

## TEXTUAL METAPHTONOMY AS OPPOSED TO LEXICAL METAPHTONOMY

### *METAFTONÍMIA TEXTUAL EM CONTRAPOSIÇÃO À METAFTONÍMIA LÉXICA*

### *METAFTONIMIA TEXTUAL EN CONTRAPOSICIÓN A LA METAFTONIMIA LÉXICA*

**Svetlana A. Pesina**

ORCID 0000-0002-3728-2561

Dr of Philology, Dr of Philosophy, Professor at the Department of Linguistics and Translation Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, NMSTU Magnitogorsk, Russia  
[spesina@bk.ru](mailto:spesina@bk.ru)

**Svetlana V. Kiseleva**

ORCID 0000-0002-3814-1111

Doctor of Philology, Professor Saint Petersburg State University of Economics, UNECON Saint Petersburg, Russia  
[svkiseljeva@bk.ru](mailto:svkiseljeva@bk.ru)

**Dmitry N. Novikov**

ORCID 0000-0002-5744-9883

PhD in Linguistics, Associate Professor at Department of English Moscow State Institute of International Relations, MGIMO-University Moscow, Russia  
[dno-vikoff@mail.ru](mailto:dno-vikoff@mail.ru)

**Svetlana A. Vinogradova**

ORCID: 0000-0002-2476-9338

Dr. of Philology, Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages, Director of the Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences Murmansk Arctic University, MASU Murmansk, Russia  
[svetvin@mail.ru](mailto:svetvin@mail.ru)

**Nella A. Trofimova**

ORCID 0000-0002-3814-1111

Doctor of Philology, Professor Saint Petersburg State University of Economics, UNECON Saint Petersburg, Russia  
[svkiseljeva@bk.ru](mailto:svkiseljeva@bk.ru)

**Natalia N. Tsytsarkina**

ORCID 0000-0002-6890-3682

Dr of Philology, Professor of the Department of Foreign Philology, Linguistics and Teaching of Foreign Languages Kurgan State University Kurgan, Russia  
[nts98@yandex.ru](mailto:nts98@yandex.ru)

**Abstract.** In this article, we have proposed to differentiate textual and lexical metaphonymy as different phenomena. We have considered the phenomenon of metaphonymy at the level of text, a chain of words the length of a sentence, a phrase, and a separate meaning. We propose to reserve the term “metaphonymy” for cases when we are talking about the cases of embedding “metonymy into metaphor” and “metaphor into metonymy” at the level of the entire text. An algorithm for determining textual metaphonymy is presented. It is proposed to distinguish “textual metaph-onymy” or simply “metaphonymy” from “reproductive metaphor” and “reproductive metonymy” as a two-stage or even three-stage tropic transformation. The latter exist at the level of semantics of polysemous words and are a rather rare phenomenon. The work presents meta-phorically inferential metonymy. Component-invariant analysis showed that with a double mechanism of transfer (transfer by contiguity and comparison) it contains in its semantics a double bundle of components, including the identified lexical invariant.

**Keywords:** metaphonymy, reproductive metaphor and metonymy, polysemous word, semantics, lexical invariant.

**Resumo.** Neste artigo, propomos diferenciar a metaftonímia textual e a metaftonímia léxica como fenômenos distintos. Consideramos o fenômeno da metaftonímia no nível do texto, abrangendo uma cadeia de palavras no comprimento de uma oração, uma frase e um significado específico. Sugerimos reservar o termo "metaftonímia" para os casos em que nos referimos à incorporação de "metonímia em metáfora" e "metáfora em metonímia" no nível de todo o texto. É apresentado um algoritmo para determinar a metaftonímia textual. Propomos distinguir a "metaftonímia textual" ou simplesmente "metaftonímia" da "metáfora reprodutiva" e da "metonímia reprodutiva" como uma transformação trópica de duas ou até mesmo três etapas. Essas últimas ocorrem no nível da semântica de palavras



polissêmicas e são um fenômeno relativamente raro. O trabalho também apresenta a metonímia inferencial metafórica. A análise invariante de componentes revelou que, com um mecanismo duplo de transferência (transferência por contiguidade e comparação), a metaftonímia contém, em sua semântica, um feixe duplo de componentes, incluindo o invariante léxico identificado.

**Palavras-chave:** metaftonímia, metáfora reprodutiva e metonímia, palavra polissêmica, semântica, invariante léxico.

**Resumen.** En este artículo, hemos propuesto diferenciar la metaftonimia textual y léxica como fenómenos diferentes. Hemos considerado el fenómeno de la metaftonimia a nivel de texto, una cadena de palabras de la longitud de una oración, una frase y un significado separado. Proponemos reservar el término “metaftonimia” para los casos en que hablamos de los casos de incrustación de “metonimia en metáfora” y “metáfora en metonimia” a nivel de todo el texto. Se presenta un algoritmo para determinar la metaftonimia textual. Se propone distinguir la “metaftonimia textual” o simplemente “metaftonimia” de la “metáfora reproductiva” y la “metonimia reproductiva” como una transformación trópica de dos o incluso tres etapas. Estas últimas existen a nivel de semántica de palabras polisémicas y son un fenómeno bastante raro. El trabajo presenta la metonimia inferencial metafórica. El análisis invariante de componentes mostró que con un doble mecanismo de transferencia (transferencia por contigüidad y comparación) contiene en su semántica un doble haz de componentes, incluyendo el invariante léxico identificado.

**Palabras-clave:** metaftonimia, metáfora reproductiva y metonimia, palabra polisémica, semántica, invariante léxico.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The key mechanisms for rethinking the semantics of the main meanings of polysemous words include metaphor, metonymy, and phraseological units. Phraseological units presuppose the use of direct meanings for their construction. To the same extent, metonymy is based on the main meaning refocusing and the phenomenon of contiguity. Only metaphor can be as far away from its target as possible. All these tropes presuppose imagination to one degree or another. They represent a method of nomination in which they seem to “enter” someone else’s territory.

At the same time, the study of non-trivial extended metaphor, as well as metonymy, as if “embedded” in metaphor, is gaining momentum. Various combinations of these tropes are capable of organizing large sections of text. We are talking about the phenomenon of metaphonymy. The term “metaphonymy” has been used for quite a long time. It was proposed by Louis Goossens in 1990 (Goossens, 1990). The author considers metonymy and metaphor not as separate phenomena, but as intersecting and “intertwined” entities that function “in combination”. They can represent alternating intermediate stages in the continuum of metonymy – metaphor. The purpose of this phenomenon investigation is quite clear: “although in principle metaphor and metonymy are distinct cognitive processes, it appears to be the case that the two are not mutually exclusive. They may be found in combination in actual natural language expressions.” (Goossens, 1990; Agusmidah, & Shalihah, 2023).

L. Goossens identifies four types of metaphonymy, four ways in which metonymy and metaphor ‘combine’ and ‘intertwine’ at clause level. These are paired into: integrated metaphonymy, which comprises ‘Metonymy within Metaphor’ and ‘Metaphor within Metonymy’; and cumulative metaphonymy, which comprises ‘Metaphor from Metonymy’ and ‘Metonymy from Metaphor’ (Goossens, 1990). The word ‘within’ in Metonymy within Metaphor and Metaphor within Metonymy is key, as it pinpoints the salient notion that both metonymy and metaphor are present but that there is a scalar difference between the two elements, that there are two levels of magnitude. In cumulative metaphonymy, ‘from’ indicates a process of derivation where either metonymy or metaphor is the ‘end product’ or ‘result’.

More recent studies of metaphonymy propose to study metonymy and metaphor on a larger



scale, i.e. on the scale of the entire text (Jin, Lin, Oakley 2021; Dirven, R. & Pörings 2003; Denroche, 2015; Paducheva 2004). The authors discuss hierarchical constructions such as “metaphor – metonymy” or “metaphor – metonymy – metaphor” in the text. Extended metaphor, metonymic clusters and metonymic chains are considered separately. The authors conclude that cases of extended metaphor, as well as metonymic clusters and chains, have the ability to structure large sections of texts and can interact at the level of discourse. In describing and classifying “metaphtonymy”, L. Goossens agrees with John Taylor, arguing that metonymy is a dominant cognitive process and is often the basis of metaphorical transposition in the metonymic effect (Goossens 2003; Kiki et al., 2023).

Currently, linguists are increasingly interested in metaphtonymy as a consistent use of metaphorical transformation of meaning following metonymic transformation (Dirven, R. & Pörings 2003; Denroche, 2015, etc.). There are different opinions about whether metaphtonymy functions only at the text level or also at the level of phrases, set expressions, i.e. minimal context.

However, metaphtonymy is not a process of “transformation” of metonymy into metaphor and vice versa, as some researchers believe (Karavaev, 2015; Naghiyeva 2016). This article proposes to differentiate textual and lexical metaphtonymy as different phenomena. Cases of double metonymy will be described, as well as metonymy that realizes certain properties of metaphorical similarity. In addition, a review of linguistic studies will be presented in which the authors postulate metaphtonymy.

It should be recognized that the rare studies of this phenomenon that can be found in linguistic literature sometimes boil down to the desire to postulate an abundance of metaphorical and metonymic transfers, as well as their intersections where they do not exist. This stems from the fact that there is no strict logically and methodologically substantiated linguistic analysis that would involve a procedure for verifying the presence of a hierarchy of any tropes in a text. The postulation of metaphtonymy should be based on a methodologically substantiated strict linguistic analysis. This is important because metaphtonymy is a rather complex trope interaction of metaphorical and metonymic transfers that require an analysis of the semantics of meanings.

## 2. HYPOTHESIS

The problem of metaphtonymy in linguistics is constantly associated with two of their functions: 1) as a means of creating a non-linear perception of the text and structuring artistic speech; 2) as a means of nomination.

Based on this, we propose to distinguish “textual metaphtonymy” or simply “metaphtonymy” from “reproductive metaphor” and “reproductive metonymy” as a two-stage or even three-stage tropic transformation.

Reproductive metaphor or metonymy has very few examples of trope transformations, where the stages of transformation of the direct meaning into a trope (metaphor or metonymy) and then of this trope into another one are traced and clearly recorded by dictionaries. Let us present what has been said in the form of two stages:

- (1) the direct meaning is transformed into metonymy and recorded by dictionaries;
- (2) the metonymy recorded by dictionaries is transformed into the next trope (metaphor or metonymy).

Let's give an example (see the analysis below): (1) arm – the upper limb of the human body extending from the shoulder to the wrist (the first meaning) → (2) arm – actions performed by the human arm (the first-stage metonymy) → (3) arm – “an athlete with an ability to throw a ball skillfully” (a reproductive metonymy).

The resulting bunch of features obtained at the first stage of the meaning transformation is



preserved in full in the second transformation with the addition of new semantic components. The second transformation has a double set of semantic features.

All these transformations are either recorded in dictionaries or are obvious, indicating in a consistent manner the mechanism used (in the case of metonymy) and the specific semantic features underlying the new metaphor.

In textual metaphonymy, it is not the same word or expression that is subject to metonymic and metaphorical transfer, as in a two-stage tropeic transformation, but different words. These words belong to the same context, for example, a poem. Strictly speaking, this is actually the relationship of metaphors and metonymies in the text. It turns out that in metaphonymy, some words represent metaphorical transformations and completely different ones represent metonymic ones. As for reproductive metaphor or metonymy, the same lexical unit is subject to semantic transfer. That is, reproductive metaphor or metonymy of transformation has stages of transformation, but metaphonymy does not.

Metaphonymy is the presence of these tropes in the text at its different levels. Thus, one trope functions at the hierarchically highest superordinate level of generalization of the content of the text. Most often, this level is occupied by a metaphor. Further, at a lower subordinate level, tropes (metaphors or metonymies) also function. Metaphonymy is the structuring of the text by means of a configuration of metaphorical and metonymic transfers.

Cases when the general outline of the work is metonymic, and a metaphor is found within the text are so rare that they are exceptional. In the sample of Goossens, there is only one such example (Goossens, 1990:336). While Metonymy in Metaphor is quite common.

This is explained by the fact that metaphor is more capable of providing a play of imagination, metaphorizing the entire text as a whole, whereas metonymy does not presuppose a greater power of imagination. For metonymy, contact between two spheres is necessary - the source and the target. For metaphor, such contact is not necessary. The two spheres - the source and the target in the case of metaphorical transfer can be as far apart as possible.

### 3. METHODS

In the case of textual metaphonymy, the following algorithm for its definition may take place:

1) having familiarized oneself with the text, find in it trope transfers – metaphor or metonymy, respectively, marking them as comparisons or similarity by contiguity. If we have a metaphor before us, then we need to verify this by carrying out an invariant-component analysis, which will allow us to identify the dominant core components underlying the metaphorical transfer. If this is metonymy, then the mechanism of transfer should be identified, for example, part-whole, animal fur-product made from it, author-his work, capacity-his contents, etc. About 100 metonymic mechanisms of transfer have been identified (Birikh, 1995).

2) determine whether the general meaning of the text has been rethought. Identify whether the entire text or part of it is symbolic (metonymy) or whether the text contains an expanded conceptual embodiment of one phenomenon in another (metaphor). In the case of a general text metaphor, there may be a projection of one known category onto another, for example, concrete onto abstract.

The last point is especially important. It involves identifying intra-text logical connections and relationships between text elements, which is determined by the presence of precedent knowledge and corresponding presuppositions. It is necessary to identify the value-semantic content of the text, as a result of which cognitive structures acquire a semiotic status. If we can perform this algorithm with positive results, we can state the fact of the presence of text metaphonymy.



In the process of semantic models of integration of meanings defining (“reproductive metaphor” and “reproductive metonymy”), interaction of various concepts and conceptual spheres is assumed. Invariant-component analysis assumes two procedures:

(1) component analysis of meaning based on its comparison with the first nominative-non-derivative meaning of the polysemous word;

(2) further reduction of the obtained semantic components in order to identify the core dominant components underlying the metaphorical transfer; in this case, trivial components that are not significant for the transfer (grammatical categories, objectivity, etc.) are eliminated.

The second procedure is necessary because we want to identify only the most important basic semantic components. We understand that the range of these components is limited. These invariant core components can form entire clusters of figurative meanings in words with a developed semantic structure (Pesina et al 2020 a). We call the resulting dominant semantic components invariant because they are used in the course of further development of the semantic structure of a polysemous word.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1 Illustration of the mechanism of “Metonymy in Metaphor”

It was noted above that metaphonymy should be considered as a text phenomenon. Below we propose to consider cases that are described by researchers as metaphonymy. Our task is to determine whether the presented cases are always metaphonymy, or we are dealing with the phenomena of transposing one trope into another, that is, with what we called above “reproductive metaphor” and “reproductive metonymy”. The latter function at the level of phrases and minimal context. Secondly, we will demonstrate the methodology of analyzing lexical metaphonymy and illustrate it with examples.

Thus, M.S. Karavaev examines the meanings of somatism substantives obtained on the basis of metaphonymy. As an example, the author analyses the Russian expression «набить морду» (to punch someone in the face or to beat someone’s face) and a figurative meaning of the same Russian word «набить морду» with the meaning “to take revenge or punish for something.” The author justifies the presence of metaphonymy with the following train of thought: “the meaning “to beat” is metonymic. The meaning “to punish” in a moral sense, not a physical one, is metaphorical, since the damage from punishment is comparable to beating. In this case, first there is an expansion of the meaning, and then the deletion of one of the components of the target sphere – the physical component – and a metaphorical leap: the person was so humiliated that it was AS IF they had beaten his face in” (Karavaev, 2015).

If we examine this basis for postulating metaphonymy, we can see that metaphonymy is “derived” based on two stages of development of the semantics of the verb “набить”. The first stage is a physical violent action towards the subject and the second step is “moral punishment”.

However, we can notice inaccuracies that appeared in the author’s analysis from the very first words. Thus, it is claimed that at the first stage the physical meaning “набить морду” is a metonymy of the first meaning. To challenge this assertion, we will turn to Ozhegov’s Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language, which provides the following meanings of the verb “набить” (to tightly place something inside something):

(1) наполнить, плотно вкладывая что-нибудь внутрь чего-нибудь (to fill, to tightly place something inside something) (Набить погреб льдом – To fill a cellar with ice).

(2) заполнить собой, скопляясь в большом количестве где-нибудь (to fill with one-self, to accumulate in large quantities somewhere) (Зал, набитый публикой – A hall packed with the public).



(3) вложить, плотно вмести́ть внутрь чего-нибудь (to put, to tightly fit inside something) (Набить табаку в трубку – To stuff tobacco into a pipe).

(4) ударом или ударами насадить, надеть (to put on, to put on with a blow or blows) (Набить обруч на кадку – To stuff a hoop onto a tub).

(5) ударом или ударами причинить вред кому или чему-нибудь (to harm someone or something with a blow or blows) (Набить шишку на лбу – To give a bump on the forehead).

(6) отпечатать узор (на ткани) (to print a pattern (on fabric)) (Набить ситец – To stuff calico).

(7) вколоти́ть во что-нибудь в каком-нибудь количестве (to hammer into something in some quantity) (Набить гвоздей в стенку – To hammer nails into a wall).

(8) разбить в каком-нибудь количестве (to smash in some quantity) (Набить посуды – To break the dishes).

(9) настрелять в каком-нибудь количестве (to shoot in some quantity) (Набить уток – To shoot ducks).

As we can see, the structure of the Russian polysemous word (1) «набить» (to tightly place something inside something) does not at all coincide with the English one. The Russian meanings of this word are equivalent to the meanings to fill, to tightly place, to tightly fit inside, to put on with a blow, to stuff, to hammer, to break the dishes, shoot.

As can be seen, the Russian meaning (5) «to harm someone or something with a blow or blows» fully reflects the semantics of the Russian word combination «набить морду» (to punch someone in the face or to beat someone's face). This meaning is not a metonymic transfer, as the author claims. Based on the fact that the first meaning means the physical action of filling something with something, then the meaning is nothing more than a metaphor, like all the other figurative meanings of this verb.

To substantiate our assertion, we can offer the following train of thought and the results of our component analysis to identify the dominant features of metaphorical transfer (Pesina et al 2022; Pesina et al 2022 b). Let us present the substantiation of the fact that we are dealing with a metaphorical, not a metonymic transfer:

– when we stuff a pillow with cotton wool (the main meaning), we make sharp movements so that the stuffing gets into a narrow hole and tightly fills the pillow. This requires physical strength. To the same extent, violent physical actions towards the subject require physical effort. In this case, the nature of the hand movement when hitting is similar to stuffing a pillow in terms of the sharpness of the movement. Such figurative associations and a fairly logical train of thought could lead to the formation of this metaphor. That is, we hit in the face as if we were stuffing the stuffing into the pillow.

Above we stated that in addition to stating the fact that we have a metaphor before us, a scientific and analytical justification of this fact is necessary. Therefore, below we present the results of the invariant-component analysis and the analysis of the corresponding dictionary definitions (Pesina 2020 b; 2022). The analyses allowed us to identify the following dominant semantic components that underlie this metaphorical transfer:

forward movement of the hand, sudden, directed, with the purpose of causing harm to someone.

These semantic components are not explicitly contained in the first meaning of the verb (1) «набить» – to tightly place something inside something. They are implicit in nature and are hidden in the depth of the semantics of the first meaning. To identify them, a component analysis is necessary, which identifies all the components that construct the direct and figurative meaning. Next, we reduce the obtained features to the minimum necessary, core ones. To do this, we get rid of trivial features (the scope of the article does not allow us to present the analysis in full). As can be seen, the presented invariant components are most clearly represented in the meaning of the verb (5) «набить» – to harm someone or something with a blow or blows.



Returning to M.S. Karavaev's postulation of metaphonymy with complex two-stage transformations, we should conclude that since we are not dealing with the mechanism "direct meaning → metonymy → metaphor", but "direct meaning → metaphor", the author's further reasoning is dismissed as erroneous.

In this regard, I would like to warn authors who are ready to easily postulate the presence of metonymic, metaphorical and further metaphonymic transfers without scientifically verifiable analysis. In order to prove that we are dealing with complex tropic transformations, a strict linguistic justification is necessary – an analysis of the semantics of meanings.

#### 4. 2 functioning of metaphors in phraseological units

We continue to differentiate between metaphonymy, which we consider a textual phenomenon, and reproductive metonymy and metaphor, which are successive transformations of one meaning into another at the level of the structure of one word. Our next examples are two phraseological units, "to rest on one's laurels" and "the struggle of Nanai boys," which are interpreted in linguistic literature as metaphonymy (Karavaev, 2015). To begin with, we will present our analysis of the semantics of these stable units. Thus, the first of them is international and goes back to Greek mythology, the second is a colloquial Russian-language phraseological unit.

Let us present the lexical composition of the phraseological unit "to rest on one's laurels":

(1) to rest (bookish obsolete) – to calm down, to surrender to complete peace, inaction, to plunge into peace (Ushakov);

(2) laurels – branches of a noble tree, a wreath of them (Modern Encyclopedia, 2000).

The figurative understanding of this set expression consists in imagining a situation when someone literally lies and rests peacefully on the branches of a noble tree. With frequent use of this set unit, it can be assumed that the stage of its visualization can be omitted due to time savings. Indeed, if the phraseological unit is understandable, then in the process of communication its understanding occurs as if in one touch. Then the symbolization of the situation occurs immediately.

We have a classic mechanism for understanding phraseological units, when the meanings of the words included in it are literal, and the meaning of the entire combination of words is rethought. But we also have a second alternative mechanism associated with the symbolization of a given situation. With frequent use, the situation is symbolized by the mechanism "ABSENCE OF MOVEMENT - ABSENCE OF DESIRE". In this case, we are dealing with metonymy.

The situation resembles the movement of electrons, which, according to the laws of quantum physics, can behave either as particles or as waves depending on the activity of the Observer. In our case, depending on whether the Observer uses the image in the process of actualizing this phraseological unit or not, one or another decoding mechanism is triggered.

If for a language user, whom we will call the Observer, every word is important and behind the whole expression in the linguistic consciousness there is an image, then every word has weight. In this case, each meaning is used in its first meaning. For such an Observer with imagination, a laurel tree is not just a tree, but a noble plant, whose luxurious branches and foliage symbolize an achievement recognized by others. Therefore, the whole expression has a logical meaning: "he who has the opportunity to recline on such a tree can relax and do nothing because he already has an achievement." The presented image is not a symbol of inaction, but "earned" inaction after the achieved result, for which a laurel wreath is awarded. In an ironic vein, one can express it by the analogy "He rests on his achievements" or, more specifically, "on his medals."

Thus, if there is a figurative representation, then the meanings appear in their first meaning;

Br. J. Ed., Tech. Soc., v.17, n.se3, p.126-136, 2024

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.14571/brajets.v17.nse3.126-136>

ISSN 2316-9907



if there is no image, but the meaning is clear, then the “ugly” metonymic mechanism “works”. It turns out that we are faced with a linguistic situation that can be compared by analogy with the action of universal physical laws.

From this we conclude that it is the figurative nature of the phraseological unit that prevents it from being reduced to metonymy. Indeed, metonymy is based on various mechanisms that operate by contiguity and do not imply figurativeness. Symbolization is based not on a detailed picture, but on an outline or diagram, when one stands in place of the other. A symbol is not a complete, but a partial comparison of two situations.

Let's consider the second set Russian expression “Nanai boys' struggle”. It belongs to the sphere of Russian political jargon and means “an imaginary feigned struggle; connivance at something under the guise of struggle” (The current struggle of the security forces with the oligarchs is the class struggle of the Nanai boys. S. Novoprudsky, “Izvestia”, 11.11. 2003). This expression arose from the title of A. Matus-Marchuk's dance number “Nanai boys' struggle” (1970s), in which the artist puts on a special doll costume and portrays two wrestlers.

Just as in the analysis of the first phraseological unit, we will present the lexical composition of the stable unit “to rest on one's laurels”. Thus, the word “struggle” is used in its main meaning:

struggle (1) “hand-to-hand combat of two, in which each tries to overcome the other”.

Indeed, what is depicted on stage through dance conveys struggle and contains elements of struggle.

With the elements of the phraseological unit “Nanai” and “boys” the situation is more complicated. On the one hand, the word “boys” is also used in its direct meaning, despite the fact that, strictly speaking, there is only one boy. But he is also a human being of flesh and blood. On the other hand, in the encyclopedic dictionary we find a second Russian metaphorical meaning of this word:

boy (2) about a man who shows frivolity, inexperience, frivolity in business (Ты уже не мальчик – You are no longer a boy).

The element “Nanai” can also be interpreted as a trope. It is known that the Nanai are an indigenous people of the Far East (about 16 thousand), traditionally settled along the Amur and Ussuri. In the dictionary, we find synonyms for the word “Nanai”: wild, headless, stupid, feral. Noting the futility of applying evaluative attributes to all representatives of any nation, we will approach the use of this word from a linguistic point of view. From this point of view, we have a metaphorical transfer: to be a Nanai boy is as if to be unreasonable (for example, The light was dimmed, and the couples locked in a dance, stupidly and amusingly, like Nanai boys, pushed each other on a patch in the middle of the room. M. Metlitskaya, “Visitors”, 2018.)

In this case, we encountered a case of functioning of a phraseological unit, which consists of one word in the literal meaning and two metaphors.

This set expression can be interpreted as a metonymy, using the cause-and-effect model THE STRUGGLE OF THE UNREASONABLE IS STUPIDITY. But, since this mechanism is not used often, the figurative interpretation of the phraseological unit takes place more often. Meanwhile, interpreting this set expression as a metonymy, we come to the functioning of two metaphorical rethinking within the metonymy.

Let us return to the analysis presented in Karavaev's work. The author sees a metaphor not in the word “Nanai”, the semantics of which is indeed rethought, but focuses on the dance:

“Then comes the relationship of adjacency: these two dolls are also not real and turn out to be one person who controls them. But at the same time, this is also a metaphor: the viewer is deceived, which is shown by the “exposure” when the artist takes off his costume. This stage is “metonymy within a metaphor”, according to (Goossens 2003). Finally, in the meaning of “imitation of political struggle”, the source sphere is the complex of the two previous meanings” (Karavaev 2015).



It is quite difficult to understand the semantics of this phraseological unit based on this text. A more thorough analysis of the semantics of this phraseological unit would undoubtedly help to more accurately identify the mechanisms of transfer. The author's reference to authority also does not clarify the situation.

### 4.3 Functioning of lexical double metonymy

Further, we will not talk about phraseologically related word combinations, but about individual figurative meanings of a polysemantic word. We will consider cases of transformation of a direct meaning not into one, but successively into two figurative meanings. Cases of double metonymy and metaphrization within the framework of the double lexical mechanism of transference postulated by us “reproductive metaphor” and “reproductive metonymy” are of real linguistic interest. These cases are rare as real pearls.

As an example, let us take the English polysemous substantive “arm”, the first meaning of which conveys the concept of a person's hand. Then follow metonymic and metaphorical transformations, among which there are several metonymic meanings. Let us dwell on the semantics of “two-stage metonymy” and the mechanisms of its formation.

arm (2) «an athlete with an ability to throw a ball skillfully» (He wasn't the best arm in the outfield, but his performance at the plate more than compensated; Last year I developed a method for evaluating outfield arms.).

This metonymy is the result of a double tropic transformation: first, the ability to skillfully throw a ball is nominated as arm (the actions are performed by a person's hand), and then, according to the “PART – WHOLE” model, arm is the athlete himself, who skillfully throws the ball.

This transfer demonstrates that the semantic components of the first meaning do not always underlie the emergence of new metonymic associations. Although it is traditionally believed that metonymy is based on the first nominative-non-derivative meaning.

Let us give another example of a “two-stage tropic transformation”. In the course of a complex empirical component-reductive invariant analysis, a complex tropic transformation of the second degree was revealed – a metonymic rethinking from a metaphor. Its example is the English polysemantic substantive “a suit”, the first meaning of which conveys the concept of a person's suit. Below we give a metonymic transformation:

suit (2) «a group of advisers/assistants, accompanying an important person».

The mechanism of this metonymy can be explained using two approaches. The first approach assumes that this is a case of synecdoche “PART – WHOLE”, i.e. a jacket is used to nominate a person in a jacket. But then we miss the very essence of the meaning "a group of advisers/assistants, accompanying an important person", where every word of interpretation is important. This is not just an abstract person in a jacket, but a group of security guards dressed in identical suits, accompanying an important person and ready to protect him in case of danger. That is, this meaning contains important information that the semantics of synecdoche does not cover.

Let us turn to the invariant-component analysis. Having analyzed all the metaphors available for a given word, we came to the conclusion that they all have the same bundle of core semantic components at their core. We called it a “lexical invariant”: a group of objects, similar, related, that follow one another in order (Pesina et al 2021; Yusupova 2016). When we involved this metaphorical invariant cluster in the analysis of the semantics of the analyzed metonymy, the logic of the emergence of the desired figurative meaning became clear to us.

That is, the meaning of suit (2) "a group of advisers/assistants, accompanying an important person" is not just a metonymy of the first meaning according to the model “PART – WHOLE”, but a metonymy and a metaphor at the same time. This meaning is based on a double mechanism

of transfer (by adjacency and comparison – as if) and contains in its semantics a double bundle of components, including the lexical invariant a group of objects, similar, related, that follow one another in order.

So, we have considered a rare case of metaphorically inferential metonymy. Or it can be called metonymy that realizes the properties of metaphorical similarity. And indeed, like a carefully selected collection of things or cards in a deck (the word has such metaphors), the retinue is represented by identical, usually strong men in suits, who usually accompany and guard the VIP person.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this article, it is proposed to distinguish “textual metaphonymy” or simply “metaphonymy” from “reproductive metaphor” and “reproductive metonymy” as a two-stage or even three-stage tropic transformation. It was proposed to reserve the term “metaphonymy” for cases when we are talking about the embedding of “metonymy in metaphor” and “metaphor in metonymy” at the level of the entire text.

In the course of the proposed invariant-component analysis, cases of metaphorically inferential metonymy and double metonymy are presented. Component-invariant analysis showed that with these double mechanisms of transfer, the semantics of the later trope contains a double bundle of components. If a metaphor is involved in a two-stage transformation, the resulting trope will include components of the previous transformation (for example, metonymy), as well as components of the generalized semantic core of the entire word – the lexical invariant.

A critical analysis of examples of postulating textual metaphonymy has shown that often authors-researchers of metaphonymy are content with simply postulating the fact that we have before us, for example, an ontological or orientational metaphor. There is also a tendency to see conceptual metaphors everywhere, and the analysis may end with this statement.

It should not be forgotten that those large classes of metaphors that J. Lakoff studied are united by maximally generalized and approximate mechanisms of transfer. At the same time, each metaphor has specific semantic components that provide this metaphorical transfer. They represent nuclear semes that, figuratively speaking, can be “touched with hands”. They must be identified as an evidentiary basis for transfer by means of component analysis, definition analysis or invariant-component analysis. Without linguistic analysis, the study of metaphor, and, consequently, metaphonymy, will be superficial.

The process of establishing metonymy must also include a description of the corresponding mechanism of transfer, of which about a hundred have been identified to date. These mechanisms are based on a shift in the focus of attention. They are the result of the superposition of the source concept on the target concept. The condition for this interaction is the proto-typical nature of the first in relation to one of the vacant positions of the second. It is necessary to show how exactly the source sphere and the target sphere of the metonymic conceptual model are involved in one situation and are connected by rational relations.

Cases of metaphor formation from metonymy and metonymy from metaphor are as rare as they are valuable. They can be compared to pearls that a swimmer finds when many shells turn out to be empty. In literature, we see that it is easy to talk about “multi-stage transfer.” But if we remain within the framework of synchronicity, it should be recognized that real tropic multi-stage is a rare phenomenon, presupposing a play of imagination and of great interest to researchers.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Russian Science Foundation, сокращенное наименование – RSF. Ссылка на информацию о



проекте: <https://rscf.ru/en/project/22-18-20022/>.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors confirm that the data do not contain any conflict of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Agusmidah, & Shalihah, F. (2023). Indonesian migrant workers: a socio-economic analysis with regard to the integrated services practice implementation. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 203(5-6), 70-75. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V203-08>
- Birikh, A. (1995) Metonymy in Modern Russian. Semantic and Grammatical Aspects. Izd-vo Verlag Otto Sagner. Myunkhen., [In Russian]
- Denroche, C. (2015). Metonymy and language: A new theory of linguistic processing. New York/London: Routledge.
- Dirven, R. & Pörings, R. (eds.), Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. P. 349-377.
- Goossens, L. Metaphtonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action, *Cognitive Linguistics*. № 1-3. 1990. P. 323-340.
- Jin, S., Lin, Z., Oakley T. Translating Metaphtonymy: Exploring Trainee Translators' Translation Approaches and Underlying Factors, *Front Psychol*. 2021 № 12. P. 629527.
- Karavaev, M.S. (2015) Metaphtonymic models of somatisms, Cognitive phenomenon of metaphor: an interdisciplinary approach. Tambov : Izdatel'skiy dom «Derzha-vinskij». [In Russian]
- Kiki F., Ayi W., Wikrama W., Lenggogeni L., Burhanudin J. (2023), How to increase organizational commitment by strategic management, *Procedia Environmental Science, Engineering and Management* **10** (4) 579-584
- Naghiyeva Sh. The role of metaphtonymy in the formation of the English economic dis-course, *European journal of literature and linguistics*. 2016. №3. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/the-role-of-metaphtonymy-in-the-formation-of-the-english-economic-discourse> (дата обращения: 04.09.2024).
- Paducheva, E.V. (2004) Dynamic models in semantics of vocabulary, *Languages of Slavic cultures*. [In Russian]
- Pesina, S., Timokhina E., Baryshnikova J., Emelyanova O. (2020 a). Experimental study of polysemous words semantics in the light of invariant approach, *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*. V. 98. European Publisher. pp. 571-578. DOI: 10.15405/epsbs.2020.12.03.57.
- Pesina, S.A., Churilina, L.N., Skvortsova, M.L., Kozhushkova, N.V., Baklykova, T.Yu., Terentieva, N.G. (2020 b). Functioning of polysemantic words in the lexicon, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. V. 4. № 9. pp. 64-69. Pustejovsky, J. The Generative Lexicon. *Language*. № 17. P. 4. DOI: 10.14744/alrj.2020.24855
- Pesina, S.A., Vinogradova S.A., Trofimova N.A., Kostina N.N., Shustova S.V., Akai O.M., Velikanova S.S. (2022). Semantic integrity of a word structure and semantic primitives, *Res Militaris*. 12(2), 2111-2119.
- Pesina, S.A., Yusupova L.G., Vinogradova S.A, Kiseleva S.V, Trofimova N.F., Rudako-va S.V., Baklykova T.Yu. (2021) Functioning of metaphor through the prism of invariant theory in polysemy, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. – V. 4. № 5. P. 247-252.

