THE FUNCTIONING MECHANISM OF ATTRIBUTIVE METONYMY IN ENGLISH FICTIONAL DISCOURSE

UDC 811.111'373.612.2

Elena V. Anashkina, Olimpiada F. Ivanova

National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE),
Department of foreign languages, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. *This paper deals with discursive attributive metonymy. This linguistic phenomenon is clearly opposed to lexical metonymy as it occurs only in discourse and as such has some distinguishing features: non-frequency, denotation of a situation, semantic discord between the modifier and the modified noun and expressiveness. This research attempts to provide a comprehensive analysis of the functioning mechanism of discursive attributive metonymy. The findings reveal that metonymic transferences in adjectives are based on different types of contiguity between objects and their attributes and in some cases such contiguity is contextually determined. The functioning mechanism involves asymmetric relations between syntactic and semantic functions of an attribute and a syntagmatic shift. Also, in attributive metonymy there is recategorization, i.e. adjectives sometimes change their lexico-grammatical class. In terms of cognitive linguistics, the functioning mechanism is based on the mapping of different mental spaces resulting in conceptual integration and blending. In fictional discourse attributive metonymy is a means to create new occasional meanings and expressiveness.*

Key words: *attributive metonymy, discourse, contiguity, syntagmatic shift, asymmetric relations, recategorization, conceptual integration, mental space*

1. INTRODUCTION

In linguistics there is a large body of work on attributive metonymy (Novikov 1996; Lifshits 2001; Merzlyakova 2003; Sandakova 2004), although the attention it has received is much less than that for metonymy of nouns. Meanwhile, adjectives, due to their attributive nature, open up ample opportunity for metonymic denominations. Some linguists believe that attributive metonymy is a more complex phenomenon than metonymy of nouns (Potsepnya 1997:157). Adjectives per se do not have denotations, they correlate only through modified nouns. Therefore, semantically adjectives are tied

with nouns. Consequently, the mechanism of metonymic transference involves both the adjectives and nouns modified by them. According to Arutyunova (1990), attributive metonymy is an adjective-plus-noun combination where the adjective syntactically relates to the modified noun but semantically refers to another noun which is either represented in a given context or implied, while the relations between the nouns are based on contiguity of different types (p. 301), e.g. *unbreakfasted morning, a disapproving finger, a sleepless pillow.*

Researchers distinguish between two types of attributive metonymy: lexical (usual, static, based on the regular models of metonymic transferences, e.g. *a powerful throne*) and discursive (contextual, dynamic, occasional, e.g. *broad-hipped charm* (Bates, The Daffodil Sky)). In this work we study discursive attributive metonymy, which still remains under-investigated. So far there is no comprehensive analysis of this phenomenon in English fictional discourse, though certain aspects of it have been studied (Osokina 2003; Kubaeva 2009). Sandakova (2004) defines discursive attributive metonymy as non-frequent metonymic usage of an adjective in discourse which does not result in a new lexical meaning; it is a condensed denomination of a situation with two participants – implicit and explicit – sharing a common attribute the transference of which causes semantic discord; an occasional combination of the elements in discursive attributive metonymy and multidimensional representation of a situation create expressiveness (p. 297), e.g. *a breast cancer husband* (Reader's Digest, 2004).

In this paper we carry out a multifaceted analysis of the functioning mechanism of attributive metonymy in English fictional discourse. Such constructions are quite typical of the English language and frequently used in fictional discourse, as the representative sample of 1600 metonymic transferences in adjectives from the works of English-speaking writers of the 19th-21th centuries demonstrates. The analysis is based on syntagmatic and semantic research as well as on the concepts of cognitive linguistics. Some aspects of attributive metonymy are investigated in terms of syntactical and grammatical categories. We also show how attributive metonymy creates expressiveness in English fictional discourse. This integrative approach presents a more comprehensive picture of the phenomenon under study.

The selected examples of discursive attributive metonymy were analysed with the combined application of general scientific and linguistic research methods. The descriptive linguostylistic analysis was based on the sampling, analysis, classification and the following synthesis of the language material. The componential and definition analysis was conducted with the help of *Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture, Longman New Universal Dictionary, The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus.* The methods used in the research also include contextual and conceptual analysis and the methods of syntactic paraphrasing.

2. BACKGROUND

For over fifty years, Russian linguists have paid attention to contextual attributive metonymic shifts. For the purposes of discussion, the works dedicated to discursive attributive metonymy can be divided into three groups.

The first group is represented by research in attributive metonymy. Researchers studied lexical metonymy and identified contextual attributive metonymy. The latter is referred to as a transferred attribute which syntactically relates to the noun which it does not have semantic relations with (Koroteev 1964; Wellek and Warren 1984). This transferred

attribute conjures the image of its real "owner" and generates a complex semantic body (Dolinin 1978:157). In our perception, the images of two objects with a common attribute co-exist. On the one hand, a new transferred attribute is understood through the attribute of the original noun. On the other hand, by characterizing a new object, the transferred attribute enriches the original meaning with new semantic elements (Ryabtseva 1973; Dolgikh 1984; Potsepnya 1997). The degree of complexity and transformation of the original meaning depends on the character of the objects and phenomena which are bound by a common attribute, as well as on the frequency of the metonymic model in the language system. The more natural and frequent the proximity between the objects, the less expressive the transferred attribute is (e.g. *an indifferent shoulder*). By contrast, the expressiveness is higher if the metonymic transference of the attribute is based on less frequent or infrequent models (e.g. *the toothless labour* ((*L. Lee, Cider with Rosie*)).

At the same time such a complex semantic body is very succinct as the combination of the object and the alien attribute from another adjacent object represents the situation in a condensed way (Fyodorov 1985). As a result of the attributive metonymic transference, new individual contextual meanings appear which give the reader an esthetic experience (Novikov 1996). Such metonymic epithets, unlike lexical metonymy, perform an expressive function in fictional discourse (Sirotina 1980).

In linguopoetics, attributive metonymy is referred to as word-association metonymy in which the transference occurs only if the objects are contextually (or phonetically) adjacent, e.g. *a moist toll* (i.e. the toll through the moist air), *in the unshaven mirror* (the unshaven person sees himself in the mirror) (Nekrasova 1975). This peculiar type of discursive attributive metonymy, which is typical solely for poetic discourse, reveals such relations between words where the contiguity is found only at the word level. The contiguity exists between phenomena and categories of poetic discourse, between an image expressed in poetry in different forms and a means of the poetic language (Ocherki istorii yazyka 1994:194).

The cognitive-discursive paradigm enables researchers to develop new approaches to studying attributive metonymy and to reveal its new important parameters. Chkheidze (1992) introduced the terms "static metonymy" and "dynamic metonymy". Static metonymy is defined as common metonymic shifts, which correlates with lexical metonymy. The latter reveals such features as occasionalism, expressiveness and the emotional colouring of the metonymic combination and obligatory ties to the context (p.9). Raevskaya (2000) also maintains that discursive metonymy functions only within the text and does not exist outside it (p. 50). She adopts a holistic approach in her studies of discursive metonymy including traditional lexical shifts and larger-than-words combinations. For example, sentences which allow several interpretations (literal and metonymic) due to the cause-and-effect relations of their potential meanings and indirect speech acts in dialogic discourse, when one utterance is used instead of another, are considered types of discursive metonymy (Raevskaya 1999). Attributive metonymy is seen as a particular type of discursive metonymy, functioning as a transferred attribute. Sandakova (2004) in her research of attributive metonymy in Russian distinguishes between lexical and discursive metonymy and provides a comprehensive description of the latter. She points out that the mechanisms of attributive metonymy in discourse are ellipsis, nominative substitution of the modified noun and a word-building mechanism. To understand and interpret attributive metonymy in fictional discourse, the reader should have relevant background knowledge as well as draw on knowledge about the language and the world and analyse the context.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1. Contiguity

Attributive metonymy is based on contiguity (i.e. closeness of association) (Rakhmanova 1983; Ckheidze 1992). However, the qualities of attributes are such that the concept of contiguity typical for substantive metonymy is not applicable. There are different types of contiguity, which is one of the linguistic mechanisms of attributive metonymy.

1) *The contiguity of objects*
   a) *Direct relations between objects*

Sometimes the objects are juxtaposed in the reality which allows them to have a common attribute. The object from which the feature is transferred is, as a rule, not mentioned but only implied:

*At that moment the music stopped and they went to sit on two chairs against the wall. Leila tucked her **pink satin feet** under and fanned herself* (*K. Mansfield, Selected stories*).

The objects *shoes* and *feet* are naturally adjacent, therefore the attribute *pink* characterizing Object$_1$ *shoes* can characterize Object$_2$ *feet* as well.

In other cases, the objects are related as the part and the whole. The attribute can be transferred from the part to the whole as well as in the opposite direction, which is more common. Usually an attribute characterizing a person is transferred to a body part:

*He [Birkin] reached and touched the dead face. [...] In the short blond moustache the life beneath was frozen into a block of ice beneath **the silent nostrils**. And this was Gerald!* (*D.H. Lawrence, Women in love*).

   b) *Indirect relations between objects*

In this case a phenomenon or a situation is described through the emotional state or intellectual properties of the object:

*Birkin's heart began to freeze. He had loved Gerald. [...]He went over the snow slopes to see where the death had been. [...] Birkin stood high in **the painful air**, looking at the peaks and the way south* (*D.H. Lawrence, Women in love*).

The character is depressed because of his friend's death. Looking at the place where the friend had died, the man feels pain. His emotions are transferred to the external world which is now characterized through the hero's emotional state.

   c) *Secondary adjective-formation on the basis of the contiguity of objects*

Attributive metonymy of this type results from condensed multi-word combinations. They are based on the adjacency of objects but the attribute is not transferred from Object$_1$ to Object$_2$. The attribute derives from the name of one of the contiguous objects:

*On her way home she usually bought a slice of honey-cake at the baker's. It was her Sunday treat. Sometimes there was an almond in her slice, sometimes not. It made a great difference. If there was an almond it was like carrying home a tiny present – a surprise – something that might very well not have been there. She hurried on **the almond Sundays** and struck the match for the kettle in quite a dashing way* (*K. Mansfield, Selected stories*).

The attributive metonymy *almond Sundays* can unfold into "*Sundays when she bought a cake with an almond in it*". There is a natural contiguity between Object$_1$ *cake* and Object$_2$ *almond* but there is also a contextual contiguity between Object$_1$, Object$_2$ and Object$_3$ *Sunday*. No attribute is transferred from one object to another. Instead, a more complicated cognitive process occurs and the situation "*Sundays when she bought a cake with an almond in it*" is compressed into the attributive metonymy *almond Sundays* where Object$_2$ *almond* becomes an attribute to Object$_1$ *cake*.

2) *The contiguity of the objects' attributes*

Sometimes the contiguity exists not between objects but between attributes. Object$_1$ has a set of attributes which are adjacent by default as belonging to one object. One of the attributes of Object$_1$ substantivizes and is characterized with another attribute of this object:

*They crowded five of them into the taxi-cab. Halliday lurched in first, and dropped into his seat against the other window. Then Minette took her place, and Gerald sat next to her. They heard the young Russian giving orders to the driver, then they were all seated in the **dark, crowded close** together, Halliday groaning and leaning out of the window. They felt the swift, muffled motion of the car (D.H.Lawrence, Women in love).*

Object$_1$ *car* has such attributes as "*dark, crowded*". But Object$_2$ *close* is itself an attribute of Object$_1$ - a car is seen as a certain enclosure. This attribute substantivizes and is described through the other attributes of Object$_1$.

Sometimes attributes become contextually contiguous as in the following example:

*So she [Ursula] swerved down to the steep, tree-hidden bank above the pond, where the alders twisted their roots. She was glad to pass into the shade out of the moon. There she stood, at the top of the fallen-away bank, her hand on the rough trunk of a tree, looking at the water, that was perfect in its stillness, floating the moon upon it. But for some reason she disliked it. It did not give her anything. She listened for the hoarse rustle of the sluice. And she wished for something else out of the night, she wanted another night, not this **moon-brilliant hardness**. She could feel her soul crying out in her, lamenting desolately (D.H. Lawrence, Women in love).*

Here, partially, the process is the same as in the previous example: Object$_2$ *hardness* is an attribute of Object$_1$ *night* (hard night) which has substantivized and is characterized with another attribute of Object$_1$ – *moon-brilliant*. But the attribute *hard* does not originally belong to Object$_1$ *night,* it appears in the context describing the heroine's perception of the night. Thus we see here a twofold metonymic shift where the first level is based on the contiguity of the objects (the heroine – moon-brilliant hard night) and the second level is based on the contiguity of the attributes (moon-brilliant hard night – moon-brilliant hardness).

In conclusion, in fictional discourse there are such attributive metonymic transferences which are based on different types of contiguity:

*The man went in to drink his can of tea, the girls went on down the lane, that was deep in soft black dust. Gudrun was as if numbed in her mind by the sense of indomitable soft weight of the man, bearing down into the living body of the horse: the strong, indomitable thighs of the blond man clenching the palpitating body of the mare into pure control; a sort of **soft white magnetic domination** from the loins and thighs and*

calves, enclosing and encompassing the mare heavily into unutterable subordination, soft-blood subordination, terrible (D.H. Lawrence, Women in love).

The attributive metonymy *"soft white magnetic domination"* results from a condensed sentence which may be restored as follows:

*soft white magnetic domination (from the loins and thighs and calves) -
a blond (white) man with his soft weight magnetically dominated (over the mare).*

Now let us track down which components in this restored sentence are contiguous. Firstly, natural contiguity exists between the objects *man* and *weight* (as any material object has weight). From these two adjacent objects two different attributes – *white* and *soft* – go into the metonymic transference. Secondly, there is contiguity between the object *man* and the action *dominated*. The verb turns into a verbal noun in the metonymic complex. Thirdly, in the restored sentence there are syntactic relations between the action *dominated* and the adverbial modifier of manner *magnetically* and this combination transforms into the attributive metonymy *magnetic domination*. Thus, the attributive metonymy results from an originally longer multi-word combination where the noun *domination* is defined by three different adjectives, each of which reveals a particular type of contiguity.

3.2. Syntactic and semantic asymmetry

The ultimate meaning of the utterance is based on three aspects – the form, the denotative meaning and the function (Kobrina 2000). Ideally, these three criteria should correspond to each other but the symmetry between them does not occur in every case. The asymmetry between the form and the meaning is an inherent property of the language system which manifests itself at different levels (Osokina 2003). One of manifestations of such asymmetry is the transferred attribute which discloses asymmetric relations between its syntactic and semantic functions. The semantic function of the attribute is its contribution to the overall meaning of the utterance while its syntactic function is to modify a noun. In the metonymic transference the attribute belongs to an action or object with which it does not syntactically correspond as in the following examples:

> *Gatsby and I in turn leaned down and took the small **reluctant hand** (F.S. Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby).*

Here the adjective *reluctant* performs the syntactic function of an adjective while its semantic function is to describe the action (the child in this example is shy and greets the strangers reluctantly).

> *… And now I may dismiss my heroine to the **sleepless couch** which is the true heroine's portion ... (J. Austen, Northanger Abbey).*

The transferred attribute *sleepless* is syntactically connected as a modifier with the noun *coach* but semantically refers to the noun *heroine.*

In both examples the objects are combined with uncharacteristic and incompatible attributes. Such asymmetric relations are impossible in reality. Their interpretation requires restoring the primary real relations between objects, actions and their attributes, in other words, it triggers the mechanism of the reader's linguistic creativity.

The transferred attribute can be regarded as a semantic ellipsis (Sandakova 2004) which is yet another manifestation of the asymmetry between the syntactic and semantic

functions. Korovkin (2002) defines semantic ellipsis as the process when some semantic elements are shifted to the implicit level which is accompanied by structural economy, and a multi-word combination turns into a condensed one (p. 214). The reader again has to return the attribute to its original noun and explicate the metonymic transference to a multi-component structure:

*We were at a particularly **tipsy table*** (*F.S. Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby*).

In this transferred attribute the syntactic valence is realized but the semantic valence is not. The adjective *tipsy* goes together with nouns denoting human beings. But instead of the expected name the adjective combines with the word *table* which does not possess such a property. The semantic gap between the adjective and the noun can be filled by expanding the transferred attribute to a larger structure (e.g. *We were at a table where particularly tipsy people were dining*).

Sometimes it seems problematic to unfold a transferred attribute into a multi-component syntactic structure due to the fact that such a structure may turn into an artificial or awkward construction:

*[...]said Betty [..] looking with uneasy emotion at the earth displayed so luridly, with sudden sparks of light from greenhouses in gardens, with a sort of **yellow and black mutability**, against this blazing sunset, this astonishing agitation and vitality of colour [...]* (*Woolf V., Jacob's room*).

To understand this transferred epithet we need to analyse it to get to the core of the author's image:

yellow and black mutability - such change (mutability) in the light of the street when the <u>lit parts</u> (yellow) are followed by the <u>unlit parts</u> (black)

Thus, the mechanism of attributive metonymy is in line with the economy principle in language (Nikitin 1996). The structural laconism of transferred attributes, on the one hand, and their semantic saturation, on the other, make the reader reconstruct the implicit elements. The implicitness allows a variety of interpretations enhancing a certain image with different associations. All in all, transferred attributes are able to convey more information in a compact structure. The asymmetry between the syntactic and semantic functions of attributive metonymy bears evidence of language elasticity which makes it an extremely flexible tool to convey the most subtle meanings.

3.3. Syntagmatic shift

The basic meaning of an adjective shows a certain syntagmatic potential. The syntagmatic, or co-occurrence, potential is the aggregate of lexical units each of which can combine with a given adjective to denote a situation, as well as the rules of such combinability (Morkovkin 1984:6). According to Sandakova (2004), the syntagmatic potential of an adjective involves, first of all, a quantitative parameter, i.e. the ability to combine with a certain number of nouns, and most adjectives are inherently able to make numerous combinations. Secondly, this co-occurrence means the ability / non-ability to attribute particular qualities to several taxonomic classes of nouns, and in this respect there are clear differences between adjectives. So, for example, some adjectives can combine only with nouns within one taxonomic class (e.g. the adjectives *corrupt* or

religious are used to describe qualities of animated objects). Other adjectives are applicable to a greater number of classes of nouns (e.g. *long nose, long hours*). There are adjectives with a broad compatibility range (e.g. *small, big, old*, etc.). The broadest range is commonly found in adjectives with the meaning of general evaluation.

When adjectives cross the boundaries of their basic co-occurrence and become attributes for nouns of new taxonomic classes, it leads to the metonymic transfer of meaning. When authors deliberately break the usual syntagmatic rules with a view to creating vivid individual and obviously occasional meanings, it results in transferred epithets. Thus, the mechanism of attributive metonymy is based on syntagmatic shift (Arutyunova 1998:300).

Nikitin (1996) pointed out that attributive metonymy occurs as the result of the deviation from logical subordination (p.200):

> *There he recalls a number of mean dirty shops, and particularly that of a plumber and decorator with a **dusty disorder** of earthenware pipes, sheet lead, ball taps, pattern books of wall-paper, and tins of enamel (Wells, H. G. The Door in the Wall).*

In the original three-member structure with the successive subordination *a disorder of dusty earthenware pipes* the attribute *dusty* of the object *pipes* is shifted to the periphery of the word combination and becomes the attribute of the object *disorder*. Due to this intentional deviation from the rules of logical subordination, the reader's attention is captured and the context requires creative analysis. In the word combination *dusty disorder,* both components contain the seme *untidiness,* which is thus enhanced. The meaning *untidiness* is also supported by the context (the word combination *dirty shops* and the enumeration of all objects sold in the shop serve to create and intensify the impression of a shambles).

Naturally, any syntagmatic shift is followed by semantic change and the core meaning of the adjective becomes more complex. For example, the adjective *dusty* as in the word combination *dusty table* acquires a new semantic component when transferred into the word combination *dusty room* meaning *"a room where the furniture or other surfaces are covered with dust".* Moreover, according to Gak (1998), transferred attributes are characterized by a semantic discord caused by the fact that an object or a phenomenon acquires a distant and alien property (p. 285) (see the mentioned above example *dusty disorder*). Apart from this typical amplification of meaning in transferred attributes, some linguists note that the boundary between the primary meaning of the adjective and its secondary metonymic meaning is very often difficult to draw due to the diffuseness of meaning (Sandakova, 2004).

3.4. Recategorization

In attributive metonymy, adjectives sometimes change their lexico-grammatical class. Linguists point out that one of the typical characteristics of adjectives is their exceptional semantic mobility, i.e. they easily adapt to the nouns they modify (Bulygina 1996; Vol'f 1998). The meaning of an adjective is largely determined by the meaning of the modified noun. When an adjective is separated from a familiar denotation it is shifted into other semantic fields. In attributive metonymy there is not only a semantic but, in some cases, a lexico-grammatical shift as well.

Semantic classifications of adjectives are numerous with the most general division into qualitative and relative adjectives (Vol'f, 1998), though some researchers consider this division incomplete and inaccurate. According to the classification offered by Arbatskaya and Arbatskiy (1983), all adjectives can be divided into three classes depending on the character of the qualitative meaning:

1) substantive – qualitative adjectives (which in other classifications are referred to as possessive adjectives);
2) qualitative – homogenous adjectives (which, in traditional classification, are referred to as relative adjectives);
3) qualitative – gradable adjectives (traditionally, qualitative adjectives).

The recategorization of adjectives is closely related to the nouns which are elements of the attributive metonymy. According to Sklyarevskaya (1987), nouns can be classified into the following sematic categories:

1) human being;
2) animal;
3) object;
4) physical phenomenon;
5) psychic phenomenon;
6) abstract concept.

The analysis of the data reveals that the recategorization of adjectives occurs when the attribute is transferred from Object$_1$ to Object$_2$ given that they belong to different semantic categories. If Object$_1$ and Object$_2$ belong to the same sematic category, the adjective does not change its lexico-grammatical class either. The most common registered shift is from qualitative – gradable to qualitative – homogenous adjectives:

The children had gone to bed before the garden gate banged and Dicky's father staggered up the steep concrete steps carrying his bicycle. It had been a bad day at the office. He was hot, dusty, tired out. [...]
"Oh, Edward, I'm so thankful you have come home", she [his wife] cried.
*"Why, what's happened?" Edward lowered the bicycle and took off his hat. A red **angry pucker** showed where the brim had pressed. "What's up?" (K. Mansfield, Selected stories).*

In the attributive metonymy the attribute *angry* is transferred from Object$_1$ *man* (semantic category – human being) to Object$_2$ *pucker* (physical phenomenon) and recategorized from a qualitative – gradable adjective to a qualitative – homogenous adjective.

By contrast, in the following example the recategorization does not occur:

*Still she [Minette] stared into his [Gerald's] face with that slow, full gaze which was so curious and so exciting to him. [...] She wore no hat in the heated cafe, her loose, simple jumper was strung on a string round her neck. But it was made of rich yellow crepe-de-chine, that hung heavily and softly from her **young throat** and her slender wrists (D.H. Lawrence, Women in love).*

The attribute *young* is transferred from Object$_1$ *woman* (semantic category – human being) to Object$_2$ *throat* (the same semantic category). Therefore, the adjective does not change its lexico-grammatical class and remains qualitative – gradable.

3.5. Cognitive mechanism

The complex nature of implicational relations in attributive metonymy allows the study of its nature in terms of the theory of mental spaces and conceptual integration. The productivity of this approach to attributive metonymy research has been stressed by Sweetser (1999) and Fauconnier and Turner (1995, 1999).

According to Fauconnier (1994), mental spaces are arranged sets with elements and their interrelations, open to new elements and relations. People analyse not objects and phenomena in accordance with their status in the real world but their cognitive representations which make mental spaces. In other words, mental spaces are models of real or hypothetical situations as they are conceptualized by human beings.

The theory of mental spaces gave rise to the theory of conceptual integration. Conceptual integration is the basic mechanism of human thinking. As a result of conceptual integration, mental spaces are selectively represented in a new construct which is referred to as a blend by Facounnier and Turner (1996). The blend is not the sum of the mental spaces and is not identical to them. It is a comprehensive, well-integrated compact construct. During conceptual integration all knowledge arrays are involved and mental spaces are constantly reorganized. As Fauconnier (1994) points out, mental spaces are related through coreferential identity as well as analogic, metaphoric and categorial cognitive mapping.

In attributive metonymy a certain part of a mental space is foregrounded, followed by the process of conceptual integration as we can see in the example below:

*To wait, slowly turning over and over in their old minds the little joys and sorrows, events and expectancies, of their little family world, as cows chew **patient cuds** in a familiar field* (*J. Galsworthy, In Chancery*).

The attributive metonymy *patient cud* consists of two elements from two different mental spaces and makes it possible to construct a new mental space. The adjective *patient* describes behaviour and belongs to the mental space "Human being". The modified noun *cud* belongs to the mental space "Cows" and foregrounds such characteristics of cows as deliberation and slow chewing. So, in this attributive metonymy there is a mapping of the original categories "Food" and "Animal" and the category "Patience". The contrast based on the opposition "Human being" - "Animal" is accompanied by the common characteristic "long and slow" which results in the attribute intensification and a new meaning (resignation, passivity).

Thus, in terms of cognitive linguistics, attributive metonymy can be considered the result of the conceptual integration, or mapping, of different mental spaces where a part of one mental space is foregrounded and substitutes the whole space resulting in a new meaning.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we investigated discursive attributive metonymy. The findings provide insights into its functioning mechanism. The analysis showed that adjective transference is based on different types of contiguity between the objects and their attributes. The functioning mechanism involves syntactic and semantic asymmetry and syntagmatic shift. In some cases there is also a lexico-grammatical shift, or recategorization. The cognitive mechanism is based on the mapping of different mental spaces resulting in

conceptual integration and blending. In fictional discourse attributive metonymy is a means to create new occasional meanings and expressiveness. The findings may be useful in many areas of investigation that deal with metonymy, adjectives or discourse analysis. They may be of interest to teachers and students of English and can be applied in designing courses in theoretical grammar, stylistics and text interpretation.

References

1. Arbatskaya, E.D. & Arbatskiy, D.I., (1983), "On lexico-semantic classes of Russian adjectives" [O leksiko–semanticheskikh klassakh imen prilagatel'nykh russkogo yazyka], *Voprosy yazykoznaniya,* 1:pp.52-65.

2. Arutyunova, N.D., (1998), "Metonymy", In: Yartseva V.N. (Ed.) *Linguistics. Encyclopedia.* (pp.300-301). [Metonimiya. In Yazykoznanie. Bol'shoy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar']. Moscow.

3. Bulygina, E.J., (1996), "The modification of semantics of expressive adjectives in speech", In *Actualization of the semantic – pragmatic potential of the language sign.* [Modifikatsiya semantiki ekspressivnogo prilagatel'nogo v rech. In Aktualizatsiya semantiko–pragmaticheskogo potentsiala yazykovogo znaka] : pp. 40-46, Novosibirsk.

4. Chkheidze, V.V., (1992), *Attributive metonymy in Pushkin's poetry* [Ad"ektivnaya metonimiya v poezii A.S. Pushkina], Dissertation Abstract, Saint Petersburg.

5. Dolgikh, I.A., (1984), "Some aspects of studying metonymy" [Aspekty izucheniya metonimi], *Vestnik Moskovskogo un–ta, Seriya 9. Filologiya*, 4: pp. 52-59.

6. Dolinin, K.A., (1978), *French stylistics* [Stilistika frantsuzskogo yazyka], Saint Petersburg.

7. *Essays on the history of the XX century Russian poetry language: Tropes in individual styles and poetic language,* (1994), [Ocherki istorii yazyka russkoy poezii KhKh veka: Tropy v individual'nom stile i poeticheskom yazyke], Moscow.

8. Fauconnier, G.& Turner, M., (1996),"Blending as a Central Process of Grammar", In:*Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*: pp. 113-130, Stanford, California, Center for the Study of Language and Information.

9. Fauconnier, G. & Turner, M., (1999), "A Mechanism of Creativity", *Poetics Today*, *20* (3): pp. 397-418.

10. Fauconnier, G. & Turner, M., (1995), "Conceptual Integration and Formal Expression", *Journal of Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 10* (3): pp. 183-204.

11. Fauconnier, G., (1994), *Mental Spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in normal languages,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

12. Fedorov, A.I., (1985), *Tropology* [Obraznaya rech'], Novosibirsk.

13. Gak, V.G., (1998), *Language transformations* [Yazykovye preobrazovaniya], Moscow.

14. Gal'perin, I.R., (1981), *Stylistics*, Moscow, Vysshaya shkola.

15. Kobrina, N.A., (2000), "Language as a cognitive-creative human activity", In: *Studia Lingüistica - 9. Cognitive – pragmatic and expressive functions of language:* pp. 23-29 [Yazyk kak kognitivno-kreativnaya deyatel'nost' cheloveka. In Studia Lingüistica - 9. Kognitivno-pragmaticheskie i khudozhestvennye funktsii yazyka], Saint Petersburg.

16. Koroteev, A.A., (1964), Syntactic shifts in the modern Russian language [Sintaksicheskie smeshcheniya v sovremennom russkom yazyke], *Dissertation Abstract, Kuybyshev.*

17. Korovkin, M.M., (2002), "The communicative aspect of economy: is the syntactic ellipsis implicit?", In:*Text and Discourse: traditional and cognitive – functional approaches to research*: pp.209-218 [Kommunikativnyy aspekt ekonomii: implitsiten li sintaksicheskiy ellipsis? In Tekst i diskurs: traditsionnyy I kognitivno-funktsional'nyy aspekty issledovaniya], Ryazan'.

18. Kubaeva, F.R., (2009), *Cognitive-semantic characteristics of the transferred epithet in the English language* [Kognitivno-semanticheskie kharakteristiki perenesennogo epiteta v angliyskom yazyke], Dissertation Abstract, Pyatigorsk.

19. Lifshits, G.M., (2001), *Types of polysemy in the modern Russian language* (*a case study of evaluative adjectives*) [Vidy mnogoznachnosti v sovremennom russkom yazyke (Na materiale otsenochnykh imen prilagatel'nykh)], Moscow.

20. Merzlyakova, A.H., (2003), *Types of semantic variation in the adjectives of perception* (*a case study of English, Russian and French*) [Tipy semanticheskogo var'irovaniya prilagatel'nykh polya «Vospriyatie» (na materiale angliyskogo, russkogo I frantsuzskogo yazykov), Moscow.

21. Morkovkin, V.V., (1984), "Word semantics and syntagmatics", In: *Word syntagmatics and issues of teaching Russian as a foreign language:* pp. 5-15 [Semantika i sochetaemost' slova. In Sochetaemost' slov i voprosy obucheniya russkomu yazyku inostrantsev], Moscow.

22. Nekrasova, E.A., (1975), "Metonymic transference in relation to some issues of linguistic poetics", In: *The word in Russian Soviet poetry:* pp.111-131 [Metonimicheskiy perenos v svyazi s nekotorymi problemami lingvisticheskoy poetiki // Slovo v russkoy sovetskoy poezii], Moscow.

23. Nikitin, M.V., (1996), *The course in linguistic semantics* [Kurs lingvisticheskoy semantiki], Saint Petersburg.

24. Novikov, A.L., (1996), *Metonymy in the Russian language* (*Semantic structure. Word-formation potential. Stylistic functions*) [Metonimiya v russkom yazyke, (Semanticheskaya struktura. Slovoobrazovatel'nyy potentsial. Stilisticheskie funktsii)], Doctoral dissertation, Moscow.

25. Osokina, N.J., (2003), *Transferred sentence parts as a syntactic phenomenon and stylistic device* [Smeshchennye chleny predlozheniya kak yavlenie sintaksisa i kak stilisticheskiy priem], Dissertation Abstract, Barnaul.

26. Potsepnia, D.M., (1997), *The worldview in the author's word* [Obraz mira v slove pisatelya], Saint Petersburg.

27. Raevskaya, O.V., (1999), "On several types of discursive metonymy" [O nekotorykh tipakh diskursivnoy metonimii], *Izvestiya AN. Seriya LYa, 58* (2): pp.3-12.

28. Raevskaya, O.V,. (2000), "Metonymy in word and text" [Metonimiya v slove i v tekste], *Filologicheskie nauki, 4:* pp. 49-55.

29. Rakhmanova, L.I., (1983), "On nature of metonymy", In: Vomperskiy V.P. (Ed.) *Lexical units and the organization of the literary text structure* [K voprosu o prirode metonimii. In Leksicheskie edinitsy i organizatsiya struktury literaturnogo teksta]: pp. 70-84, Kalinin.

30. Ryabtseva, E.G., (1973), *Linguistic nature and stylistic functions of metonymic tropes* (*a case stydy of English*) [Lingvisticheskaya priroda i stilisticheskie funktsii metonimicheskikh tropov (na materiale angliyskogo yazyka)], Dissertation Abstract, Saint Petersburg.

31. Sandakova, M.V., (2004), *Attributive metonymy in the Russian language* [Metonimiya prilagatel'nogo v russkom yazyke], Doctoral dissertation, Moscow.

32. Sirotina, V.A., (1980), "Metonymy and metonymic epithet in fictional discourse" [Metonimiya i metonimicheskiy epitet v khudozhestvennoy rechi], *Russkiy yazyk v shkole, 6:* pp.72-77.

33. Sklyarevskaya, G.N., (1987), "Language metaphor in a dictionary. The experience in the system description" [Yazykovaya metafora v slovare. Opyt sistemnogo opisaniya], *Voprosy yazykoznaniya, 2:* pp. 58-65.

34. Sweetser, E., (1999), "Compositionality and Blending: Semantic Composition in a Cognitive Realistic Framework", *Cognitive Linguistics Research, 15, Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Score, and Methodology:* pp. 129-162.

35. Usminskiy, O.I., (1996), *Sensory tropes: classification, meaning, functions* [Sensornye tropy: klassifikatsiya, znachenie, funktsii], Tyumen'.

36. Vol'f, E.M., (1998), "Adjective", In: Yartseva V.N. (Ed.) *Linguistics. Encyclopedia:* pp.397-398 [Metonimiya. In Yazykoznanie. Bol'shoy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'], Moscow.

37. Wellek, R. & Warren, A., (1984), *Theory of literature*, Mariner Books.

DICTIONARIES

1. Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture, (2000), (3rd edition), Pearson ESL.
2. Longman New Universal Dictionary, (1982), Longman Dictionaries, London.
3. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, (1973), New York, Random House.
4. Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus, (2002), (2nd edition), Webster's New World.

MATERIAL

1. Austen, J., (2000), *Northanger Abbey*, Kent, Wordsworth Edition.
2. Bates, H.E., (1955), *The Daffodil Sky*, London, Michael Joseph.
3. Fitzgerald, F.S., (1973), *The Great Gatsby,* Kiev, Dnepro Publishers.
4. Galsworthy, J., (1974), *In Chancery*, Moscow, Progress Publishers.
5. Lawrence, D.H., (1996), *Women in Love*, Penguin Books.
6. Lee, L., (1959), *Cider with Rosie*, Penguin Books.
7. Mansfield, K., (1953), *Selected stories*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing   House.

  8.   Reader's Digest, November, 2004, Aventis, 2004.
  9.   Wells, H. G., (2000), "The Door in the Wall", In: English story of XX century: short stories. (Comp. by Samuelyan N.A.): pp. 3-26, Moscow, Manager.
 10.   Woolf, V., (1974), *Jacob's room*, London, The Hogarth Press.

FUNKCIONALNI MEHANIZAM ATRIBUTIVNE METONIMIJE U ENGLESKOM DISKURSU FIKCIJE

Ovaj rad bavi se atributivnom metonimijom diskursa. Ovaj lingistički fenomen je u suprotnosti sa leksičkom metonimijom zato što se javlja isključivo u diskursu i kao takav poseduje neke prepoznatljive karakteristike: nevelika učestalost, označavanje situacije, semantičko neslaganje izmedju modifikatora i modifikovane imenice i ekspresivnost. Ovo istraživanje pokušava da pruži detaljnu analizu funkcionalnog mehanizma atributivne metonimije diskursa. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da se metonimijski prenosi u pridevima zasnivaju na različitim vrstama povezanosti izmedju objekata i njihovih atributa i u nekim slučajevima takva povezanost je kontekstualno uslovljena. Funkcionalni mehanizam uključuje asimetrične odnose između sintaksičke i semantičke funkcije atributa i sintagmatičko pomeranje. Takođe, u atributivnoj metonimiji postoji rekatekorizacija, npr. pridevi nekada promene svoju leksičko-gramatičku klasu. U pogledu kognitivne lingvistike, funcionalni mehanizam je zasnovan na mapiranju različitih mentalnih prostora što dovodi do konceptualne integracije i stapanja. U diskursu fikcije atributivna metonimija je sredstvo pomoću kog se stvara novo promenljivo značenje i ekspresivnost.

Ključne reči: *atributivna metonimija, diskurs, povezanost, sintagmatičko pomeranje, asimetrični odnosi, rekategorizacija, konceptualna integracija, mentalni prostor*