

Tatjana Pišković

University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

tatjana.piskovic@gmail.com

Lexical synecdoche in Croatian

The three key mechanisms in deriving the secondary meaning of polysemous lexemes are lexical metaphor, lexical metonymy and lexical synecdoche. Considering that lexical synecdoche has not received much attention so far, this paper will explore its role in creating the polysemous structure of Croatian lexemes. In this paper, lexical synecdoche is viewed as a predictable mechanism with several reversible transfers in its core: PART FOR WHOLE and WHOLE FOR PART, GENERAL FOR INDIVIDUAL and INDIVIDUAL FOR GENERAL, SINGULAR FOR PLURAL and PLURAL FOR SINGULAR, SPECIES FOR GENUS and GENUS FOR SPECIES. The formulas of these transfers are at the same time notations for conceptual metonymies which we consider the starting point for the creativity of lexical synecdoches. We do so because the metonymy and the synecdoche operate within a single conceptual domain, where one entity stands for another on the basis of their spatial, temporal, functional or causal relation. This common relation is why the synecdoche is usually considered a subcategory of metonymy. On the other hand, the metonymy and the synecdoche can be seen as separate lexical mechanisms because they are motivated by different types of relations between entities involved in the transfer. While the metonymic transfer is based on the closeness of entities in conceptual proximity as parts of the same domain, the transfer in synecdoche occurs between the domain itself and its integral part and turns from proximity to inclusion.

1. Mechanisms of polysemy

When comparing relations between secondary and primary meanings of numerous polysemous lexemes, what can be observed is that polysemous structures develop according to predictable patterns, not arbitrary or uncontrolled. The consistent mechanisms recognized in making secondary meaning out of the primary meaning of polysemous lexemes are called **the mechanisms of polysemy**. For example, in the sentences *Cijeli grad spava* (Eng. *The whole town is asleep*), *Cijelo selo spava* (Eng. *The whole village is asleep*), *Cijeli kvart spava* (Eng. *The whole neighborhood is asleep*), *Cijela ulica spava* (Eng. *The whole street is asleep*) it is easy to find similarities in creating the secondary meaning of the nouns *grad*, *selo*, *kvart* and *ulica* (Eng. *town, village, neighborhood, street*): their primary meanings all refer to a settled area,

and then secondary refer to people who live in that settled area. So, it is not the city that is asleep, it is the people who live in it, and the same principle can be used in creating secondary meaning for all nouns that denote a settled place. Moreover, in the sentences *Vuk živi u čoporu* (Eng. *The wolf lives in a pack*), *Medvjed je samotnjak* (Eng. *The bear is a solitary animal*), *Lisica je izrazito nedruštvena životinja* (Eng. *The fox is a very antisocial animal*), the name for the animal used in singular may refer to all members of the species. Finally, the secondary meanings of the nouns *zebra* ‘pješački prijelaz’ (Eng. *zebra* ‘pedestrian crossing’) and *zelembać* ‘američki dolar’ (Eng. *green* ‘US dollar bill’), adjectives *čokoladni* ‘koji je boje čokolade, npr. čokoladna put’ (Eng. *chocolate* ‘of color similar to chocolate, e.g., chocolate tan’) and *biserni* ‘koji je boje bisera, npr. biserni zubi’ (Eng. *pearl* ‘of color similar to pearl, e.g. pearly teeth’) as well as the nominalized adjectives *bijelo* ‘kokain’ (Eng. *white* ‘cocaine’) and *žuto* ‘heroin’ (Eng. *yellow* ‘heroin’) reveal how similarity in color can also motivate multiple meanings in some lexemes. Deriving secondary from primary meaning is realized through language, but the process starts in the mind of the speaker. In other words, all lexical mechanisms that lexemes use to build their polysemous structure have a common source in cognitive mechanisms, i.e. in human capability to experience the world around them in a similar fashion (Raffaelli 2015: 177). After all, if it were not for this capability, we would not be able to communicate. Humans possess the ability to notice and comprehend the vast diversity of creatures, phenomena, objects and processes in the world outside of language, then to condense, classify and generalize said diversity and finally name the diversity and realize it in language. They have to perform this in an economical and rational manner as the number of items and entities to name is innumerable, but the volume of the mental lexicon is limited. The cognitive foundation of lexical mechanisms had been highlighted by pre-structuralist semantics, and this idea remained as the fundamental methodological and theoretical premise of cognitive semantics, which inextricably connects human language capability with all other cognitive activities and their experience with the world outside of language.

The cognitive mechanisms of **conceptual metaphor** and **conceptual metonymy** are the starting points of metaphors, metonymies and synecdoches realized in language and in turn enable the following: first, the stylistic infusion of texts, and second, the polysemous development of the lexeme. Thus, thanks to our capability to think in metaphoric and metonymic manner, at the level of language we are able to create two types of metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche: **stylistic**, which we use as unique figures of speech, and **lexical**, which help us derive the secondary meaning of polysemous lexemes. Stylistic metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche are the focus of stylistic study, while lexical metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche are a matter of lexical semantics. Both disciplines should keep in mind that forming metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche in language is possible due to the human capability of metaphoric and metonymic thought. By introducing the attributes *conceptual*, *lexical* and *stylistic* with the nouns *metaphor*, *metonymy* and *synecdoche*

we separate the three basic levels of these mechanisms, considering conceptual mechanisms primary, and lexical and stylistic derived. Such stratification was first articulated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) within the framework of the conceptual metaphor theory, thus creating a powerful impact on further research on metaphor and metonymy in language.

Among the three mechanisms most frequently used in developing the secondary meaning of lexemes, synecdoche has gained the least attention in research. Hence, this paper will explore the role of synecdoche in creating the secondary meaning of polysemous lexemes in Croatian and establish its starting point in the conceptual mechanisms it originates from.

2. Metonymy as conceptual source of lexical synecdoche

Classical rhetoric introduced four main tropes — metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony. The structural mind of Roman Jakobson presented the influential dichotomy of metaphor and metonymy as the key figures of thought (Jakobson – Halle 1956). In this binary view, synecdoche was described as a subtype of metonymy. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) also highlighted metaphor and metonymy as the two key mechanisms in human understanding of the world, organization of knowledge of the world and shaping and articulating that knowledge by using language, whereas synecdoche was interpreted by them as a specific type of metonymy. By relying on the structuralist and cognitive linguistic subsuming of synecdoche under metonymy, in this paper we will consider conceptual metonymy the cognitive source of lexical synecdoche.¹

Synecdoche is founded in the relation between a part and the whole: either the whole is replaced by one of its parts or a part is replaced by the whole it belongs to. By selecting a part as representative of the whole, what is highlighted is the desired feature of the whole, which is for some reason significant, necessary or crucial for the whole to function. For example, in the sentence *Charlize Theron okrenula je mnoge glave svojom blijedoplavom Diorovom haljinom* (Eng. *Charlize Theron turned many heads in her light blue Dior dress*) curious people are reduced to their heads turning. The reason behind this is not that their heads will detach from the body and turn on their own — the eyes are located in the head and, when necessary, we turn our head so as to take a better look with our eyes at the person moving. This synecdoche reduces the person to the part of their body crucial for sight in the same manner as they are reduced to the organ crucial for speech in the sentence *Čini se da su zli jezici bili u krivu* (Eng. *It seems evil tongues [gossip] were wrong*). On the other hand, switching a part with the whole emphasizes that this part is typical, adequate and representative as the key vessel of the prototypical and appropriate features of

1 Cf. Littlemore's (2015: 23) explanation why it is not necessary to rigidly separate metonymy and synecdoche. For the description of synecdoche as independent mechanism, as a subtype of metonymic mechanism and supermechanism superordinate to metaphor and metonymy, see Nerlich 2010.

the whole it belongs to. In the sentence *Italija je europski prvak* (Eng. *Italy is the European football champion*) Italian football players are elevated to the level of the country itself, as they have been selected to the national team that represents the country Italy at the European Football Championship. The reasoning behind the metonymy is recognized in the transfer between the close referents in the same conceptual field. Namely, both synecdoche and metonymy operate within a single conceptual domain where one entity represents another entity on the basis of proximity, that is of their spatial, temporal, functional or causal relation (Nerlich – Clarke 1999; Bagić 2012: 199). The reason for extracting synecdoche as a special kind of metonymy and a lexical mechanism of its own can be observed in the specific relation between entities in the synecdochal transfer. This relation moves away from proximity and transforms into **inclusion** (Seto 1999: 92; Nerlich – Clark 1999: 201; Vajs 2000: 137). While metonymic transfers take place between entities connected by different close relations present in the conceptual proximity as parts of the same domain, the synecdochal transfer happens between the domain itself and one of its integral parts. The head and the tongue are integral and vital parts of the human body, so reducing the person to their head and tongue in the examples above illustrates synecdoche. Bukovac is not an integral part of his own paintings nor is a tennis racquet a vital part of Ćorić's body, so in the sentences *U svojoj zbirci ima tri Bukovca* (Eng. *He owns three Bukovacs in his collection*) and *Ćorić je prvi hrvatski reket* (Eng. *Ćorić is the first racquet of Croatia*) we find realizations of lexical metonymy. The painter Bukovac and his works are parts of the same domain we call the art of painting that encompasses many other elements (e.g., brush, tempera, oil, pastel, canvas, exhibition, etc.). The tennis player Ćorić and his racquet belong to the domain of tennis that also contains many other elements (e.g., tennis ball, tennis court, net, etc.). Entities in metonymy are parts of the same domain and share the same conceptual superordinate term. In contrast with these, the head, tongue and human do not need abstracting the common domain but rather recognizing whether the human is that same domain or the conceptual superordinate term which comprises the tongue, the head and many other parts of human body (e.g., arm, leg, neck, back, bones, etc.). In other words, one of the entities in the synecdoche is always the domain itself and the other entity is an integral part of that domain. On the basis of this crucial difference between metonymy and synecdoche, Seto (1999: 91–92) concludes that metonymy is transfer between entities *within* the same category, whereas synecdoche is transfer between the entity *and* the category. In line with this, Nerlich and Clarke (1999: 201) claim that metonymy is based on our encyclopedic knowledge of the world (e.g., space and time, cause and consequence, creator and product, container and content, and so on), while synecdoche is based on our knowledge of taxonomies and categorization. Metonymy emerges from our knowledge of the world that surrounds us, while synecdoche arises from our knowledge of how the world is organized in our mind.

The synecdochal transfer of the name of one entity onto another takes place, similar to metonymic transfer, according to the predictable patterns that can be

applied to the whole set of thematically connected entities. It is for this reason that both lexical metonymy and lexical synecdoche are interpreted and abstracted by using a formula that comprises all lexemes affected by the same principle of the extension of meaning and is considered the articulation of the conceptual mechanism necessary for the realization of language processes. The assumed conceptual sources for lexical synecdoches are noted down in the same manner as the starting points for lexical metonymy, by using small caps and the format x FOR y (e.g., HEAD FOR PERSON). The entity X (*head*) is the representative for the entity Y (*person*) and transfers its name onto Y (e.g., *Mudre glave imaju rješenje*; Eng. *Wise heads will provide solution*). In the metonymic formula to abstract the synecdochal transfer, X stands for the primary meaning of the word ('part of human body that contains the brain, the mouth and sensory organs'), and Y stands for its secondary meaning ('person, individual'). Lexical synecdoche is a rather predictable mechanism, as it can be, in principle, reduced to several reversible transfers: PART FOR WHOLE and WHOLE FOR PART, GENERAL FOR INDIVIDUAL and INDIVIDUAL FOR GENERAL, SINGULAR FOR PLURAL and PLURAL FOR SINGULAR, SPECIES FOR GENUS and GENUS FOR SPECIES (cf. Bagić 2012: 291–294). These transfers can be further stratified into more specific realizations, but induction will always lead us from a single lexical synecdoche towards the principles mentioned above of substituting the whole domain with one of its parts or one part with the whole domain.

Depending on the direction of the synecdochal transfer, the difference between the **particularizing** and **generalizing synecdoches** had already been observed in Antiquity (Wodak et al. 1999: 44; Bagić 2012: 293): the former referred to the rhetorical figure of changing the whole with one of its parts and the latter vice versa. In pre-structuralist semantics the terms *specialization* and *generalization* were commonly used to describe semantic changes based on synecdoche, whereas in structuralism these terms became used to denote more general transfers recognizable both in metaphoric and metonymic extensions of meaning of words (Ullmann 1951: 10–20). Metaphoric extension of meaning motivated by specialization can be seen in words that cross over from the general vocabulary to specialized (e.g., the noun *siroče* 'dijete kojem su umrli roditelji', Eng. *orphan* 'child whose parents died', denotes an undesired solution in typesetting, 'the first line of a new passage sitting on its own at the bottom of a page'). Metaphoric extension of meaning motivated by generalization can be seen in words that cross over from the specialized vocabulary to general (e.g., the adjective *anemičan* 'slabokrvan', Eng. *anemic*, entered the general vocabulary from medical terminology and is used as 'bezbojan, bezizražajan, slab, bez okusa, bez svojstava', Eng. 'colorless, lifeless, feeble, bland, pallid, without features'). Describing lexical metaphor through the terms *specialization* and *generalization* indicates lexical activity between two conceptual domains and between the general and specialized vocabulary. Describing lexical synecdoche by using the term *specialization* denotes what was known as the particularizing synecdoche, i.e. changing the whole with the part (Lat. *pars pro toto*), whereas by using

the term *generalization* we denote what was known as the generalizing synecdoche, i.e. changing the part with the whole (Lat. *totum pro parte*). It could be said that there is something contradictory in the relation between how the conceptual system behind the synecdoche works and the lexical outcome of this activity: changing the whole with one of its parts, i.e. something broad with something more narrow really is an act of specialization (e.g., human with head in the sentence *Mudra je on glava*, Eng. *He is a wise head*), but the result of this carries completely opposite features. Namely, the noun *glava* (Eng. *head*) has a specialized primary meaning ('part of the human body'), although once the synecdochal mechanism is activated it gains the general meaning of 'person', which is undoubtedly an act of generalization. Similarly, changing a part with the whole, i.e., something narrower with something broader (e.g., specific alcoholic beverage with alcohol in the sentence *Nemojte piti alkohol*, Eng. *Do not drink alcohol*) is indeed an act of generalization, which also results in opposite effect. The noun *alkohol* (Eng. *alcohol*) carries the general primary meaning of 'hydrocarbon compound with one or more hydroxyl groups', but the synecdochal mechanism causes a change to the specialized meaning of 'an alcoholic beverage', which is undoubtedly an act of specialization. The complicated relation between generalization and specialization in the description of synecdoche can only be resolved by separating conceptual metonymy as the cognitive starting point of synecdoche on one hand from the effects of lexical synecdoche that establishes the secondary meaning of a word on the other. Then we can claim that conceptual metonymy based on specialization (e.g., PART FOR WHOLE) results in lexical synecdoche that makes word meaning more general (e.g., *glava* 'čovjek', Eng. *head* 'human'), while conceptual metonymy based on generalization (e.g., TYPE FOR SUBTYPE) results in lexical synecdoche which makes word meaning more specialized (e.g., *alkohol* 'alkoholno piće', Eng. *alcohol* 'alcoholic beverage').

3. Part for whole

A skilled interpretation of apparently predictable lexical synecdoches is manifested, first, in successful naming of entities X and Y in conceptual metonymy, which is the source for the creativity of lexical synecdoche, and second, in recognizing other lexical mechanisms which cooperate in producing individual types of synecdoche. We will start with examples of lexical synecdoche based on the mechanism PART FOR WHOLE, which is traditionally considered the most frequent direction of the synecdochal transfer and periphrasis for synecdoche in general.² We will divide this mechanism into two subtypes considering (non-)animacy of the entity

2 In cognitive semantics, it is exactly that essential direction of synecdochal transfer that is taken away from synecdoche and affiliated to metonymy, while synecdoche is reduced to the transfer species for genus (cf. Seto 1999; Nerlich 2010). Whitsitt (2013) describes the maneuvers cognitive semantics performed to appropriate the key synecdochal transfer for metonymy and points out the fallacies of these maneuvers. We stand with his view that synecdoche has to be observed in the traditional manner as a mechanism primarily based on the formula part for whole which other more specific transfers based on lexical inclusion can join.

Y in the synecdochal formula and list examples of referring to a human by using the lexeme for a part of their body and referring to a whole object by using the lexeme for one of its constituent parts.³

PART OF BODY OR ORGAN FOR HUMAN

- (1) Vlada je uvažila vukovarsko–srijemske argumente vezane uz tešku ekonomsku situaciju u županiji koja roditelje mnogih *mladih pametnih glava* priječi da ih šalju na studije. [pametni mladi ljudi]
The government accepted the arguments from Vukovar and Srijem related to the difficult economic situation in the county, which prevents the parents of many *young smart heads* [minds] from sending them to study. [smart young people]
- (2) Najimućniji biznismen na svijetu razmotrio je čitav niz gradova u Europi prije nego li se odlučio za Cambridge, smatrajući da se tamo nalaze *najveći mozgovi* na svijetu. [najpametniji ljudi]
The richest businessman in the world considered a number of cities in Europe before settling on Cambridge, believing that *the greatest brains* [minds] in the world are located there. [smartest people]
- (3) Nekada su *važne glave* dolazile u Veli. [važni ljudi, uglednici]
In the past, *important heads* came to Veli. [important people, dignitaries]
- (4) A tamo gdje su uzavrele emocije, naboj u zraku, a oružje u rukama, teško da može ikakva *mudra glava* reći dosta je. [mudar čovjek]
Where emotions are boiling, the air is charged, and weapons are carried, hardly any *wise head* can say enough is enough. [wise person]
- (5) *Sve* su se *glave* okrenule prema njoj. [svi ljudi]
All heads turned towards her. [all people]
- (6) U publici smo zatekli mnoga *poznata lica*. [poznate ljude]
There were many *familiar faces* in the crowd. [familiar people]
- (7) Na prvom treningu pojavila su se i najavljena *nova lica*. [novi igrači]
At the first practice, there were the *new faces* that had been announced. [new players]
- (8) Teniski spektakl je privukao i puno *poznatih faca*. [poznatih ljudi]
The tennis spectacle attracted many *familiar faces*. [famous people, celebrities]
- (9) Zna on da su sada *sve oči uprte* u njega. [svi ljudi gledaju]
He knows *all eyes* are on him now. [everyone is watching]
- (10) Trebali bismo razgovarati u *četiri oka*. [dviije osobe]
We should talk *in private* (Eng. lit. *in four eyes*). [two persons]
- (11) Zamolite prijatelja ili *člana* obitelji da pogleda vaš tekst jer drugi *par svježih očiju* ponekad može otkriti male pogreške. [osoba koja prvi put čita tekst]

3 Most of the examples have been extracted from hrWaC – Croatian web corpus (<http://nlp.ffzg.hr/resources/corpora/hrwac/>). A smaller number of examples have been found by using Google search.

- Ask a friend or a family member to check your text because *a fresh pair of eyes* may find the smallest errors. [person reading a text for the first time]
- (12) *Načuljene uši čekale* su da čuju što imam za reći. [ljudi koji slušaju]
 Everyone *pricked up their ears* to hear what I had to say. [people listening]
- (13) Prvotni Live Aid skupio je više od stotinu milijuna funti i nahranio mnoga *gladna usta* u Etiopiji. [gladni ljudi]
 The first Live Aid gathered over a hundred million pounds and fed many a *hungry mouth* in Ethiopia. [hungry people]
- (14) Kao što je trinaest glazbenika na pozornici zvučalo kao cijeli simfonijski orkestar tako je pljesak *trideset pari ruku* na kraju koncerta zvučalo kao pljesak prepune dvorane. [trideset ljudi]
 As thirteen musicians on the stage sounded like an entire symphonic orchestra, so did the *thirty pairs of hands* applauding at the end of the concert sound like the applause of a full concert hall. [thirty people]
- (15) Koliko vrijedi *prva noga* HNL-a? [najbolji nogometaš]
 How much is the best player (Eng. lit. *the first leg*) of the Croatian football league worth? [the best football player]
- (16) Stotine sabalja bljesne u dvorani i *stotinu grla* povika: – U boj! [stotinu ljudi]
 Hundreds of sabers glistened in the hall and *a hundred mouths* (Eng. lit. *a hundred throats*) yelled: – To battle! [a hundred people]
- (17) No *zli jezici* svašta govore, posebice o lijepim ženama koje žive daleko od svlačćih muških očiju. [zli ljudi]
 However, *evil tongues* say many things, especially about beautiful women who live far away from men’s eyes that undress them. [evil people]
- (18) Ne radi se tu o *šmrkavim nosićima*, nego o djeci koja dolaze u vrtić bolesna pod antibioticima. [prehlađena djeca]
 The topic here are not *their little runny noses* but kids who come to kindergarten sick and taking antibiotics. [kids with a cold]
- (19) Nije teško zaključiti da *mlada i svježa krv*, s fakultetskom diplomom i raznim certifikatima, računalno i jezično potkovana, po završetku studija neće imati problema s pronalaskom posla. [mladi i svježi ljudi]
 It is not that difficult to understand that *young and fresh blood*, with degrees and certificates, well versed in computers and languages, will have no problem finding a job after college. [young and fresh people]
- (20) Na brodu je bio i neki bijeli fratar, *inteligentna njuška*, misionar. [inteligentan čovjek]
 There was a white friar on the boat, a *smart guy* (Eng. lit. *a smart snout*), a missionary. [smart person]
- (21) Neke smo serije grupirali da se ne ponavljamo s komentarima, ne samo zato što smo *lijene guzice*. [lijeni ljudi]
 Some shows we grouped together, so as not to repeat the comments, not just because we’re *lazy asses*. [lazy people]

- (22) Evo *lijeno dupe* se natjeralo konačno napraviti video. [lijen čovjek]
This *lazy ass* finally forced itself to make a video. [lazy person]
- (23) Gdje su sve one *pičke* koje su pljuvale po Englezima? [loši ljudi]
Where are all those *pussies* who bashed the English? [bad people]
- (24) Sve znamo, bogati, nismo *pizde!* [loši ljudi]
We know everything, come on, we're not *cunts!* [bad people]
- (25) Govorio mi je da sam *šupak* i *papak* i zato sam ga istjerao iz kuće. [beskarakteran i priglupek čovjek]
He used to tell me I was an *asshole* and a *wuss* (Eng. lit. *hoof*), so I evicted him. [spineless, thick person]
- (26) Ono što ćete često čuti o ovoj omiljenoj destinaciji partijanera jest da je tamo pravi *pimpek party*, odnosno da cura ni nema. [*party* za muškarce]
What you will often hear about this favorite party destination is that it's a real *sausage fest*, i.e., there are almost no girls there. [male party]

What precedes most instances of synecdoche illustrated above is the establishing of metonymic shortcuts by using the formulas CONTAINER FOR CONTENT and ORGAN FOR SENSE. Namely, the head is conceptualized as a container containing the brain, the mouth and sensory organs. The brain is, among other, the center of intelligence and memory, so this trait is first metonymically transferred onto the whole head and then the head represents as synecdoche the entire clever human. Similarly, the head as the container contains the eyes, organs of sight, so metonymically the head takes over the ability to see and then as synecdoche stands for the person as a whole who is carefully watching or rudely staring. On the other hand, some instances of synecdoche are preceded by the metaphorical conceptualization of specific organs as centers of undesired human traits. These are mostly the genitalia and the anus, referred to by using vulgar names, e.g., !!!*pička* (Eng. *pussy*), !!!*pizda* (Eng. *cunt*), !!!*šupak* (Eng. *asshole*), which intensifies the pejorative effect. Reducing a person through synecdoche to these organs is a grave insult and is mostly linked to the affective spoken register. In the example (26) we find the syntagm !!!*pimpek party* (Eng. lit. *pecker party* 'sausage fest') in which the insult is less intense than in examples (23)–(25) because the noun !!!*pimpek* (Eng. *pecker*) is used for highlighting exclusively male company, so the affective quality that emerges from the synecdoche can be viewed as irony and joke, not as explicit insult. By using the nouns !!!*guzica* (Eng. *bottom*) and !!!*dupe* (Eng. *ass*) in examples (21) and (22) the speakers refer to themselves by pointing out their own laziness, which is obvious self-deprecating humor. This synecdoche is preceded by the metaphorical link between sitting and not doing anything and being lazy, and then the metonymic representation of sitting by using the backside. The example (25) is particularly interesting, in which a person is being referred to by using the noun *papak* (Eng. *wuss*; Eng. lit. *hoof*) which primarily denotes 'covering of horn that protects the front of or encloses the ends of the toes of some mammals (as horses, oxen, and pigs)'. The conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS provides the cognitive foundation for the lexical metaphor

by which the nouns for animals extend their meaning to people. This type of zoosemy is usually accompanied by pejoration and depreciation, which is obvious from observing the nouns *oxen*, *sheep*, *goat*, *pig* used in the definition of hoof as quoted above because their secondary meanings are shaped around the negative human traits. The animals denoted by these nouns are reduced, through synecdoche, to their hooves as the recognizable distinctive feature, but the synecdoche then refers to the person, not the animal. Thanks to the metaphor based on the proximity of position, shoes can be named hooves (e.g., *Cijelu zimu nabadam u štiklama, čizmama, gležnjačama, špic papcima*, Eng. *The whole winter I've been walking about in heels, boots and pointy shoes* [Eng. lit. *pointy hooves*]) as can feet too (e.g., *Izvela sam papke na pedikuru*, Eng. *I took my feet* [Eng. lit. *hooves*] *for a pedicure*).⁴ It is from that metaphor that a new synecdoche can be derived that reduces the entire person — usually a man — to a hoof (e.g., *Da nama papcima koji ne prate nogać ne bi bilo dosadno, pripremili su i popratne sadržaje; Zašto su muškarci danas postali takvi papci i teško ulijeću curama?*, Eng. *So us wusses* [Eng. lit. *hooves*] *who don't watch football don't get bored, there'll be additional entertainment; Why are men today such wusses* [Eng. lit. *hooves*] *and have issues approaching girls?*).

Let us now illustrate synecdoche by using examples in which a whole object is lexically reduced to the parts that are crucial for them to function. The reasoning behind the functional saliency in this type of synecdoche is best seen in the lexical reduction of most vehicles to wheels.

PART OF OBJECT FOR WHOLE OBJECT

- (27) Pa vi birajte između statusnog simbola na četiri kotača, jahte ili balona. [automobil]
Choose then between a status symbol on *four wheels*, a yacht or a balloon. [car]
- (28) Vozač kamiona koji se kretao u njihovu smjeru zaspao je za volanom. [vozeći kamion]
The truck driver who was driving in their direction fell asleep at the *steering wheel*. [driving a truck]
- (29) Frigo je bio najveće ovosezonsko osvježanje i novo lice u svijetu na dva kotača. [bicikl]
Frigo was the biggest fresh new thing this season and a new face in the world of *two wheels*. [bicycle]
- (30) Razbojnici na dva kotača opljačkali su u subotu dvije Zagrepčanke. [motocikl]
Thieves on *two wheels* robbed two women from Zagreb this Saturday. [motorcycle]

4 In casual spoken production, heels are replaced with hooves in the phraseological unit *dati petama/papcima vjetra* (Eng. lit. *to give wind to the heels/hooves, to make a run for it*), and fingers are hooves in *umiješati svoje prste/papke u što* (Eng. lit., *to mix your fingers/hooves in something, to interfere, to get involved*).

- (31) Smrt na *kotačima*. [moped]
Death on *wheels*. [moped]
- (32) Dostava na *kotačima*. [bicikl]
Delivery on *wheels*. [bicycle]
- (33) Zlovolja je prolazila, *žice* su sve toplije brujale. [žičano glazbalo]
Sulking was almost over, the *strings* were humming warmer. [string instrument]
- (34) Možemo reći da je *tiskana riječ* igrala presudnu ulogu u formiranju društva u zadnjim stoljećima. [knjige]
It is safe to say that the *printed word* has played a crucial role in forming the society in recent centuries. [books]
- (35) Lijepo je bilo sve ove godine nositi veliki *kamen* na prstu. [prsten s dragim kamenom]
It's been lovely wearing a big *rock* on my finger all these years. [ring with gemstone]

In the examples of the synecdoche PART OF OBJECT FOR WHOLE OBJECT we recognize the concatenation of different subtypes of this mechanism to extend the meaning of words. In the example (35) the ring with the gemstone is reduced to the stone. In order for such lexical maneuver to become conventionalized in the semantic structure of the noun *kamen* (Eng. *rock, stone*), we first employ the mechanism of generalization by which one kind of a gemstone is elevated to the level of stone in general, which in the next passage will be abstracted by using the formula GENUS FOR SPECIES. The process of the synecdochal generalization results in specialization or narrowing of meaning of the noun *kamen* (Eng. *rock, stone*), whose secondary meaning is a specific type of a gemstone. After that, we then resort to the synecdoche part of object for object and the entire ring is reduced to the stone, which means that in the second stage of the process we generalize or broaden its meaning by referring to the entire object that contains only a small part of that gemstone. Similarly, for the printed word to stand for the entire book in the example (34), it first had to go through the synecdoche singular for plural and encompass all printed words or the entire text in a book,⁵ and then undergo the synecdoche part of object for object because the book does not only comprise the printed text, but also the leaves, the spine, the covers, photos, etc.

As an example for synecdoche that emerged from lexical substitution of the entire object with one of its parts, what is frequently used is the phraseological unit *ostati bez krova nad glavom* ‘ostati bez kuće, postati beskućnik’ (Eng. lit. *lose the roof over one's head*, ‘to lose one's home, to become homeless’). The basis for this phraseological unit is the reduction of the house to the roof through synecdoche, but we cannot use it as an example of lexical synecdoche because its meaning is realized exclusively in the set connection of all items present in the unit mentioned.

5 The mechanism SINGULAR FOR PLURAL will be explored in Part 6 of this paper.

The sentence *Više od dva milijuna ljudi ostalo je bez krova nad glavom* (Eng. *Over two million people lost the roof over their heads*) cannot be rewritten as **Više od dva milijuna ljudi ostalo je bez krova* (Eng. **Over two million people lost the roof*) because the phraseological unit then lacks the prepositional–case expression *nad glavom* (Eng. *over their heads*). Phraseological units are acquired, learned and memorized as a whole in which we cannot leave out constituent elements or change their order arbitrarily. Metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche are not only lexical mechanisms used to extend the meaning of a lexeme, but they are also creative strategies used to form phraseological units. Therefore, metaphoric, metonymic and synecdochal transfers are important arguments that contemporary phraseology uses to dispute the traditional interpretation of phraseological units as unmotivated and arbitrary connections in words in which constituent elements either lose meaning or are randomly connected into complex lexical units.⁶

4. Species for genus

Switching the whole with its part through synecdoche is based on extralinguistic, constitutive relations and we cannot rearrange them arbitrarily. The referents of the nouns *glava*, *ruka*, *noga* (Eng. *head*, *arm*, *leg*) are physically connected with the referent of the noun *tijelo* (Eng. *body*), the referents of the nouns *volan*, *kotač*, *pedale* (Eng. *steering wheel*, *wheel*, *pedals*) are physically connected with the referent of the noun *bicikl* (Eng. *bicycle*) and such **partonymic** order does not allow for any cognitive rearrangement. In contrast to this, the substitution through synecdoche of the entire genus with the species and the general with the individual is the result of our mental classification, categorization and organization of the extralinguistic reality, which is, along with conceptualization, the most important cognitive mechanism used to translate the concept into language. There is liberty in the taxonomic distribution of entities into categories and the naming of the categories, but the partonymic relations are guided by the extralinguistic reality and there is no liberty there. We cannot change a single thing in the fact that the trunk is part of the oak tree, but situation the oak tree is in the beech family and naming the family *Fagaceae* is the result of conscious attempts and agreement among botanists. If they agreed differently, the oak tree would still have grown and had its trunk, and the forest would not care the least; however, if they said that the wheel is part of the oak tree, a simple glance towards the tree would have disproved that. The prescriptiveness of the partonymic synecdoche and the arbitrariness of the taxonomic one are confirmed by the fact that both entities in the partonymic synecdoche are concrete (e.g., the nouns *wheel* and *bicycle* have concrete, visible referents), while the taxonomic synecdoche contains only the concrete species, i.e. that which is individual (e.g., the noun *oak (tree)* has all individual oak trees as the concrete referent, while the family

6 Cf. Barčot (2017) and Novoselec (2022) for cognitive–semantic and linguo–cultural analyses of Croatian, Russian and Swedish phraseological units.

it belongs to has no concrete, natural form in extralinguistic reality that would correspond with the whole category). Hence, the basis for the partonymic synecdoche is found in observing the connections and inclusion of entities in reality, and the taxonymic synecdoche is based on the creation of hierarchies and categories in our mind for entities observed in reality (Seto 1999: 94). In the taxonymic synecdoche, we find frequent examples of marking the entire plant or animal genus with the noun for the species from that genus, which highlights the homogeneity of the genus and compatibility of features of all its members.

SPECIES FOR FAMILY OR GENUS

- (36) Na nižoj, moru okrenutoj, strani su *grab*, *hrast* i *javor*, na malo višim predjelima dominira pojas bukovih šuma, a pri vrhu reliktna alpske podvrste *crnog bora*, koje je moguće naći jedino na Velebitu. [mnogobrojna stabla iz vrste graba, hrasta, javora, crnog bora]

On the lower part, facing the sea, we find *hornbeam*, *oak tree* and *sycamore*, the parts higher up contain beech forests, and at the top we find the relic Alpine subtype of *black pine*, which can be found on Velebit only. [numerous trees of the species of hornbeam, oak tree, sycamore and black pine]

- (37) Na Velebitu obitavaju *smeđi medvjed*, *vuk*, *divlja mačka*, *ris*, nekoliko vrsta orlova, kao i neke mediteranske endemske vrste ptica pjevica. [smeđi medvjedi, vukovi, divlje mačke, risovi]

The *brown bear*, *the wolf*, *the wildcat*, *the lynx*, several kinds of eagles, as well as some endemic Mediterranean kinds of songbirds inhabit Velebit. [brown bears, wolves, wildcats, lynxes]

Synecdoche is the main lexicographic strategy in lemmatization, i.e., in selecting entries or lemmas for plants and animals in dictionaries of Croatian. We will list definitions of the nouns from the previous example to illustrate the common representation of the entire genus of animals or plants by using the common noun in singular.⁷ As with any lexical mechanism used to derive secondary meanings of lexemes, synecdoche is inconspicuous, it will not cause any wonder or excitement for the native speaker, nor will it seem forced or intrusive as some one-of-a-kind stylistic maneuver. It may be that the description of lexical synecdoche so far has made it seem secondary in relation to metaphor and metonymy, which contain numerous examples and their own cognitive mechanisms as sources. Lexical synecdoche does borrow from the metonymic cognitive matrix and in describing polysemy it is always mentioned last, but due to the large number of nouns being lemmatized according to the principle of synecdoche it has become clear that synecdoche and metonymy are equal.

GRAB bjelogorično drvo (*Carpinus*) iz porodice brezovki (*Betulaceae*)
HORNBEAM deciduous tree (*Carpinus*) of the birch tree family (*Betulaceae*)

⁷ All definitions in this paper are taken from Vladimir Anić's dictionary (*Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, Zagreb, 2004).

HRAST visoko listopadno stablo iz roda *Quercus*, porodica bukava (*Fagaceae*),
plod mu je žir

OAK tall deciduous tree of the *Quercus* genus, beech family (*Fagaceae*), its fruit
is an acorn

JAVOR bjelogorično stablo (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) iz porodice javorka (*Aceraceae*)

SYCAMORE deciduous tree (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) of the maple family (*Aceraceae*)

BOR biljni rod četinjača (*Pinus*), više od 100 vrsta (bijeli/obični bor *P. sylvestris*,
crni bor *P. nigra*, primorski bor *Pinus pinaster*)

PINE the plant genus of coniferous trees (*Pinus*), over a hundred species (Scotch
pine *P. sylvestris*, black pine *P. nigra*, maritime pine *Pinus pinaster*)

MEDVJED zvijer planinskih krajeva, guste runjave smeđe dlake (*Ursus arctos*)

BEAR beast of mountain areas, thick brown fur (*Ursus arctos*)

VUK sisavac mesožder (*Canis lupus*) iz porodice pasa

WOLF carnivorous mammal (*Canis lupus*) of the canine family

DIVLJA MAČKA divlja zvijer iz porodice mačaka (*Felis silvestris*)

WILDCAT wild beast of the feline family (*Felis silvestris*)

RIS sisavac (*Lynx lynx*) iz porodice mačaka, živi u Europi i Sjevernoj Americi

LYNX mammal (*Lynx lynx*) of the feline family, lives in Europe and North America

The metonymic conceptual source of synecdoche is visible from another feature that makes the metonymic mechanism different from the metaphorical, and that is bidirectionality. The entities that engage in certain types of metonymic transfers are in reversible relation, which is confirmed by the lexical synecdoche that follows from the bidirectional metonymy SPECIES FOR GENUS and GENUS FOR SPECIES. The relation between the species and the genus may motivate synecdochal generalization and enable the noun for plant or animal species to represent the entire genus. In the same manner, the relation between the species and the genus may entice synecdochal specialization and enable the noun for the plant or animal genus to mark the species from the genus. The species will always imply the genus it belongs to (e.g., the hornbeam is a tree, the wolf is a mammal), the genus never implies one completely specific species but rather all species that belong to the genus. This is clear from the example used to illustrate the formula GENUS FOR SPECIES in which the secondary meaning created by synecdoche can only be discerned in the broader context, and in our examples, we list these in square brackets. From the sentence in the example (38) we cannot discern which animal is represented by the noun *beast* used as synecdoche, which is similar to the situation in the sentence in the example (45), where we cannot find out which particular kind of tree is represented by the noun *tree*. Additional insight into the textual sources of the two sentences shows that, on the one hand, the author aimed not to repeat the noun for the species (*oak tree*), and on the other, the author wished to emphasize the dramatic moment when the bus ran into a tiger. Synecdoche, therefore, is not only a lexical mechanism that shapes secondary meanings of the word, but it is also an impor-

tant discourse strategy that comprises different effects (cf. Nerlich – Clarke 1999: 203–210; Wodak et al. 1999: 44–47).

FAMILY OR GENUS FOR SPECIES

- (38) *Vozač autobusa u mraku nije vidio veliku zvijer, kazala je policija.* [tigar]
The bus driver didn't notice the *beast*, the police said. [tiger]
- (39) *Pauk mora odbaciti staru ljušturu i pustiti da mu izraste nova.* [tarantula]
The spider should discard its old shell and let a new one grow. [tarantula]
- (40) *Slike vađenja ovog kukca iz mladićeva uha dugo će vam ostati urezane u podsvijest.* [cvrčak]
Images of extracting this *insect* from the man's ear will remain etched in your mind for a long time. [cricket]
- (41) *Teško ranjena životinja odmah je prevezena u veterinarsku stanicu.* [srna]
Badly wounded *animal* rushed to the vet. [roe deer]
- (42) *Uplašena životinja ipak je uspješno izvučena na sigurno.* [konj]
The frightened *animal* has been rescued. [horse]
- (43) *Ptica je iz dana u dan pokazivala sve veću naklonost za brižnu bolničarku.* [pelikan]
The bird was showing more and more affection every day for the caring nurse. [pelican]
- (44) *Svojehlavi pas odmah je ustao i sam hodao.* [haski]
The stubborn *dog* rose and walked on its own. [husky]
- (45) *Jaka bura i obilna kiša uništile su drvo koje je godinama krasilo dvorište naše škole.* [hrast]
Strong wind and heavy rain destroyed the *tree* that had adorned our school yard for ages. [oak tree]
- (46) *Staro stablo nije izdržalo jaki nalet vjetra i palo je na obiteljsku kuću i automobil.* [lipa]
The old *tree* did not resist the strong gusts of wind and it fell over on the family house and car. [linden tree]

Lexicographic definitions of the nouns in the examples above reveal the synecdochal mechanism of their use by determining the *beast* as 'individual among beasts', the *spider* as 'animal from the genus spider', *animal* as 'any living organism other than human', a *tree* as 'plant'.

ZVIJER jedinka između zvjeri, divljih grabežljivaca, kopnenih sisavaca mesoždera koji se razlikuju po obliku i načinu preživljavanja

BEAST individual among beasts, wild predatory animals, land carnivorous mammals, differs according to shape and survival mode

PAUK životinja iz reda pauka

SPIDER animal of the Arachnida class

KUKAC jedinka iz skupine malih životinja člankastih nogu, bez kralješnice

INSECT individual from the group of small animals, arthropods, invertebrates

ŽIVOTINJA svaki živi organizam, osim čovjeka, koji pripada životinjskom carstvu, drugom odjelu organskog svijeta na Zemlji prema biljkama
 ANIMAL any living organism, other than humans, who belongs to the animal kingdom, as opposed to plants
 PTICA životinja iz razreda kralješnjaka obrasla perjem, s krilima, kljunom i s dvije noge
 BIRD animal, vertebrate, covered in feathers, has a beak, wings and two legs
 DRVO dugogodišnja biljka s deblom i korijenom; stablo
 TREE perennial plant with trunk and root

5. Member for group

While the synecdochal selection of species as representative of the genus highlights the homogeneity and coherence of plant and animal genera as well as compatibility of features of all their members, the lexical realization of the formula MEMBER FOR GROUP subtly singles out the most salient member on the basis of their leading role as the most responsible for the success of the group. At the same time, the group is established as the human organization of partonymic make-up in which individual members are minimal constituent units, which in turn means that they do not belong to the organization as persons *per se*, but rather as replaceable members who perform certain duties (Seto 1999: 100–101; Ivić 2006). This is why managers and certain members have their deputies (e.g., US Deputy Secretary of Defense, Deputy Head of City Office for Physical Planning, Deputy Minister of Justice, substitute for the Norwegian defender, etc.). The formula SPECIES FOR GENUS highlights homogeneity, equality or substantial correspondence among the members of the genus, while the formula MEMBER FOR GROUP results in lexical synecdoche that reflects the hierarchy of the group. This is why the representative of the military is its commander, the representative of the (national) football team is its head coach, and the representative of the orchestra is the conductor.

MEMBER FOR GROUP

- (47) *Vladimir Putin* izvršio invaziju na Ukrajinu. [ruska vojska kojom zapovijeda Vladimir Putin]
Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine. [Russian Army under Putin's command]
- (48) To je taktički aksiom zbog kojeg je *Klopp* izgubio, a *Dalić* pobijedio. [momčad koju trenira Klopp, reprezentacija čiji je izbornik Dalić]
 This is a tactical axiom that caused *Klopp* to lose and *Dalić* win. [team coached by Klopp, national team coached by Dalić]
- (49) *Gotovina* je do kraja srpnja 1995. zauzeo Bosansko Grahovo i Glamoč. [vojna jedinica kojom zapovijeda Gotovina]
 By the end of July 1995, *Gotovina* took Bosansko Grahovo and Glamoč. [military unit under Gotovina's command]

- (50) *Maestro Nikša Bareza* zaključio je tu lijepu koncertnu večer simfonijskom pjesmom „Tako je govorio Zaratustra“ Richarda Straussa. [orkestar kojim dirigira maestro Nikša Bareza]

Maestro Nikša Bareza concluded the beautiful concert evening with the symphonic poem “Thus spoke Zarathustra” by Richard Strauss. [orchestra conducted by maestro Nikša Bareza]

The formula is bidirectional, so the noun for the group may be used to refer to the individual member or several members in order to point out that the members are equal, the task was handled by more persons, the decision was made unanimously and that everyone will take responsibility for the consequences of the decision. In contrast with the formula MEMBER FOR GROUP which extracts the most salient member from the group, the formula GROUP FOR MEMBER renders the hierarchy of the group relative and the responsibility of the manager is dispersed on all members of the group. For example, a committee is led by the chair/president who prepares the report and takes responsibility for the assessment of the topic of the report, but if other members agree with the chair and do not add a separate opinion to the report, then it is stated, as a synecdoche, that the committee has reached a unanimous decision.

GROUP FOR MEMBER

- (51) *Ministarstvo* je uputilo dopise svim muzejima. [ministar]
The Ministry sent out letters to all museums. [Minister]
- (52) *Ravnateljstvo* je u veljači potpisalo sporni ugovor. [ravnatelj]
The directorate signed the controversial contract in February. [director]
- (53) *Tužiteljstvo* je uložilo žalbu na tu presudu. [tužitelj]
The prosecutor's office filed a complaint to appeal the verdict. [the prosecutor]
- (54) *Odvjetništvo* je navelo samo inicijale. [odvjetnik]
The prosecutor's office only mentioned the initials. [the attorney]
- (55) *Povjerenstvo* je utvrdilo nepravilnosti u procesu isplate. [članovi povjerenstva]
The committee determined that there had been irregularities in the disbursement. [members of the committee]
- (56) *Odbor* će se prije prve ovojesenske sjednice Zastupničkog doma sastati vjerojatno još dvaput. [članovi odbora]
The board will most likely meet up twice before the first session of the House of Representatives this fall. [members of the board]
- (57) *Skupština* je prihvatila i financijska i ostala izvješća o poslovanju tvrtke u prošloj godini. [članovi skupštine]
The assembly accepted the financial and other reports about the company in the last year. [members of the assembly]
- (58) I ovog puta *vijeće* je ostalo pri ranije donesenoj odluci. [članovi vijeća]
The council remains with their previous decision this time as well. [members of the council]

To the bidirectional metonymies SPECIES FOR GENUS and MEMBER FOR GROUP we could tentatively attach an interesting synecdochal extension of the classic metonymic formula PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT. Here we talk about the substitution represented by the formula CATEGORY MEMBER FOR CATEGORY which makes it possible that an individual product stands for the entire class of equivalent products (Littlemore 2015: 32). Although the metonymic motivation and synecdochal realization of such examples are undeniable, we cannot hold them as examples of polysemic growth of individual lexemes. Factory name of the product (chrematonym) for the entity X in the metonymic formula is a proper noun, local or foreign (e.g., *Labello*, *Kalodont*, *Čarli*, *Sellotape*, *Hansaplast*, *Jeep* — all brand names for various products, such as chapstick, toothpaste, dish soap, sticky tape, band-aid, and vehicle), but the entire class of products is referred to by using the common noun (e.g. *labelo*, *kalodont*, *čarli*, *selotejp*, *hanzaplast*, *džip*), which is orthographically adapted to Croatian if it is of foreign origin. It is therefore clear that these are not two meanings of one lexical unit but rather two units, and the common noun is the result of eponymization.

PRODUCT FACTORY NAME FOR ENTIRE CLASS OF PRODUCTS

- (59) Zna li itko gdje ima za kupiti *labelo* za usne Bebe young care? [balzam za usne]
Can anyone tell me where to buy the Bebe young care *chapstick*? [lip balm]
- (69) Masne mrlje na odjeći operem *čarlijem*. [deterđent za suđe]
I use *Dawn* to remove greasy stains on clothes. [dish soap]
- (61) Pronašli smo tri novinska smotuljka oblijepljena *selotejpom*. [prozirna ljepljiva vrpca]
We found three folded rolls of newspapers taped with *scotch tape*. [transparent adhesive tape]
- (62) Za prvu pomoć kod manjih rana bit će dovoljan *hanzaplast*.
A Band-Aid will be sufficient as first aid for minor wounds. [adhesive bandage, patch]
- (63) Nedugo zatim na cesti se zaustavio otvoreni ruski *džip*. [terenski automobil]
Not long after, an open Russian-made *jeep* stopped on the road. [cross country vehicle]
- (64) *Ženama* koje uzimaju *aspirin* prijete manja opasnost od raka jajnika. [protuupalni lijek]
Women who take *aspirin* are at less risk of ovarian cancer. [anti-inflammatory drug]
- (65) Najobičniji *brufeni* mogu izazvati tešku ovisnost. [lijek protiv bolova]
The common *ibuprofen* can cause serious addiction. [analgesic]

6. Singular for plural

It should be noted that lexical synecdoche that originates from the metonymy SPECIES FOR GENUS comprises nouns for plants and animals, the one that originates from the metonymy MEMBER FOR GROUP comprises nouns for people, and the one originating from the metonymy member of CATEGORY FOR CATEGORY comprise nouns for inanimate entities. Reflections of these lexical shortcuts can be recognized in the formula SINGULAR FOR PLURAL that enables extension of meaning of nouns through lexical synecdoche for animate and inanimate entities. A typical example of such synecdochal practice is the generic use of the singular demonym. In the sentence *Talijan će trošiti na jelo i sport, Nijemac na zabavu, Čeh na izlete* (Eng. *An Italian will spend money on food and sport, a German on entertainment and a Czech on trips*), it is clear that the demonyms *Talijan*, *Nijemac* and *Čeh* (Eng. *Italian, German, Czech*) are not used to refer to a specific inhabitant of Italy, Germany or Czechia but the majority. At the same time what is typically highlighted is a representative trait, habit, flaw or some other feature conventionally assigned to a nation, and the singular demonym is the representative for the entire nation. An even higher degree of synecdochal generalization is seen in the example *Komuniciraju onako europski međudržavno Janez i Mujo* (Eng. *Janez and Mujo have been communicating, y'know, in that European transnational manner*), originating from the metonymy ANTHROPONYM FOR DEMONYM, where the typical Slovenian male name *Janez* and typical Bosnian male name *Mujo* stand for Slovenians and Bosnians in general. Such synecdochal shortcuts frequently reflect stereotypes, prejudice and derogatory attitude towards the referents, which is common practice in jokes or aggressive comments online. In fact, Littlemore (2015: 39) points out that such impulsive, biased use of negative stereotypes towards large groups of people may lead to racism and chauvinism. In other examples of synecdoche originating from switching the plural with singular, we can observe compact insight into life experience and wisdom within the genre or style of a proverb, where this is a frequent device.

SINGULAR FOR PLURAL

- (66) *Sit gladnu ne vjeruje.* [siti, gladni]
The well fed does not trust the hungry. [well fed, hungry, Pl]
- (67) *Tada seljak ne bi bio kmet, a posrednik mafijaš.* [seljaci, kmetovi, posrednici, mafijaši]
Then the peasant would not be a serf, and the middleman a mobster. [peasants, serfs, middlemen, mobsters]
- (68) *Kao što Amerikanac izbjegava reći da je gubitnik, Hrvat izbjegava reći da mu je dobro.* [Amerikanci, Hrvati]
The same way an American will refuse to call himself a loser, so a Croat will not say he's doing alright. [Americans, Croats]
- (69) *Vojnik mora biti visok 175 cm i ne smije imati više od 75 kg.* [vojnici]
A soldier must be 175 cm tall and have no more than 75 kilos. [soldiers]

- (70) Evoluirani *ratnik* ili *sportaš* mora biti sposoban priznati pogreške i o njima razmišljati. [ratnici, sportaši]
A developed *warrior* or *sportsman* must be able to own up to his mistakes and reflect on them. [warriors, sportsmen]
- (71) *Mama* uvijek zna najbolje. [mame]
Mom knows best. [moms]
- (72) U idealnim obiteljima *otac* će *kćeri* davati svu ljubav bez uvjeta i natjecanja. [očevi, kćeri]
In ideal families, a *father* will provide his *daughter* with all his love, no conditions, no competition. [fathers, daughters]
- (73) *Rečenica* mu je odmjerena, a misao bremenita aluzijama. [rečenice]
His sentence is well paced, and his thoughts laden with allusions. [sentences]
- (74) *Stih* mu je slobodan, a strofe i metar različitih dužina. [stihovi]
His verse is free, and stanzas and meter vary in length. [verses]
- (75) U Velikoj Britaniji na *piluli* je 28 posto žena. [kontracepcijske pilule]
In Great Britain, 28 per cent of women is on the *pill*. [contraceptive pills]

In the example (75) two synecdochal mechanisms cooperate: other than the singular (*pilula*, Eng. *pill*) being representative for plural (*pilule*, Eng. *pills*), the entire category (*pilule*, Eng. *pills*) stands for the member, i.e., one of its subcategories (*kontracepcijske pilule*, Eng. *contraceptive pills*). In this way, the common reversibility of synecdochal mechanisms is confirmed as well as their concatenation in deriving secondary meanings of polysemous lexemes. What should be pointed out is that the reversibility is not fully reciprocal, so one direction of a specific synecdoche may be more prolific than the other, while some synecdoches may be unidirectional. We did not provide counterexamples to the synecdochal reduction of a person to its body parts. When it comes to reducing an object to one of its parts, we can name only a few reverse synecdoches where the whole object stands for its one part (e.g., in the sentence *Vjetrenjače se okreću*, Eng. *The windmills are turning*, the noun *vjetrenjače*, Eng. *windmills* stands for the blades of the windmill). Neither the formula SINGULAR FOR PLURAL has a rich opposite direction, but one synecdoche that originates from the metonymy PLURAL FOR SINGULAR is frequent and efficient enough to establish some balance in the lexical substitutions of singular and plural. The latter refers to switching the first-person singular with the first-person plural (*pluralis modestiae*), which is a common rhetorical strategy in scientific and academic discourse (Wodak et al. 2009: 45–47).

- (76) *Mi* tvrdimo da znanost i etika moraju biti povezani, kaže Iličić. [ja]
We claim that science and ethics have to be connected, Iličić says. [I]

7. Individual for general

The bidirectionality of lexical synecdoche is the result of the constant tension between, on the one hand, observing the most salient member of a group or category and the most functional part of a whole and, on the other, the need to generalize, provide information and make it compact. This is confirmed by the final rich bidirectional synecdoche we will observe in this paper — its cognitive foundation comprises the metonymies INDIVIDUAL FOR GENERAL and GENERAL FOR INDIVIDUAL. When we reduce food and drink to bread and water, we symbolically represent large general categories by using their most elementary items. When we have a banana and an apple for breakfast and say we had fruit for breakfast, we skip the naming of the individual members of a category and refer to them by using the hyperonym; we shortened the utterance and informed the collocutor but did not bother them with details. Seto (1999: 115) is of the opinion that the metonymy GENERAL FOR INDIVIDUAL reflects the Gricean maxim of quantity that states that our contribution in a conversation should be as informative as required but not more informative than is necessary (Grice 1975: 45).

INDIVIDUAL FOR GENERAL

- (77) Čovjek bez knjige može preživjeti, ali bez *kruha* i *vode* ne može. [hrana, piće]
Humans can survive without a book, but not without *bread* or *water*. [food, beverage]
- (78) Godine 1989. godine drvna je industrija u nas zapošljavala 35.000 ljudi, a danas osigurava *kruh* samo za njih 11.000. [hrana]
In the year 1989, the wood industry employed 35,000 people, and nowadays it puts *bread* on the table for 11,000 people. [food]
- (79) Zašto bi sadio krtolu kad mogu voziti taksi s aerodroma i zaraditi sigurnu *kunu*? [novac]
Why plant potatoes when I can drive a cab from the airport and earn a steady *euro*? [money]
- (80) On je platio *zadnju lipu* koju je bio dužan. [ukupan iznos]
He paid the *last cent* he owed. [total sum]
- (81) Svoju radionicu u Teslinoj 15, gdje popravlja *cipele*, ima punih 30 godina. [obuća]
He has owned his shop in Teslina 15, where he repairs *shoes*, for 30 years. [footwear]
- (82) Lako je glumiti neshvaćenog sanjara dok ti mama pere *gaće*. [odjeća]
It's easy to play a misunderstood dreamer while mom still washes your *underwear*. [clothes]
- (83) Uz to poslužite *salatu* po želji. [svježe povrće]
You can serve *salad* if you wish with this meal. [fresh vegetables]
- (84) Idemo na *kavu*? [piće]
Let's go have a *coffee*? [drinks]

GENERAL FOR INDIVIDUAL

- (85) Jeli smo *ribu* s povrćem, skuhanu u malo vode. [meso grdobine]
We had *fish* and vegetables, boiled in only a bit of water. [monkfish]
- (86) Doručkovala sam *voće*. [banane]
I had *fruit* for breakfast. [bananas]
- (87) *Cvijet* je dobio ime po svojim narkotičkim svojstvima. [narcis]
The flower got its name for its narcotic properties. [daffodils]
- (88) Ručali smo *meso*. [svinjetina]
We had *meat* for lunch. [pork]
- (89) *Školjke* se kuhaju 15–20 minuta. [dagnje]
Cook the *seashells* for 15–20 minutes. [mussels]
- (90) *Salata* je odličan izvor antioksidansa. [kristalka]
Lettuce is a rich source of antioxidants. [iceberg lettuce]
- (91) Lovci su pripremili gulaš od *divljači*. [srnetina]
The hunters have prepared *wild game* goulash. [roe deer meat]
- (92) *Pribor* se servira kada gosti sjednu. [žlica, vilica, nož]
Cutlery is placed once the guests have been seated. [spoon, fork, knife]
- (93) *Alkohol* je zabranjen, kao i pušenje u javnom prostoru. [alkoholna pića]
Alcohol is banned, as is smoking in public areas. [alcoholic beverages]
- (94) Vozač je izgubio kontrolu nad *vozilom* i zabio se u zaštitnu ogradu. [automobil]
The driver lost control of his *vehicle* and hit the protective barrier. [automobile]
- (95) *Obuća* mu je bila kožna i očito kvalitetno šivana. [cipele]
His *footwear* was made of leather and obviously well-stitched. [shoes]
- (96) U sebe vjeruje i zato što se već godinama bavi *sportom*. [karate]
He has self-confidence because he's been practicing *sports* for years. [karate]
- (97) Žaba polaže tisuće jaja u *vodi*. [površinska, slatka voda]
The frog will lay thousands of eggs in *water*. [surface water, freshwater]
- (98) Je li Fanny, ti imaš muža? – Imadah do danas. Sada si ti moj čovjek. [muž, suprug, partner]
Fanny, do you have a husband? – I had a husband until today. You are now my *man*. [husband, spouse, partner]
- (99) Milivoj se odjednom smrtno zaljubio u to prekrasno *biće*. [žena]
He fell in love suddenly with that marvelous *being*. [woman]

8. Other types of synecdoche

We will conclude the description of lexical synecdoche in Croatian by presenting three less prolific formulas which result in common and frequent, and inconspicuous to the speaker, secondary meanings of nouns, adjectives and numerals.

First, we will list examples of synecdoche originating from the metonymy SPECIFIC NUMBER FOR UNDETERMINED QUANTITY in which the undetermined quantity or undetermined duration are expressed by using numerals for precise quantity of duration (Bagić 2012: 293–294).

SPECIFIC NUMBER FOR UNDETERMINED QUANTITY

- (100) *Zakasnio sam minutu–dvije.* [malo]
I was late a *minute or two*. [a bit]
- (101) *Sam je Marić potvrdio da se s klubom sve dogovorio za pet minuta.* [kratko vrijeme, brzo]
Marić himself confirmed that he arranged everything with the club in *five minutes*. [short time, quickly]
- (102) *Priložite dva–tri retka umjetničke biografije onih koje predstavljate.* [nekoliko]
Provide *two or three* lines of artistic bio for the ones you're presenting. [a few]
- (103) *Već sam milijun puta rekao, ali ponovit ću još jednom.* [mnogo]
I have said this a *million* times and I will say it again. [innumerable]

The following examples illustrate the bidirectional geographical metonymy CONSTITUENT STATE FOR ENTIRE STATE which enables reference to the entire state by using the name of its most prominent constituent member state as well as referencing to the most prominent constituent member state by using the name of the entire country or the continent even.

CONSTITUENT STATE FOR ENTIRE STATE

- (104) *Rusija je tada opozvala svoje diplomatsko osoblje.* [SSSR]
Russia removed their diplomatic staff at that time. [USSR]
- (105) *Engleska je tada bila vodeća kolonijalna sila.* [Britansko Carstvo]
England was the leading colonial power at the time. [British Empire]
- (106) *Engleska je puna žutih novina.* [Velika Britanija]
England was full of tabloids. [Great Britain]

ENTIRE STATE FOR CONSTITUENT STATE; CONTINENT FOR COUNTRY

- (107) *Napustio je domovinu i otišao u Veliku Britaniju.* [Engleska]
He left his country and went to *Great Britain*. [England]
- (108) *Nakon puštanja na slobodu poslovno je oputovao u SSSR.* [Rusija]
After his release, he traveled to the *USSR*. [Russia]
- (109) *Ivana odlazi u Ameriku uz podršku Hrvatskog atletske saveza.* [SAD]
Ivana is going to *America* with the support of the Croatian Athletic Association. [USA]

Finally, it is important to mention the synecdoche observed when some gradient quality is represented by the highest value on the scale that contains a series of words used to qualify the quality. The conceptual foundation for this is the

metonymy HIGHEST VALUE ON SCALE FOR ENTIRE SCALE (cf. Belaj 2023: 290–291). For instance, when referring to someone's age, it is by using reference to old age, not youth, so you would ask a person *Koliko si star* (Eng. *How old are you?*), and not **Koliko si mlad* (Eng. **How young are you?*). The quantity of the distance travelled in the unit of time is called *brzina* (Eng. *speed*), not *sporost* (Eng. *slowness*) and you ask *Koliko je brz taj automobil* (Eng. *How fast is this car*), not **Koliko je spor taj automobil* (Eng. **How slow is this car*). The distance between two points is called *dužina* (Eng. *length*), not *kračina* (Eng. *shortness*) and you ask *Koliko je dug taj put* (Eng. *How long is the trip*), not **Koliko je kratak taj put* (Eng. **How short is the trip*). The highest value on the scale of a quality or order is commonly seen as positive and commendable, so it could be argued that this evokes the quality itself and the lexical morpheme is contained in the word formation of the name of the quality.

9. Weak figure of speech, but a powerful lexical mechanism

Of the three lexical mechanisms used for extending the meaning of lexemes – metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche – the least figurative potential is found in synecdoche (Nerlich – Clarke 1999: 206–207; Nerlich 2010: 314–315). Synecdoche is usually realized as a lexical mechanism and is rarely used as a stylistic device.⁸ For this reason, synecdoche is very frequent in formal discourse types (e.g., in administrative and journalistic texts and forms, police reports, public statements, etc.) where two formulas are especially frequently used, GENUS FOR SPECIES and GENERAL FOR INDIVIDUAL. When, for example, a human (SPECIES) is referred to as person (GENUS) in the sentence *Osoba je privedena u policiju* (Eng. *The person was taken to the police station*) or when a car (INDIVIDUAL) is called a vehicle (GENERAL) in the sentence *Vozilo je zaplijenjeno kao dokaz* (Eng. *The vehicle was impounded as evidence*), the truth conditions of the utterance remain intact, only the more specific concept has been replaced by the generic one. Such practice is one of the requirements of public, especially administrative discourse, which is used to avoid reference to concrete referents and present too many details about a potentially sensitive situation. In contrast to the truth conditions present in lexical synecdoche, metaphor is usually used to relativize or even completely erode the truth–conditional outcome of the lexical mechanism, so we will never find the following sentence in a police report: *Drotovi su uhitili osobu koja je nemilice derala svoje radnike i koja je već odležala dvadeset godina jer je smaknula suradnika* (Eng. *Cops have apprehended the person who has ruthlessly fleeced [ripping off] his workers and had already served twenty years in prison for wiping out his associate*). The secondary meanings of the words *drot*, *derati*, *odležati*, *smaknuti* (Eng. *cop*, *fleece* [rip off], *serve*, *wipe out*) realized in the sentence in Croatian are shaped by lexical metaphor and are not appropriate for use in a formal genre, while in a casual conversation they are rather common. Of the three polysemic

8 Most examples that Bagić (2012: 291–294) lists as examples of stylistic synecdoche are non-affective, fossilized, unmarked lexical synecdoches, which shows how difficult it is to produce an expressive synecdoche.

mechanisms, metaphor carries the largest stylistic potential and is the prototypical stylistic device which will never collide with its lexical realizations. This is possible because metaphor establishes unexpected relations between two domains and is difficult to be reduced to predictable formulas found in metonymy and synecdoche. In other words, metaphor is the queen of figures of speech, in the coddling words of Krešimir Bačić (2012: 187). While the stylistic and lexical metonymies and synecdoches are usually illustrated with the same examples, which are conventionalized commonly accepted lexical realizations, metaphor is treated very differently and is illustrated with numerous clearly delineated stylistic and lexical examples. Why is this so? Because metaphor is not predictable, and its conceptual source cannot be reduced to a set of formulas applicable to entire classes of thematically connected lexemes. Metaphor cannot be disciplined and the different manners in which it is articulated cannot be formalized, which is precisely why this is an inexhaustible mechanism in the production of stylistic devices and secondary meanings of polysemous lexemes. The predictable synecdoche is still far away from a royal status among stylistic devices, but as a lexical mechanism used to derive secondary meanings of lexemes, it is completely equal to metaphor and metonymy.

References

- Anić, Vladimir (2004). *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Novi liber
- Bačić, Krešimir (2012). *Rječnik stilskih figura*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga
- Barčot, Branka (2017). *Lingvokulturologija i zoonimska frazeologija*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada
- Belaj, Branimir (2023). Metafora, metonimija i hrvatske subordinirane strukture. In: *Kognitivna lingvistika i hrvatski jezik*. Osijek: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, 263–306
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. Cole, Peter and Jerry L. Morgan, eds. *Syntax and Semantics III. Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 41–58
- Ivić, Milka (2006). Kognitivni aspekti fenomena partonimije. *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* 70: 13–19
- Jakobson, Roman (1971). Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances. In: *Studies on Child Language and Aphasia*. The Hague – Paris: De Gruyter Mouton, 49–73
- Jakobson, Roman and Morris Halle (1956). *Fundamentals of Language*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Littlemore, Jeannette (2015). *Metonymy: Hidden Shortcuts in Language, Thought and Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Nerlich, Brigitte (2010). Synecdoche: A trope, a whole trope, and nothing but a trope?. Burkhardt, Armin, and Brigitte Nerlich, eds. *Tropical Truth(s): The Epistemology of Metaphor and other Tropes*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 297–319, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110230215.297>

- Nerlich, Brigitte and David D. Clarke (1999). Synecdoche as a cognitive and communicative strategy. Blank, Andreas, and Peter Koch, eds. *Historical Semantics and Cognition*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 197–213, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110804195.197>
- Novoselec, Zvonimir (2022). *Frazeološke jedinice sa sastavnicom srce u hrvatskom i švedskom. Kulturni modeli i motivacija*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada
- Raffaelli, Ida (2015). *O značenju. Uvod u semantiku*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska
- Seto, Ken-ichi (1999). Distinguishing metonymy from synecdoche. Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Günter Radden, eds. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 91–120, <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.4.06set>
- Ullmann, Stephen (1951). *The Principles of Semantics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Vajs, Nada (2000). Metonimija i sinegdoha. *Filologija* 35: 129–139
- Whitsitt, Samuel P. (2013). *Metonymy, synecdoche, and the disorders of contiguity*. Padova: Biblioteca Universitaria
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl and Karin Liebhart (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Second edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Leksička sinegdoha u hrvatskome jeziku

Tri mehanizma ključna za izvođenje sekundarnih značenja polisemnih leksema jesu leksička metafora, leksička metonimija i leksička sinegdoha. Budući da je leksička sinegdoha zasad dobila najmanje istraživačke pozornosti, u ovom ćemo radu ukazati na njezinu ulogu u oblikovanju polisemne strukture hrvatskih leksema. Leksičku ćemo sinegdohu opisati kao predvidljiv jezični mehanizam čije se funkcioniranje načelno može svesti na nekoliko reverzibilnih transfera: DIO ZA CJELINU i CJELINA ZA DIO, OPĆE ZA POJEDINAČNO i POJEDINAČNO ZA OPĆE, SINGULAR ZA PLURAL i PLURAL ZA SINGULAR, JEDINKA ZA VRSTU i VRSTA ZA JEDINKU. Formule navedenih transfera ujedno su zapisi pojmovnih metonimija koje smatramo kognitivnim ishodištem sinegdoške leksičke kreativnosti. Činimo to zato što i metonimija i sinegdoha operiraju unutar jedne pojmovne domene gdje jedan entitet zastupa drugi entitet na temelju prostorne, vremenske, funkcionalne ili uzročno–posljedične povezanosti. To im je zajedničko i zbog toga se sinegdoha obično drži podvrstom metonimije. S druge strane metonimija i sinegdoha imaju status zasebnih leksičkih mehanizama jer ih motiviraju različite vrste odnosa između entiteta zahvaćenih transferom. Dok metonimijski transferi proizlaze iz bliskosti entiteta koji obitavaju u pojmovnom susjedstvu kao dijelovi iste domene, sinegdoški se transferi odvijaju između same domene i njezina sastavnog dijela te nadrastaju bliskost i prelaze u inkluziju.

Keywords: lexical synecdoche, polysemy, mechanisms of polysemy, metonymy, metonymic formulas, Croatian

Ključne riječi: leksička sinegdoha, polisemija, mehanizmi polisemije, metonimija, metonimijske formule, hrvatski jezik