option for inanimate subjects.

On the other hand, we note that pro–drop languages like Croatian or Hungarian, even if they can do without any anaphoric pronouns, must very soon narrow down the reference of the topic in order to be able to select appropriate number agreement features. English and German are more likely to gradually determine the ultimate reference of the topic on–line in a step–by–step fashion, i. e. pick it up from the larger context or from one of the consecutively activated knowledge domains or ICMs, while Croatian and Hungarian seem to automatically assign the default metonymic interpretation to capital names in this type of discourse. This is why the range of possible referents of metonymic expressions based on place names is broader in English and German than in Croatian or Hungarian, as reported in (Brdar–Szabó 2002).

This means that even if Croatian and Hungarian can initially get around the problem of the selection of anaphoric pronouns by simply avoiding these pronouns, the problem of the selection of the appropriate agreement features cannot be that easily solved. Of course, a possible strategy is to avoid metonymy altogether, which accounts for a relatively frequent situation: newspaper articles in the Croatian and Hungarian that exhibit no metonymically used names of capitals whatsoever.

Another unnatural solution to the pressure of maintaining topic continuity, attested both in Croatian and Hungarian texts in our corpus, is to stick to a whole series of metonymic uses of the same capital name within a single text. This is admittedly a very awkward solution in stylistic terms, but it is never-

theless used. This point is exemplified in the relevant sections of a Hungarian article reproduced below:

(9) Vita *Phenjan* atombombája körül
controversy Pyongyang nuclear bomb–POSS around
[...]
Tegnap aztán ugyanaz a rádió – önmagára
yesterday however the–same DEF radio itself–on

hivatkozva – jól érthetően azt mondta, hogy
citing well comprehensible–ADV that said that

Phenjannak joga van birtokolni atomfegyvert,
Pyongyang–DAT right is possess–INF nuclear weapons–ACC

majd ugyanez a kijelentés megjelent a
and the–same DEF statement appeared DEF

phenjani lapokban is. Az Egyesült Államok a
Pyongyang–ADJ papers–in too DEF United States DEF

múlt héten függesztette fel az Észak–Koreába
last week–in suspended PREF DEF North Korea–to

irányuló olajszállítást, amely az 1994–es
directed oil–supplies–ACC which DEF 1994–ADJ

úgynevezett keretegyezmény értelmében az
so.called general–agreement in–accordance–with DEF

egyik kompenzációs tényezője annak, hogy
one–among compensatory measures for–DAT that

Phenjan leállította régi típusú atomerőműveit.
Pyongyang closed old type nuclear–plants–POSS–ACC
[...]
Sok megfigyelő korábban úgy vélte, hogy *Phenjan*
many observer earlier so thought that Pyongyang

az egész hírrel, miszerint van
DEF whole news–with according–to–which is

atomfegyverprogramja, csak az Egyesült
nuclear.weapons–programme–POSS just DEF United

Államokat akarja tárgyaló–asztalhoz ültetni.
States–ACC wants conference–table–at seat–CAUS–INF

'Controvery over *Pyongyang's* atom bomb
Yesterday, however, the very same radio station, quoting itself, said very clearly that *Pyongyang* has the right to possess nuclear weapons, after which the same statement appeared in Pyongyang papers. The Uni-

ted States suspended last week the oil supplies to North Korea which was introduced as one of the compensatory measures inducing *Pyongyang* to shut down its old–type nuclear plants. [...] Many observers were earlier of the opinion that the only goal that *Pyongyang* wanted to achieve by announcing that it has a nuclear weapons programme was to bring the United States to the conference table'

The most natural strategy for languages such as Croatian and Hungarian, is to remove the pressure of maintaining the metonymic topic continuity by shifting it from the subject position, and partly detopicalizing it at the same time, and have the name of the capital mentioned in a PP functioning as an adverbial, as illustrated above. This is precisely what we have observed above. This discourse–functional strategy is made possible, moreover it is made the most natural one, by the typological givens of these languages. Their grammatical structure is pervasively characterized by the fact that they are pro–drop languages and that their productive subsystems of impersonal constructions play an extremely important role. Let us illustrate the latter phenomenon by the following sets of Croatian and Hungarian examples, (10) and (11), respectively.

Both languages have numerous impersonal constructions. In addition to constructions with verbal and adjectival or nominal meteorological predicates (illustrated in 10a. and 11.a. below), there are also constructions with experiencers in the dative or accusative (in Croatian, as in (10) b.), and in the dative (in Hungarian, as shown in (11.b.)). Finite verb forms are in both languages in the 3rd personal singular:

(10)a. Meni je   zima.
   me–DAT COP–3SG cold
   'I am cold'
  b. Boli   me/   Strah me je
   hurt–3SG me–ACC fear me–ACC is–3SG
   'I feel pain/I am afraid'

(11)a. (Nekem) tetszik   ez a   ház.
   me–DAT like–3SG this DEF house–NOM
   'I like this house'
  b. Melegem   van/ Nekem melegem   van
   hot–POSS–1SG is–3SG me–DAT hot–POSS–1SG is–3SG
   'I am hot'

It is significant that the same pattern of replacement of metonymically used names of capitals is found in some other pro–drop languages that have elaborate agreement systems as well as productive impersonal constructions. Cf. the following examples from Slovenian (12), Russian (13), Spanish (14) and Italian (15):

(12) *V Washingtonu* so o   tem podvomili,   prebegli
   in Washington AUX about that doubted–3PL dissident

general severnokorejske   vojske   pa je   v izjavah
general North–Korean   army–GEN   but AUX   in statements

za   japonske   medije   potrdil,...
for   Japanese   media   confirmed...

'In Washington, they doubted this, the dissident North Korean general
has nevertheless in his statements for Japanese media confirmed...'

(13) *V Tbilisi* že   kategoričeski   oprovergajut   zajavlenija
     in Tbilisi however   categorical–ADV   refute–3PL   announcements

     o   tom,   što   kakie–to   diversionnye
     about   DEM–PREP–CASE   that   some–NOM–PL   sabotage

     gruppy   zasylajutsja   v Abxaziju.
     group–NOM–PL   being–sent   in Abhazia–ACC
     [Izvestija, May 7, 2003]

     'Tbilisi categorically denies any reports that some sabotage detach-
     ments are being sent to Abkhazia'

(14) *En Washington*   se   consideraba seguro   que importantes
     in Washington   REFL   considered   certain   that important

     dirigentes iraquíes habían   huido hacia   el país
     leaders   Iraqi   had fled towards DEF   country

     vecino,...
     neighbouring

     'It is taken for certain in Washington that important Iraqi leaders had
     fled to a neighbouring country'

(15) Il   rischio   di un   attentato   contro   il
     DEF   risk   of INDEF assassination   against   DEF

     premier   è considerato "alto"   *a Washington.*
     prime–minister   is considered   high   in Washington

     'The risk of an attempt on the prime minister's life is considered in
     Washington to be high'

Concerning the status of the adverbial replacements observed above, it has
been argued in Brdar–Szabó and Brdar (2003) that such prepositional phrases,
so far overlooked in mostly English–biased research on metonymy (largely be-
cause this type of construction is as good as nonexistent in English in this
function, as shown by our corpus), are also full–blown referential metonymies.
The locative PPs and adnominal NPs in question appear to be straightforward
adjunct/adverbial structures with literal local meaning only before they are

subjected to closer scrutiny.[3] That they do not have the straightforward literal meaning is shown by the oddity of sentences in which they are combined with other PPs that have a genuine literal locative meaning (and even with some PPs with temporal meaning):

(16) *U Sarajevu na trgovima/   u   sjevernom   dijelu grada*
     in Sarajevo in squares   in northern   part   city–GEN

     smatraju   ovu izjavu   nezgodnom.
     consider–3PL this statement awkward
     'In Sarajevo in squares and in the northern part of the city this state-
     ment is considered awkward'

Rather than being literal locatives, it is claim that these locatives are two–tiered metonymies. In the first round of metonymic mapping there is a basic projection from a mental space that is opened by the particular discourse type and topic, i. e. a mental space is set up on the basis of our realization that the utterance in question is in terms of its text type a newspaper article dealing with politics, specifically with international relations, or with sports, etc. This mental space also contains elements of encyclopaedic knowledge that get projected into it. These projections trigger the first layer of metonymic meaning. *Sarajevo*, *Washington*, and other such names of capitals in our examples, are not used to refer to the locality as a whole – not just everywhere or anywhere in Sarajevo is meant here, etc. What is intended is not the whole domain but just a part or parts of it, specifically it is just the sphere of political life, more precisely its foreign affairs aspects. In sum, these expressions should be treated as a sort of active zone phenomena. This means that even place names in utterances such as:

(17) The Prime Minister is travelling tomorrow to *Berlin*.

must be recognized as metonymic, although they do not traditionally receive such treatment. The politician in question is not travelling privately, i. e. for pleasure. He is rather acting in his official capacity, representing the country, usually with his entourage, and his visit to Berlin consists of a whole stereo-typed sequence of subevents. If the context is different, i. e. in a different type of papers, or type of articles, the same place name can be used to refer to other aspects of political life, or to the press or media in general that are connected with this locality, its sporting scene, general public, etc.

---

3   An anonymous referee suggested that metonymic PPs are a prominent strategy in pro–drop languages not only because pro–drop languages have the feature 'animate/human' high on the scale of features determining the choice of subjects with activity verbs that require human subjects (which is apparently not the case with English), but also because pro–drop languages, not requiring explicit subjects, may treat metonymic PPs as modifiers of omitted possible subjects. While this does not seem to extend to other metonymic PPs (see *poslije Pariza* 'after Paris' below), this may be an additional structural factor providing free ride for metonymies in pro–drop languages, so I am very grateful to the referee for drawing my attention to this possibility.

26

This first round of PART–FOR–WHOLE metonymic mapping takes place in both the straightforward examples of metonymies and the locative expressions alike. The differences between them appear in the second layer of metonymic meaning. The context and the contents of the article then determine in the second step the entity that the capital name refers to, i. e. whether we actually mean the whole government, just a ministry, or some other institution, legal, economic, or otherwise. This is the stage at which we arrive in our examples at the specific low–level CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT metonymy.

In the case of bare capital name NPs we may assume that a metaphorical mapping can kick in immediately after the second round of metonymic mapping and that it so to say fixes the specific low–level metonymy. If a capital name stands for an institution which is a collective body, such as government, it is automatically personalized. This ORGANIZATIONS–ARE–HUMANS metaphor confers on the capital name a certain amount of agency properties, such as control and responsibility.

There are good reasons to assume that the specific personalizing metaphorical mapping is actually delayed until the second round of metonymic mappings. Firstly, a capital name used in a weakly metonymic sense in a relatively poor context lends itself to a whole range of interpretations, like any other place name. It could refer to a salient event taking place in the location specified, e. g. *Paris* or a prepositional phrase with this name, such as *after Paris* or *in Paris* used in 2003 or around that time in the sports context, could be used to refer to the World Athletics Championships 2003. In a different context, *Paris* might be used to refer to the domain of fashion. A sentence such as *Paris was really appalling* will hardly in that context be understood as referring to designers only. It will also include the reference to the fashions shows, clothes, etc. But it may also be used to refer to just clothes. This seems to indicate that metaphorical personalization does not take place at this stage. Secondly, the ORGANIZATIONS–ARE–HUMANS metaphor can hardly apply to just any assembly of entities, even if they involve people. What seems to be necessary in our opinion for the metaphor to apply is that the entity in question should really emerge as a clearly–defined one, i. e. as a genuine organization, with internal structure, and with more or less clear boundaries. This of course does not preclude the possibility that other, less specific types of metaphors, some of which may include elements of personalization, may apply before the second round of metonymic mapping in certain contexts, i. e. in some types of situations allowing a vague reference to people such as, *the whole town*, etc.

3. Concluding remarks

On the basis of the observations above we are in the position to draw a number of conclusions, some of which are more directly related to the metonymy type under examination, while some have far–reaching theoretical and methodological consequences.

First of all, it appears that constraints on the cross–linguistic availability of certain types of referential metonymies seem to be the result of an intricate interplay of conceptual, structural and discourse–pragmatic factors. The inventory of formal/structural realizations of metonymy is broadened beyond the traditional confines of nominals and some predicative expressions, functioning as subject or objects, and predicates, respectively. The fact that the two types of metonymy, CAPITAL–FOR–GOVERNMENT metonymies realized as NPs and their locative adverbial counterparts, appear to be partly in complementary distribution across language types in certain grammatical environments shows that cognitive and structural aspects of language may interact in many interesting ways. Specifically, the Croatian and Hungarian data have shown that the availability of metonymy may also be dependent on some structural factors (in the sense of what is already present in the ecology of a language). It has been demonstrated that the function of nominal metonymies is not purely referential. They have other important functions in discourse such as managing general topic continuity. While keeping the same metonymic source as nominal topic, one still has some room for maneuvering conceptually between more or less distant and more or less established metonymic targets.

Demonstrating this sort of interaction between conceptual structures/processes and linguistic systems does not in our view undermine in any way the foundations of cognitive linguistics. On the contrary, if cognitive linguistics does not want to doom itself to the status of a partial model, it should in search for external motivation take clue from functional linguistics as a welcome corrective and also consider the role of the existing linguistic system. Bearing in mind that linguistic structures in question that are said to motivate the availability of metonymy, may themselves be results of layers of complex interaction between cognitive and structural factors (the ultimate primacy of cognitive factors not ruled out), cognitive linguistics thus becomes a more realistic framework capable of accommodating more authentic data, even if the net result is a more complicated description.

References

Brdar, Mario (2006). "Metonymic friends and foes, metaphor and cultural models." Benczes, Réka, Szilvia Csábi, eds. (2006). *The Metaphors of Sixty. Papers Presented on the Occasion of the 60th Birthday of Zoltán Kövecses*. Budapest: Department of American Studies, School of English and American Studies, Loránd Eötvös University, 75–83.

Brdar–Szabó, Rita (2002). "Referentielle Metonymie im Sprachvergleich." Barota, Mária, Petra Szatmári, József Tóth, Anikó Zsigmond, Hrsgg. (2002). *Sprache(n) und Literatur(en) im Kontakt*. Konferenz – 25. –26. Oktober 2001. (Acta Germanistica Savariensia 7). Szombathely: Pädagogische Hochschule "Berzsenyi Dániel", 53–65.

Brdar–Szabó, Rita, Mario Brdar (2003). "Referential metonymy across languages: What can cognitive linguistics and contrastive linguistics learn from each other?" *IJES. International Journal of English Studies* 3.2: 85–105.

Haiman, John (1980). "The iconicity of grammar: Isomorphism and motivation." *Language* 56.3: 515–540.

Haiman, John (1983). "Iconic and economic motivation." *Language* 59.4: 781–819.

Lakoff, George (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume 1. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume 2. Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1999). Assessing the cognitive linguistic enterprise. *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope, and Methodology*, ed. by Theo Janssen & Gisela Redeker. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 13–59.

Mithun, Marianne (1991). "The role of motivation in the emergence of grammatical categories: the grammaticization of subjects." Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, Bernd Heine, eds. (1991). *Approaches to Grammaticalization. Volume 2: Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers*. (Typological Studies in Language 19.2). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 161–184.

Nichols, Johanna (1984). Functional theories of grammar. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13: 97–117.

Nuyts, Jan (2005). "Brothers in arms? On the relations between Cognitive and Functional Linguistics." Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, M. Sandra Peña Cervel, eds. (2005). *Cognitive Linguistics. Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction*. (Cognitive Linguistics Research 32). Berlin – New York, 69–100.

Radden, Günter, Zoltán Kövecses (1999). "Towards a theory of metonymy." Panther, Klaus–Uwe, Günter Radden, eds. (1999). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. (Human Cognitive Processing 4). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 17–59.

Tomka, Timea. 2003. Metonymie in einigen deutschen, kroatischen und slowenischen Zeitschriften. Seminar paper. Budapest: Loránd Eötvös University.

Kontinuitet topika, metonimija i priložne oznake mjesta: Kognitivno–funkcionalni pristup

Cilj je ovog rada pokazati kako se funkcionalna i kognitivna lingvistika dopunjavaju u potrazi za eksternom motivacijom jezičnih činjenica. Tvrdi se da bi se kognitivna lingvistika, ako ne želi biti samo još jedan od parcijalnih modela, trebala u potrazi za motivacijom ugledati na funkcionalne lingviste, iskoračiti dalje od činjenice ljudskog utjelovljenja i socio–kulturnog okoliša te uzeti u obzir i ulogu postojećega jezičnog sustava. U radu se to pokazuje na primjeru interakcije metonimijskih preslikavanja i topikalizacije. Nedavna su istraživanja pokazala da je referencijalna metonimija relativno produktivan proces, no ispitivanje metonimijske porabe imena glavnih gradova u novinskom korpusu pokazuje da je taj tip u hrvatskom i mađarskom, za razliku od engleskog i njemačkog, podložan nizu ograničenja. Detaljna analiza otkriva da se dio tog kontrasta može objasniti činjenicom da u hrvatskom i mađarskom umjesto metonimijske porabe imenskih izraza nalazimo priložne oznake mjesta (ostvarene kao prijedložni izrazi u hrvatskom te kao imenski izrazi s mjesnom adpozicijom u mađarskom). Tvrdi se da se te mjesne oznake, za koje se može pokazati da su zapravo metonimijske naravi, optimalno rješenje u jezicima koji imaju implicitne subjekte (*pro–drop*) i razvijen sustav bezličnih konstrukcija kada se radi o kompleksnom zadatku održavanja nominalnog kontinuiteta metonimijskog topika uz istodobno izmjenjivanje više metonimijskih ciljeva.

Key words: metonymy, metaphor, topicalisation, locative adverbial, functionalism, cognitive linguistics.

Ključne riječi: metonimija, metafora, topikalizacija, priložne oznake mjesta, funkcionalizam, kognitivna lingvistika.