

E-ISSN: 2709-9369

P-ISSN: 2709-9350

www.multisubjectjournal.com

IJMT 2022; 4(2): 25-30

Received: 29-06-2022

Accepted: 05-08-2022

Dr. Ihsan Hashim Abdulwahid
Department of English,
College of Education,
University of Thi-Qar, Iraq

Conceptual synecdoche in Iraqi Arabic

Dr. Ihsan Hashim Abdulwahid

Abstract

This investigation sheds light on the way of constructing meaning, using a particular type of conceptual metonymy that is called 'synecdoche' which is divided into two types: The part for the whole and the whole for the part. The data are tackled in accordance to the qualitative method, they are analyzed depending on the framework of the conceptual metonymy presented by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) who present synecdoche as a type of metonymy that implies the part for the whole. Furthermore, synecdoche also includes another case that is the use of the whole in order to refer to just a part (The whole for the part). The study has found out that this type of the conceptual metonymy is employed in Iraqi Arabic- It uses one domain to refer to another one. These domains represent a particular relationship in which one domain is either a part of the whole or the whole referring to just a part and these domains do not refer to one concept, instead they are two separated entities.

Keywords: Conceptual metonymy, synecdoche, domain, concept

1. Introduction

Metonymy has been dealt with for a long time as just a figure of speech that has something to do just in language. Metonymy has traditionally been viewed as one of the main figures of speech identified in the classical rhetoric. The recent view of metonymy is that metonymy should extend up to include the conceptual aspects of meaning. Cognitively speaking, metonymy is not just a speech figure which has the role of organizing meaning, or producing and interpreting the meaning, but it also indicates that there is a continuous sequence between the linguistic meaning and its communicative use (Panther and Thornburg, 2007: 237).

The process of metonymy is distinguished as a referential phenomenon (Panther and Thornburg, 2003: 2) ^[15]. The main function of this conceptual process is referential in that a particular entity is used to refer to another, but this is not the only function-it also has the function of understanding by the use of such a reference (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 36) ^[11]. Howe (2006: 91) ^[9] agrees with Lakoff and Johnson's view of metonymy (1980) ^[11], saying that it is used for a referential purpose- its main function is experientially and conceptually established. It systematically and conventionally operates in languages. This process expresses the human thinking and actions and also has a crucial impact on them.

Yule (2006: 121) ^[20] asserts that examples of metonymy should be conventionalized and easily interpreted because it is implicit and relies on the listener's ability of inferring to the speaker's intended meaning. The way of interpreting metonymy may be so broad, it may extend to the relationship between form and meaning (this includes the study of sign), the relationship between the acronym and its full form, the relationship between the prototype and the category it categorizes and the relationship between the linguistic sign and its referent (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 216) ^[4]. Gibbs (1994: 20) ^[7] shows that synecdoche is a certain form of metonymy that is a way of exchanging the name of the part for the whole or vice versa. Thus, this case is of two types which are the part for the whole and the whole for the part. For the purpose of the present study, metonymy is construed to include just one case that is synecdoche. The collected examples are explicated according to the speakers' views and exhibited in real situations.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Conceptual Domains

In linguistics, a context for categorizing a unit is semantically considered a domain that is principally a cognitive entity which may be a concept or conceptual complex, representational space or mental experience. There are two kinds of domains which are explicit and implicit. Generally speaking. One domain cannot absolutely defines another, it can only refer to it. For instance, KNUCKLE can be used to refer to the conception of finger, but it does not define it.

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Ihsan Hashim Abdulwahid
Department of English,
College of Education,
University of Thi-Qar, Iraq

These concepts are interrelated to each other in that it is not possible to talk about a knuckle without identifying the finger as a holistic entity. Thus, the concept of finger supplies an essential context (or a domain) for describing the concept of knuckle. To be characterized, the concept of knuckle should be identified depending on its position in the configuration of the hand, and the knowledge of such a configuration constitutes one domain of the finger's. The concept of hand is also characterized by its position in relation to the arm that is partially related to the human body as a whole (Langacker, 1987: 147) ^[13].

Evans and Green (2006: 14) ^[5] define the conceptual domain as "a body of knowledge within our conceptual system that contains and organises related ideas and experiences", they show an appropriate example of domains which is TIME as in the example of "Christmas is approaching". This example exhibits two kinds of domains: the first domain is the concept of time that is an abstract conceptual domain, employed to explicate a temporal concept of Christmas that is a temporal event. On the other hand, there is a concrete domain in that Christmas is conceptually conceived using the domain of the physical MOTION that appears obviously in using 'approaching'.

Radden and Dirven (2007: 11) ^[17] mention that "A conceptual domain is the general field to which a category or frame belongs in a given situation". They explain this idea in the example of using the knife in that the situation plays an important role of identifying the domain associated with this concept. If the word knife is used in the kitchen, it will belong to the domain of eating, as it is used for cutting bread when having a meal on the table. On the other side, it may be used as a weapon in the fighting (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 11) ^[17].

2.2 Metonymy as a Cognitive Phenomenon

Traditionally speaking, metonymy has been used as a linguistic trope that has something to do only with language (Evans and Green, 2006: 311) ^[5]. Recently, cognitive semanticists deal with metonymy as a phenomenon that is essential to the conceptual system, in addition to being a superficial language device. Metonymy is referred to as a cognitive mechanism employed to draw the inference, reasoning about and understanding the world (Ibanez and Hernandez, 2003: 24) ^[10]. It has been argued that in studying cognitive semantics, the foremost approach of conceptual metonymy is evolved by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) ^[11] who assert that the conceptual metonymy is a conceptual process that has its distinct basis. It is associated with both language and thought (Evans and Green, 2006: 293) ^[5].

Metonymy is similar to personification metaphor in that things are given human qualities, and thus they are referred to as human beings who are able to move, impacting others like the well-known example of "The ham sandwich is waiting for his check". In the personification metaphor, the entity (thing) is given appropriate human characteristics to be understood in a way in which the human being behaves; the idea of metonymy indicates that one entity (thing) is referred to as another (human being). In the given example, the entity of ham sandwich has been obtained human characteristics to refer to the man who has got a sandwich and is now sitting on the table, waiting for his check. Accordingly, there should be two entities: one entity occurs in the linguistic context while the second one is brought to the situation, depending on the physical context in which the

word is referred to- these two entities have a relationship that can be distinguished to the listener or reader. Another example is "The Times hasn't arrived at the press conference yet", in which Times newspaper is given human characteristics so as to refer to the reporter of this newspaper (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) ^[11].

Evans and Green (2006: 288) ^[5] confirm Lakoff and Johnson's idea including that "Metonymy depends upon an association between two entities so that one entity can stand for the other". There is a conceptual relation between the two entities based on the metonymic basis. In such a relation, one entity refers to another, so that this relation has a referential nature. In metonymy, the entities are pinpointed in order to be expressed clearly. This is clearly exhibited in the two examples: "My wheels are parked out (the) back" and "My motor is parked out (the) back", in which the terms of wheels and motor indicate to the whole concept of car. Although there are two entities, the first entity is just one part of the second entity.

2.3 Metonymic Mapping

Panther and Thornburg (2007: 237) define metonymy as a semantic link between two senses of a particular lexical item depending on a contiguous relationship between the referents. Thus, in metonymy, there is mapping from one domain onto another that depends on a referential relation in which the name of one thing (the source or vehicle) refers to another thing (the target), and these two things have either a particular association or contiguity. This idea is referred to as the substitution theory of metonymy. This theory's idea is that the source and the target (at a certain level of analysis) are equivalent ways of choosing the same referent. For instance, the sentence "Buckingham Palace issued a statement this morning" implies how Buckingham Palace (the source) may refer to the British queen or a spokesman (the target) of hers. This theory is very simplistic in that it only emphasizes the referential function of metonymy. In fact, it is not only found in the referential level but also in the predicational and illocutionary levels. Radden and Kovecses (1999 as cited in Panther and Thornburg, 2007: 238) confirm that the predicative process of metonymy has more than the operation of substitution to do. For instance, in the sentence "She is just a pretty face", a pretty face has both a referential task (it is used as a substitute expression for a pretty person) and a predicative task in that it shows the idea of the prettiness of the person's face, so we can infer the prettiness of the person. Thus, such a sentence exhibits more content than its plain meaning.

In contrast to metaphor which includes mapping one domain to another and the two domains are not part of the same matrix, metonymy is the mapping of the same domain matrix. Panther and Thornburg (2007: 238) mention that the idea of domain matrix is associated with Langacker's (1987) ^[13] view that:

The notion of domain matrix goes back to Langacker's (1987) ^[13] insight that the meaning of an expression can often only be determined against the background of a set of overlapping domains that jointly serve as a base against which the meaning of an expression is profiled.

Thus, mapping of metonymy includes just one cognitive domain. This is confirmed by Lakoff and Turner (1989: 103) ^[12] who show that metonymy includes just one domain in that the metonymic mapping is found in a single conceptual domain.

2.4 Synecdoche

Baldick (2001: 254) ^[1] and Mey (2009: 888) ^[14] mention that 'synecdoche' is related to the Greek term 'synekdoche' that is applied to the way of understanding one thing in relation to another. It is also similar to metonymy in the way it is dealt with in that it has the same traditional view of synecdoche which is considered as a rhetorical trope used semantically to refer to a term using a broader or a narrower term (Bussmann, 1996: 1163) ^[3]. Harvey (1967: 795-6) ^[8] has the same idea of dealing with synecdoche, it is a figure of speech that uses a more comprehensive term to refer to a less one or vice versa. The traditional view deals with synecdoche as very distinct from metonymy (Bredin, 1984: 46) ^[2].

To deal with synecdoche, one should know that there are two views of synecdoche in relation to metonymy. The first view confirms that they are two processes which have similar functions but different in their categorization. In spite of the similar notion (they deal with relations of larger and lesser entities) shared by both metonymy and synecdoche, they function differently. In general, synecdoche refers to the part as a whole and uses some terms of reference that are usually concrete- it is commonly used in colloquial usages. For instance, people always use the hand to substitute a worker, the head for substituting a person, or the door for substituting a house. Such examples are found in the usages of "They're taking on hands down at the factory", "we had to pay ten dollars a head just to get into the concert" and "Mary Sue lives four doors down the street". On the other hand, metonymy is more productive and precise than synecdoche in that it substitutes the token for the type, or a certain example or a feature for the general principle or function. Its terms often associate abstract entities with concrete ones, e.g., the bench is used for substituting the law and the pen is employed to substitute the author (Gibbs 1994: 322.3) ^[7].

Taylor (2003: 224) ^[18] deals with synecdoche as a subcategory of metonymy, explicating that the salient part is employed to refer to the whole, e.g., in the sentence "We need some new faces around here", the speaker uses the word faces to persons where the face is the most salient part of the human being. Another example is the use of an institution as a reference to the influential group or person. Metonymy and synecdoche are not often recognizable. Although Gibbs (1994: 322) ^[7] tries to distinguish between metonymy and synecdoche, he asserts that the metonymic expression can be dealt with as a synecdoche. These two conceptual processes may be overlapped in some situations, such as a phrase in certain examples is considered as synecdoche according to a particular perspective while it is regarded as metonymy according to another one. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 36) ^[11] include that there is a particular case of metonymy which is "THE PART FOR THE WHOLE", this case was called synecdoche by the traditional rhetoricians. They show this case by their examples: "We need a couple of strong bodies for our team. (= strong people)", "There are a lot of good heads in the university. (= intelligent people)", "I've got a new set of wheels. (= car, motorcycle. etc.)" and "We need some new blood in the organization. (= new people)".

These cases are similar to the other cases of metonymy in which one entity refers to another, i.e. the use of one entity to stand for the other one. In this case of metonymy, choosing a particular part of the whole determines which

aspect we are going to focus. The emphasis of the speaker is choosing a part helps understand the importance of this part or the whole, on the other hand. For example, "good heads" may be chosen to refer to "intelligent people". The significance of using the part (head) is not only to conceive the whole (person) but also to choose a certain feature of the person, particularly, the intelligence that is related to the concept of head (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 36) ^[11].

Croft and Cruse (2004: 217) ^[4] confirm the two cases of synecdoche which are: THE PART FOR THE WHOLE, as in "I noticed several new faces tonight" and THE WHOLE FOR THE PART, as in "Do you need to use the bathroom?". Evans (2007: 142-3) ^[6] shows the case of THE WHOLE FOR THE PART by giving the examples of "England beat Australia in the 2003 Rugby World Cup final", "The European Union has just passed new human rights legislation" and "My car has developed a mechanical fault". Tuggy (2007: 105) ^[19] also verifies that this case of metonymy is called synecdoche or "meronymical metonymy" which also has two cases that are "part-to-whole or whole-to-part metonymy". It is the way "where one of the two concepts involved is largely coextensive with the common base for the two concepts", as in the example of wheels referring to the vehicle where the common base is a vehicle with its wheels.

3. Material and Method

The data are collected from different sources but the main source is the use of dictionaries of Iraqi Arabic. The researcher, as a native speaker of Iraqi Arabic, uses other sources of collecting data that depend on communicating Iraqis either in face-to-face communication situations, or using the different devices of the social media, such as Facebook and Whatsapp. The main objective of this investigation is a qualitative analysis of synecdoche and its two types which are the part for the whole and the whole for the part.

In general, metonymy can be broadly interpreted, but this study sheds light on just one case of metonymy that is traditionally called synecdoche. The data collected are handled and analyzed according to Lakoff and Johnson's Cognitive Approach of Metonymy (1980) that deals with synecdoche as a particular case of metonymy that includes the part for the whole. Moreover, there is another view employed by other cognitive semanticists to imply another case which is the whole for the part. In this study, synecdoche is employed to deal with examples of the two cases.

4. Data Analytics of some Synecdochical Expressions in Iraqi Arabic

For the purpose of analyzing the collected data, the two types of synecdoche (the part for the whole and the whole for the part) are employed depending on the cognitive views.

4.1 The Part for the Whole

This type can be presented by various aspects of the human life that may be associated with the human body or things in the world in which we live. Generally speaking, there are some parts of the human body which are commonly used, such as the concept of hand which is used to refer to other concepts like the concept of help. For example, the expression of "اطيني ايديك", (give me a help), refers to how the

speaker is in need of help. Another concept expressed by 'hand' is 'criminal', for instance, "أيده ملطخة بالدم" (he is criminal), is employed to explicate how the listener is criminal. Another part of the human body is the eye that is used to express the envy as in "عينه بالمكان" (he is very envious) in an attempt to refer to how the person is grudging. Another thing that may be referred to using this concept is the desire as in "عينه عليها" (he likes her) to explain how the person likes or loves her.

The third part of the human body is the heart that refers to various concepts, such as the contradictory concepts of good and evil. Appropriate examples are "كلمته أبيض" (his is kind) referring to how the person is kind and "كلمته أسود" (he is evil) referring to how the person is hostile. Another part chosen in this study is the head as in "زاسين بالحلال" (two persons are advised to marry) that refers to a way of gathering a man and a woman in a marriage. This concept also expresses how the person is intelligent as in "عقل" (he is intelligent). The concept of tongue is also employed for the purpose of synecdoche as in "لسانه حلو" (he has a polite speaking style). Her is a situation in which the speaker indicates that the person has a nice style of speaking where the tongue is just one part of those organs that are responsible for speaking.

This type of synecdoche can also be applied to the concept of animal as in the example of using the head to refer to the whole animal, such as "أريد راسين من الحلال" (I want two heads of cattle, in which the speaker wants to buy or take two animals. Synecdoche also occurs in some expressions associated with the nature of the work in that the speaker uses one element or part associated with his work in order to refer to the whole work for saving time talking about unnecessary details of the work. One example of such synecdoche is the expression of "عندي محاضرة" (I have a lecture). This expression may be said by a professor to indicate to the university (the place in which he works). There are other expressions used to refer to the work, such as "زايح للعمليات" (I'm going to the surgeries) that is said by a doctor or a nurse, "زايح للواجب" (I'm going to the duty) that is said by an officer or a policeman and "زايح للسوك" (I'm going to the market) that is said by a salesman who works there or a person who is going to the market for buying something.

This kind is also used to refer to different sorts of feelings: first, the love as in the expression of "يابعد روعي" in which the speaker expresses how that person is so precious to him'. The speaker uses the concept of soul to refer to the whole person (himself), showing how he loves this person. This type also occurs in our conversations, e.g. when the speaker urges the listener to do a particular thing, such as the expression of "أنطي حجابتين بالعظم" (give him significant words), by which the speaker urges the listener to give a person effective words that may be one sentence or a group of sentences- they are more significant than talking for long time with no use. Here is the use of a part (two words) to refer to the whole (sentence). This conceptual process can also be applied to the concept of the car used as a whole. For instance, modern cars have some prominent features that are not found in the old ones like their smart keys which depend on wireless control. So the speaker uses such a feature to refer to the whole modern cars, as in "السيارة بصمة" that refers how the car is one of the modern fashion. In the park, is "نقن عندي بصمتين" that is said by the worker when the owner of the park, or another worker asks him about the

number of the cars that are still in the car. Thus, the worker uses one part to refer to the whole car.

In guiding people to their destination, the door can stand for the house as in "الباب الثاني على اليمين" (the next door on right). In this situation, the speaker uses the door as a part of the house to refer to the whole house since it is the most prominent part of the house. Another concept referred to in this section is the place in which we live, such as "أسكن يم" and "أسكن يم الإمام الحسين" that respectively mean 'I live near Al-Imam Ali' and 'I live near Al-Imam Al-Hussain'. In this situation, the speaker uses the most prominent part of the place to refer to the whole place like Imam Ali Shrine to refer to Al-Najef City, or Imam Al-Hussain Shrine to refer to Karbala City.

The situation plays a crucial role of understanding the meaning of the conceptual synecdoche. In conversations, people do not like to waste time in talking about details, they tend to use the words that carry the main ideas. An appropriate example is included in the situation in which a speaker is in the market to buy some sorts of vegetables and fruits, he may use the words 'كيلو تفاح' (a kilo of apple), 'واحد برتقال' (a kilo of orange), 'كيلو باننجان' (a kilo of eggplant) and 'واحد فلفل' (a kilo of pepper). In this situation, the speaker employs such words to refer to the whole sentence which is "I want to buy a kilo of a sort of the grocery.

4.2 The Whole for the Part

This type has many examples associated with different aspects of the life. One example is in contrast to the example given in THE WHOLE FOR THE PART related to the place of living. People sometimes employ the whole place to refer to a particular part of that place, such as "راح أزور النجف" (I am going to visit Al-Najef) and "زايح أزور كربله" (I am going to visit Karbala). The speaker uses the whole place (the province) in order to refer to a particular place. Thus, he uses Al-Najef as a whole to refer to Al-Imam Ali Shrine and Karbala as a whole to refer to Al-Imam Al-Hussain Shrine. Moreover, we sometimes use to the whole country not just a province so as to refer to a place or an aspect found in this country, such as "زايح لايران" (I am going to Iran) by which the speaker refers to visiting Al-Imam Ali Al-Rudha, or for the purpose of tourism. Another example is "زايح أسافر للشمال" (I am travelling to the north)- the speaker refers to just one province to travel to like Erbil or Sulaymaniyah. This type is also applied to the expression of "تركيا بيها بحر" (Turkey has a sea), but there is actually a sea in just one place of Turkey.

The profession can also be included in this type as in the following example "الطب بابيران كلش زين" (the medicine is very good in Iran) that includes how the speaker uses the general term (medicine) to refer to some professional doctors existing in Iran. The example concerning the nature of the work can also be applied to this type as in "راح أروح للجامعة" (I will go to university) by which the speaker uses the whole concept (university) to refer to one department in which he works. Another example is "زايح للمعارض" (I am going to the car shows)- the speaker employs the whole concept (the car shows) in order to refer to just his car show. Moreover, a pharmacist may tell his wife that "I have just left the hospital" that can be similarly said in Iraqi Arabic "توني طلعت من المستشفى". The speaker uses the hospital to refer to the pharmacy of the hospital in which he works. A worker may say "أشتغل بغداد" (I work in Baghdad) in that he does not mean that he works in all parts of this province, he

refers to just one place in which his work occurs.

This type also occurs in the concept of nationality or the place you live. For instance, the person may be asked "Where are you from?" and his answer is "I am Iraqi" that is "أنا عراقي" in Iraqi Arabic - this does not mean that the speaker refers to the whole Iraq, but he means just one part (province or city) in which he lives. This is similar to the situation when the person is asked about the province in which he lives, he uses a particular province in which there is one place (city or street) in which he lives. This kind of synecdoche extends to the use of institutions to refer to their members or those who judge or manage in such institutions, as in the examples of "الوزارة" (ministry), "المحافظة" (province), "الدائرة" (bureau), "مجلس القضاء الأعلى" (Higher Judicial Board), "المسرح العراقي" (Iraqi theater), "دائرة الصحة" (The Health Bureau) and "هيئة النزاهة" (Integrity Commission), referring to the person who judges or manages like the minister or a particular committee which may be called the opinion panel or the board of directions.

Speakers sometimes use the whole group in order to refer to the members of such groups, as in the examples of "الشرطة العراقية" (Iraqi policemen), "تخلية الأزمة" (crisis group), "بيت أبو علي" (Abo Ali's family), "العشيرة" (tribe), "الأساتذة الجامعيين" (Iraqi university instructors), "الطلبة المجتهدين" (diligent students) and "الموظفين المحجدين" (hard-working employee) by which the speaker refers to the whole members of the group. In the expression "فاز العراق على إيران", there is also a reference to the part using the whole in that the speaker uses 'العراق' (Iraq) to refer Iraqi football team and 'إيران' to refer to Iranian football team. It is possible to use the term of team to refer to its members as in the expression of "منتخبنا". Here is a reference to the ability of playing football by members of the Iraqi football team.

The speaker may talk about the whole types of vegetables and fruits as in the expression of "جيت المخضر من الفجر" (I brought the grocery at dawn). Using this concept 'مخضر' is to refer to all items of this grocery. The speaker sometimes uses the concept of car in general to refer to just one part as in "السيارة عطلت" (the car is broken down). In this situation, the speaker does not mean that the whole parts of the car are broken down, but there is just one part that is broken down. Another related example is "سيارتك كلش حارة" (your car is very hot)- the speaker refers that either the air conditioner of the car has a damage or it does not work well. Talking about the climate, the whole continent is used to refer to its countries as in "أوروبا باردة" (Europe is cold) and "آسيا حارة" (Asian is hot). These continents are generally used to refer to all of their countries. This type of the conceptual metonymy is also used to refer to the countries, such as the expression of "دخلت كورونا للعراق" by which the speaker uses the whole country to refer to particular provinces. Sometime the cities are also employed in such regard like "الناصرية" in order to refer to the weather of this city.

Once again, the speaker may use a general concept to refer to just one particular part- this probably happens in the example of buying some groceries from the market in that the speaker can use these expressions 'أريد مخضر من السوق' (I want you to buy grocery from the market), 'زاح أشترى سمج' (I am going to buy fish), 'جيبينه لحم' (bring us meat), 'جيبينه حنظل' (bring us pickles), 'جيبينه تمين' (bring us rice) and 'كيلو' (a kilo of tea) to mean that the speaker needs just one sort of these items of food- it refers to the sort that the family used to buy from the market.

5. Conclusions

Synecdoche is commonly used by the Iraqi Arabic speakers. It is a crucial factor of understanding what people mean when referring to a particular entity using another one, and the relationship between the two entities is a matter of being either a part standing for the whole or a whole standing for the part. In Iraqi community, listeners feel bored when the speaker gives more details in the conversation; therefore, the speaker tries to give a concept that is more significant to the listener. There are other uses of synecdoche in Iraqi Arabic like Iraqis use it for the purpose of telling implicit ideas because they do not want to speak frankly to their listeners. Iraqi Arabic speakers use synecdoche for its striking impacts on the listeners. Using this conceptual process makes the speakers able to go far from the literal meaning. Thus, such a conceptual case (synecdoche) has two roles: the first role is to exhibit an emphasis represented by the first concept in order to offer much understanding of the main idea included in the second concept while the second role is to achieve the economic function in that it is used for the purpose of exploiting time in talking about only the main concepts.

6. References

- Baldick C. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001.
- Bredin Hugh. Metonymy. Poetics Today. 1984;5:45-58.
- Bussmann H. Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London: Routledge. 1996.
- Croft W. Cruse DA. Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004.
- Evans V, Green M. Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2006.
- Evans V. A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2007.
- Gibbs RW. The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding. Cambridge: C.U.P. 1994.
- Harvey P. The Oxford Companion to English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1967.
- Howe B. Because You Bear this Name: Conceptual Metaphor and The Moral Meaning of 1 Peter. Leiden: Brill. 2006.
- Ibanez F, Hernandez L. Cognitive Operations and Pragmatic Implication, in Panther, K. and Thornburg, L. (eds), Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V. 2003.
- Lakoff G, Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1980.
- Lakoff G, Turner M. More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1989.
- Langacker RW. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites. Vol.1. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1987.
- Mey JL. Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. Amsterdam: Elsevier Ltd. 2009.
- Panther K, Thornburg L. Introduction: On the Nature of Conceptual Metonymy, in Panther, K. and Thornburg, L. (eds), Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V. 2003.
- Metonymy, in Geeraerts, D. and Cuyckens, H., The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007.

17. Radden G, Dirven R. Cognitive English Grammar: Cognitive Linguistics in Practice Philadelphia: John Benjamins B. V. 2007, 2.
18. Taylor JR. Category Extension by Metonymy and Metaphor, in Dirven R, Porings R. Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast (eds), Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2003.
19. Tuggy D. Schematicity and Similarity: Full and Partial Schematicity, in Geeraerts D, Cuyckens H. The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007.
20. Yule G. The Study of Language. 3rd ed. Cambridge: C. U. P. 2006.