

**Sylwia Wojciechowska.** *Conceptual Metonymy and Lexicographic Representation*. 2012, 209 pp. ISBN 978-3-631-63510-0. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Price: €53.15.

The field of lexicography has proven a fruitful ground from which language learners can benefit (Boers and Lindstromberg 2006). The cognitive approach to dictionary making relies on the motivation of a word's senses so that the connection between literal and nonliteral meaning can be elucidated by foreign language students more easily. Geeraerts (1990), one of the main proponents of cognitive lexicography, claims that many dictionaries make use of cognitive principles such as the prototypicality of senses and their network-structured nature. Experimental studies on the acquisition and retrieval of vocabulary, for instance, have shown the benefits of this approach (Boers 2000). Unlike studies on metaphor encoding (e.g. Van der Meer 1997, 1999; DeCesaris and Alsina 2002; Philip 2006), Wojciechowska's (2012) book and dissertation are among the first attempts to uncover the (un)systematicity of metonymic shifts in English dictionaries. The author's aim is 'to show how the tenets of the cognitive theory of metonymy can benefit the representation of metonymic lexemes in pedagogical lexicography' (2012: 16).

The book is composed of four chapters which encompass a theoretical overview of metonymy and an analysis of the microstructure, including definitions, examples and codes, of five English Monolingual Learner's Dictionaries (MLD hereafter). They are, as cited in Wojciechowska (2012: 167), the so-called 'Big Five', namely the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2005), the *Collins COBUILD English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (2003), the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2003), the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (2007) and the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (2005). Her present work was previously published in a shortened version in *Proceedings of the 14th EURALEX International Congress* as Wojciechowska (2010). Chapter 1 provides a theoretical account of metonymy, highlighting the most prominent notions within the field, including the idea of domain highlighting, conceptual contiguity, the semantic elaboration of the source and the interplay of metonymy with metaphor. Chapter 2 deals with the organization of metonymic senses in the microstructure of the dictionary, including metonymic chains, and proposes an ordering according to our conceptualization of meaning which goes from literal to figurative senses. Chapter 3 analyzes the *definiens* of metonymic senses according to the effectiveness and coherence of the strategies followed in the 'Big Five'. Finally, chapter 4 looks at the lexicographic coding of count-mass nominal metonymies and points out the lack of transparency of the grammatical markers for distinguishing them.

'Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics' (43 pages) presents an overview of the Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989) together with foundational definitions of metonymy and domain. From the canonical definitions in Lakoff and Johnson

(1980) of both metaphor and metonymy, we are walked to those offered respectively by Barcelona (2000) and Croft (2002) in subsection 1.2: two-domain and one-domain correspondences in the former are equated with superordinate-to-superordinate and subordinate-to-superordinate correspondences in the latter. Wojciechowska reports as well Nerlich and Clarke's (2001) pragmatic characterization of metaphor as extracting new information from old words and of metonymy as extracting more information from fewer words. Finally, Radden and Kövecses' (1999) Idealized Cognitive Model-based mental access provided by the source to the target is cited as an essential add-up to the cognitive understanding of metonymy. Subsections 1.3 and 1.4 establish a comparison between metonymy and ellipsis firstly, and metonymy and synecdoche secondly. In short, ellipsis works at the linguistic level whereas metonymy works at the conceptual level. The author follows Seto (1999) in his distinction between synecdoche and metonymy, opposing the conventional classification of the PART FOR WHOLE synecdochic pattern as metonymic in the literature (cf. Radden and Kövecses 1999).

A series of problematic issues are presented in subsection 1.5, entitled 'Problems with the Standard Definitions of Metaphor and Metonymy'. Domains are still not defined with precision, at least in the current cognitive linguistic theory. This fact represents a hindrance to the identification of what constitutes metonymy or not as well as to the identification of the nature of mappings between entities. Several proposals elaborating on the Langackerian notion of domain have been propounded, among which the conceptions of matrix domains (Croft 2002) and superordinate domains (Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez 2000: 116) stand out. The former option, that of domain matrices, is used by Wojciechowska in her dissertation. In 1.6 alternate solutions are brought forth, namely domain highlighting (instead of domain mapping) and domain reduction and expansion. In this respect, the author favours the idea of semantic elaboration to explain metonymy. Among those alternates, she downplays in 1.7 the role of conceptual contiguity and the Langackerian notions of facetizations and zone activation (Langacker 1987). Domains and conceptual contiguity, following Peirsman and Geeraerts' (2006) critical view, is substituted by the characterization of metonymies according to their prototypicality, strength of contact and boundedness. The distinction made by Paradis (2004) between metonymy, on the one hand, and facetization and zone activation, on the other hand, is disregarded by Wojciechowska because if such were the case, no metonyms would be listed in dictionaries.

In consequence, semantic elaboration overruns other options because, in her own words, it 'is not based on the vague notion of a domain [...] does not incorporate mapping' and also includes 'the backgrounded source meaning in the conceptual structure of the target meaning' (2012: 40). Additionally, she adopts the formula X-Y instead of the pervasive X FOR Y to indicate the absence of substitution of the source by the target (2012: 18). In *I like Mozart*, the target *Mozart* has not substituted simply 'music' but 'music by Mozart' (Warren

1999: 127-128) and similarly, in *She is just a pretty face, a pretty face* does not substitute the whole person as beautiful but only her beautiful face belonging, naturally, to her whole body (Radden and Kövecses 1999: 19). Next, subsection 1.8 comprises an analysis of different typologies of metonymies as proposed by Radden and Kövecses (1999), Seto (1999), Peirsman and Geeraerts (2006) and Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (2000). A point of agreement among them all is the basic nature of the WHOLE-PART pattern from which others stem. The final remark in chapter 1 comprises the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in many real-language instances. As stated in subsection 1.9, it may be more realistic to talk of a continuum with each of the two conceptual operations at opposite ends and a series of 'in-between' cases rather than separate notions with strictly defined boundaries.

Chapter 2 (35 pages) initially overviews the theoretical stances towards the disambiguation of words' senses conceived as the first lexicographic step. Once dictionary makers know what senses to include, it is time to worry about what ordering they should adopt within the entry. Wojciechowska's first empirical study and its subsequent results attempt at checking whether conventionalized metonymic senses are included within the 'Big Five' and how they are included, i.e. if dependently or independently from other senses. Her stance in this chapter is that 'as institutionalised metaphors are covered in MLDs, conventionalised metonyms also deserve their share of dictionary space' (2012: 64).

Subsection 2.1, 'Word Sense Disambiguation', summarizes two distinct stances regarding the notion of 'sense', a radical one where dictionaries only contain potential meaning and a milder one that follows the dictates of Rosch's theory of prototypes (Ungerer and Schmid 1996). The first trend gives a preponderant role to context. In this respect, Cruse's (1986: 50-54) distinction between 'sense selection' and 'sense modulation' is exemplified by the words *bank* and *cousin* respectively. Among *bank* as 'financial institution' and *bank* as 'side of a river', which are ambiguous senses, we select the sense that is appropriate to a specific context. Conversely, in the vague word *cousin* we modulate or further specify the sense of cousin as female or male without changing its basic characterization. One of the main ideas that Wojciechowska propels is that of a gradual nature in meaning understanding, be it metaphor and metonymy, ambiguity, polysemy or vagueness. Therefore, context bears, according to this view of meaning as potentiality, a crucial role in understanding the sense of a word (Kilgarriff 1997; Hanks 2000). In lexicographic production, corpora are seen as the most reliable sources for obtaining those context-dependent examples. Nonetheless, the author does not make use of any corpora but treats dictionaries as corpora-like sources for language in her study.

The second stance aims at listing in dictionaries the most prototypical senses of each lexeme, thus still considering, though to a lesser extent, a word's context in discourse. The processes of 'lumping' and 'splitting' denote what in lexicography correspond to these two diverging stances on the inclusion of

word sense in lexicographic works: the former, that of potentiality of meaning, minimizes the number of senses and the latter, that of prototypicality, maximizes them (Adamska-Sałaciak 2006; Atkins and Rundell 2008). Wojciechowska banks on the idea of coherence with respect to the strategy used to list words' senses in dictionaries. Furthermore, she propounds 'template entries' as 'a framework designated to facilitate writing entries for words that belong to lexical sets' (Atkins and Rundell 2008: 123 as cited by Wojciechowska 2012: 68). Her statement that 'it would be an exaggeration to say that there are no word meanings outside context' (2012: 68) and her belief that only conventionalized metonymies should be listed in dictionaries are an 'in-between' stand with respect to the approaches elaborated above.

Subsection 2.2, 'Sense Ordering', makes reference to the three existing types of ordering, namely the historical, logical and frequency-based ones. Precluding the first one to historical dictionaries like the OED, the logical ordering presents the 'core' and prototypical senses first following the second approach to dictionary making developed in subsection 2.1. The ordering according to frequency, in turn, is based on corpora studies and presents the most used words first. This subsection 2.2 tackles next the cognitive ordering of senses which, aware of the linearity problem (Geeraerts 1990) and unable to express the complex networks of meaning representing words in a two-dimension volume, embraces a series of tenets. Following Van der Meer and Sansome (2001), the literal meaning must precede the figurative meaning. Similarly, Wojciechowska believes, as Mel'čuk (1988) does, that metonymic senses must precede metaphorical ones. Finally, the source of a metonymy should come before the target (2012: 74). Another issue raised in 2.2 is 'metonymic chains' and 'double metonymies' which the author names 'multiple metonymies' to avoid the implication that all of the targets of a metonymic source must be related or further elaborated. For example, the different targets of the metonymic source *silver*, namely 'coin', 'utensil/object', 'colour' and 'medal', are not semantically elaborated.

The empirical study in 2.3 that the author presents is motivated by the scant number of studies analyzing metonymies in dictionaries vis-à-vis the more numerous studies of the inclusion of metaphors in dictionaries. A hundred metonymic senses grouped under the metonymic patterns PART-WHOLE, WHOLE-PART and PART-PART proposed in Radden and Kövecses (1999) are studied. They all are conventionalized, nominal, frequent (at least present in two of the dictionaries) and not outdated metonymies. Additionally, they are cases of regular polysemy because their pattern of meaning extension is repeated in more than one linguistic unit (Apresjan 1995). The results yield a very heterogeneous panorama in the treatment of metonymy within the 'Big Five'. CALD2 is the only dictionary that presents metonymic sources and targets as distinct entries due to its policy of homonymy maximization. It is also unique in its use of brackets for metonymic senses. OALDCE7 and LDOCE4 list metonyms as separate senses of a lexical item. In contrast, MEDAL2 opts for

listing the metonymic target as a subsense in accordance to Wojciechowska's policy. Broadly speaking, 'LDOCE4, MEDAL2 and OALDCE7 stand out as more successful than either CALD2 or COBUILD4' (2012: 85) in terms of how metonymic senses are treated in the 'Big Five'. Regarding the ordering of the source before the target, however, over 80% of metonymies are successfully represented from the cognitive point of view.

In subsection 2.4 a discussion of the results is proffered, some facts of which are highlighted here. Firstly, there is a lack of cohesive treatment of metonymies within dictionaries and in each dictionary individually. For example, *lamb* in the pattern ANIMAL-MEAT (WHOLE-PART) is listed in the dictionaries using strategies such as the conjunction *or*, two senses with the source first or the target as a subsense of the source. The most coherent dictionary with respect to the representation of specific metonymic patterns is OALDCE7. Secondly, the source and both source and target are sometimes, though rarely, omitted. An example of the source omission is *stiletto* in its 'heel' meaning in CALD2 and COBUILD4. The full omission of metonymic source and target happens with the VOICE-PART pattern in *alto*, *bass* and *tenor* in COBUILD4. Lastly, the ordering of source and target is mostly followed in all dictionaries, except for some internal variation in specific patterns. Some cases become even more complicated when a lexical item such as *hand* has both metaphorical and metonymic senses: in many cases its metaphorical extension is placed between the metonymic source 'hand' and the target 'manual worker' illustrated by the BODY PART-PERSON pattern.

Chapter 3 (37 pages) assesses the 'Big Five' in relation to their definitions of metonymic senses. The difficulty to distinguish and clearly define them intersects with the central role of definitions, together with examples, as tools facilitating the users' understanding of meaning. The cognitive approach to lexicography overshadows the structuralist tradition as evinced in chapters 1, 2 and 3 of Wojciechowska's book. From this perspective, encyclopaedic information is prone to be reflected in the entries when necessary to make the meaning and its connections clearer. Comprehensibility and clarity are hence seen as decisive factors in the quality and success of the definitions in MLDs.

Among the defining strategies presently in the field, the canonical analytical definition and the full-sentence definition are pervasive in the 'Big Five'. Their presence is solidly grounded since they are able to accommodate both source and target in the definition as opposed to other strategies which are shorter. Wojciechowska's results confirm these facts by which 'the examination of the defining styles for the fifty metonyms in the present enquiry has revealed that the analytical definition predominates' (2012: 106). Within those, the target appears first in the function of *genus proximum* and the source appears as the explanation or *differentia specifica*.

Six issues with defining are found by Wojciechowska in her analysis, of which the second bears no repercussion to the successfulness of the definitions. Firstly, there is an inconsistent use of reference strategies illustrated by the

definition of *condominium*. CALD2, COBUILD4 and MEDAL2 use the definiendum, LDOCE4 uses the controlled defining vocabulary and OALDCE7 uses anaphoric reference. The author believes that 'template entries' would yield a homogeneous definition of metonymic senses in each dictionary. Unexpectedly, the use of derivative and base words is not condemned by the author, as Landau (2001) does, if those words are defined somewhere else in the dictionary. For example, the verb–noun conversion of *dance* showing the metonymic pattern ACTION–EVENT seems acceptable to the author: an alternative definition in the fashion of 'a social event where people move their bodies to music' (2012: 121) would be longer and more difficult to understand for beginners. Thirdly, the semantic relation between source and target is based on how close the defining vocabulary of each of them is to the other. Wojciechowska accordingly illustrates the improvement of, among others, the definition of the target *genius* so that its defining vocabulary matches that of its source.

A fourth issue is that of the absence of reference to the source in the *definiens* which, though scarce, happens with *casserole* in COBUILD4 and OALDCE7. In this case, only reference to the 'food' sense of the word, i.e. the target of the metonymy, and not to the 'recipient' sense, i.e. the source, is made explicitly by those dictionaries. Similarly questionable is what Wojciechowska reports as the absence of reference to the target in the source definition, as we see in the target definition of *press* in LDOCE4. '[P]eople who write reports for newspapers, radio or television' captures the 'reporters' sense, i.e. the target, of the metonymic pattern in the source definition. To our mind, however, it seems a case of absence of reference to the source, thus belonging to the subsection 3.5.4. Instead of the 'mass media' sense, i.e. the source, we only find reference to the 'reporters' sense, i.e. the target. These two issues of inclusion seem to be lexeme dependent. The final problem in definitional terms is that of the misconceived direction of the transfer, more prone to appear with the *definiendum* or anaphoric reference strategies.

In chapter 4 (26 pages), the distinction between count and mass nouns is acknowledged by the author as one of the most problematic for English language learners. Three aspects influence the intelligibility of such aspects in MLDs. Thanks to the trend of pedagogical lexicography, coding has been made more easily understandable for students through the letters [C] for countable and [U] for uncountable. The extra column that the COBUILD4 dictionary has is well-known for its rich grammatical information. The evolution of grammatical coding is also reflected in the inclusion of examples of three types, namely invented, extracted from corpora and corpora-based ones. Whereas examples are mostly used by beginners, more advanced learners resort to pattern illustrations such as *reward sb with sth*. Additionally, definitions are seen as 'much less obvious sources of grammatical information than examples' (2012: 142) by Bogaards and Van der Kloot (2002) and Dziemianko (2006). Wojciechowska favours well-formulated examples in her study as a clarifying strategy for count–mass distinction.

The author emphasizes in subsection 4.2 the crucial role that context plays in making sense of metonymies. She provides the taxonomies in Panther and Thornburg (2003, 2005, 2007) and Paradis (2004). In the latter, for instance, *The pasta bake asked for some more wine*, likely to be uttered in a restaurant setting, relies more heavily on context than *There are a lot of good heads at our university* does, which makes reference to heads as an important part of our human bodies (Paradis 2004: 7). The last empirical study of the dissertation identifies which metonyms out of those 100 in the first study show a countability dissimilarity and which of those are most helpfully encoded. The grammatical coding of 40 metonyms is the target for analysis. Quantitatively, CALD2 presents the worst results assigning confusing or erroneous [C] and [U] in 20 out of 40 instances whereas MEDAL2 assigns countability coding properly in all instances. In terms of examples which were rendered extremely useful for noting this distinction, COBUILD4 achieves the highest results due to its policy of maximum exemplification (Fox 1987: 137).

Although satisfactory overall (except for CALD2 results), four issues are raised by the author concerning the count–mass distinction in dictionaries, namely their occasional opaqueness, discrepancies, inclusion in definitions and absence of exemplification. As the author reports, the [C]/[U] distinctions run the risk of being opaque when the metonymic source and target are joined by a semicolon or the conjunction *or*. In this respect, 'the division of senses into subsenses and providing each with a code is a successful policy' (2012: 152). As far as the second is concerned, 15 out of 40 metonyms lack either [C] or [U] in one of its senses. For instance, the source *beer* in the CONTENTS–CONTAINER pattern refers to the uncountable noun 'beer' as in *I don't drink beer, only spirits*, and to the countable noun 'beer' referring to 'kinds of beer', as in *We have quite a good range of beers*. However, only two (COBUILD4 and OALDCE7) of the five dictionaries under analysis acknowledge that double countability coding of the source *beer*. The last issue, that of examples in the entries of the dictionary, evinces that there is no correlation between the frequency of words and their likelihood of exemplification. Surprisingly, the author notes that *baseball*, *basketball* and *football*, quite common words and part of the EVENT–INSTRUMENT pattern, are not exemplified in any of the 'Big Five'.

On the whole, the general findings of Wojciechowska (2012: 98) regarding the treatment of metonymy in those dictionaries yield diverging results. Although small inconsistencies in dictionaries are present both internally and in relation to others, the Macmillan dictionary outperforms the others regarding cognitive compatibility due to a conscious approach to figurative meaning. For this dictionary, inclusion of 'metonymy boxes' in the fashion of its 'metaphor boxes' is advised by the author. Three techniques are found to be used in the *definiens* of conventionalized metonyms, namely the use of anaphora, the repetition of the *definiendum* or the use of controlled defining vocabulary. The main problems with definitions are that some of them seem to suggest that the source is derived from the target and also seem to obscure the derivation of the

metonymic target from the core meaning. In the final chapter, it is reported that labels indicating countability of nouns of the *beer*, *shipment* and *fleece* type may sometimes be confusing for the learners. Their main feature should be clarity as to whether the source is countable, uncountable or both. According to Wojciechowska (2012), each subsense should have its own example for learners not to confuse the noun's countability. In this respect, examples taken as bearing, among other functions, that of reinforcing grammatical information may help clarify what is countable and uncountable in the metonymic relation.

In Wojciechowska's (2012) understanding, metonymy acts as a process of semantic elaboration of the source into the target and as such, the former should precede the latter. She proposes, though not uncritically, an organization of entries according to Van der Meer's (1997, 1999) and Geeraerts' (1990) ideas. Thence, the core, i.e. prototypical, meaning should come first, and figuratively derived ones should be listed as its subsenses. Metonymy as a same-domain mapping is thought of as closer to the core meaning and is therefore placed before the different-domain mapping operation of metaphor. The author acknowledges the existence of exceptional entries in learner's dictionaries where the core meaning may not come first as with the original meaning of *tea* as the plant: its low frequency may not facilitate the learner's understanding of the word's most common meaning (2012: 31-32). 'Multiple metonymies' as in *tea* or *silver* are accounted for by placing the targets under their source. If they are serially derived, frequency of occurrence will then be used as the criteria to order the metonymic targets. The dictionary entry for a word will thus present the core sense first, then the metonymic source and target, and finally its metaphorical senses.

It must be noted that the author's findings mostly acknowledge the (un)conscious cognitive approach of lexicographers to dictionary making. Some room for improvement is evinced in issues such as the coding of countability in each of the subsenses or consistent use of a defining strategy for metonymies. Nonetheless, MLDs are above all a product designed for the success of language learners. The subtleties and ameliorations proposed by Wojciechowska (2012) must be collated with empirical studies that verify the positive effects of her proposals on L2 learning. Tono (2001: 12-13) supports this claim by acknowledging the gap between the lexicographers' expectations of the users' skills and the actual skills of students in using the dictionary. Since that gap may hinder the entrenchment and apprehension of these metonymic patterns by English language learners, further experimental studies should be conducted to prove the present suggestions successful.

Wojciechowska's (2012) contribution is a step further in the optimization of lexicographic works regarding current semantic theories with an emphasis on metonymy codification. Her book presents the state of affairs of some conventionalized metonymic patterns as reflected in the 'Big Five'. Her study endorses the principle that '[e]xplanations of word meanings should rather be as intelligible as possible even if it sometimes means sacrificing a dictionary's uniformity' (2012: 119). Despite the naturally limited though rich analysis, the



author mentions but does not model 'template entries' (Atkins and Rundell 2008) for the standardization of dictionaries' microstructure of metonyms. On the whole, her research as presented in *Conceptual Metonymy and Lexicographic Representation* (2012) adds on the pedagogical lexicographic trends which advocate a more transparent connection between literal and figurative meaning.

## References

- Adamska-Salaciak, A. 2006. *Meaning and the Bilingual Dictionary. The Case of English and Polish*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Apresjan, J.D. 1995. *Semantyka Leksykalna. Synonimiczne Środki Języka*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich-Wydawnictwo.
- Atkins, B.T.S. and M. Rundell. 2008. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barcelona, A. 2000. Introduction: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy. Barcelona, A. (Ed.). 2000. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*: 1-25. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boers, F. 2000. Metaphor Awareness and Vocabulary Retention. *Applied Linguistics* 21(4): 553-571. Available: <http://sla.sjtu.edu.cn/thesis/Metaphor%20awareness%20and%20vocabulary%20retention.pdf>.
- Boers, F. and S. Lindstromberg. 2006. Cognitive Linguistic Applications in Second or Foreign Language Instruction: Rationale, Proposals and Evaluation. Kristiansen, G., M. Achard, R. Dirven and F.J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (Eds.). 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*: 305-358. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bogaards, P. and W.A. van der Kloot. 2002. Verb Constructions in Learners' Dictionaries. Braasch, A. and C. Povlsen. 2002. *Proceedings of the Tenth EURALEX International Congress. EURALEX 2002. Volume II: 747-757*. Copenhagen: Center for Sprogteknologi.
- Croft, W. 2002. The Role of Domains in the Interpretation of Metaphors and Metonymies. Dirven, R. and R. Pörings (Eds.). 2002. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*: 161-205. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cruse, D.A. 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeCesaris, J. and V. Alsina. 2002. The Representation of Figurative Senses in Learner's Dictionaries. Gottlieb, H., J.E. Mogensen and A. Zettersen (Eds.). 2002. *Symposium on Lexicography X: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Lexicography May 4-6, 2000 at the University of Copenhagen*: 77-90. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Dziemiątko, A. 2006. *User-friendliness of Verb Syntax in Pedagogical Dictionaries of English*. Lexicographica. Series Maior 130. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Fox, G. 1987. The Case for Examples. Sinclair, J.M. (Ed.). 1987. *Looking Up: An Account of the COBUILD Project in Lexical Computing and the Development of the Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary*: 137-149. London: Collins ELT.
- Geeraerts, D. 1990. The Lexicographical Treatment of Prototypical Polysemy. Tsohatzidis, S.L. (Ed.). 1990. *Meaning and Prototypes: Studies in Linguistic Categorisation*: 195-210. London: Routledge.
- Hanks, P. 2000. Do Word Meanings Exist? *Computers and the Humanities* 34: 205-215.

- Kilgarriff, A.** 1997. I Don't Believe in Word Senses. *Computers and the Humanities* 31(2): 91-113.
- Lakoff, G.** 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson.** 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Turner.** 1989. *More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Landau, S.** 2001. *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, R.W.** 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mel'čuk, I.** 1988. Semantic Description of Lexical Units in an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary: Basic Principles and Heuristic Criteria. *International Journal of Lexicography* 1(3): 165-188.
- Nerlich, B. and D.D. Clark.** 2001. Serial Metonymy: A Reference-based Study of Polysemisation. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2(2): 245-272.
- Panther, K.-U. and G. Radden (Eds.).** 1999. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Panther, K.-U. and L. Thornburg.** 2003. Metonymies as Natural Inference and Activation Schemas: The Case of Dependent Clauses as Independent Speech Acts. Panther, K.-U. and L. Thornburg (Eds.). 2003. *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing*: 127-147. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Panther, K.-U. and L. Thornburg.** 2005. Inference in the Construction of Meaning: The Role of Conceptual Metonymy. Górska, E. and G. Radden (Eds.). 2005. *Metonymy–Metaphor Collage*: 37-57. Warsaw: Warsaw University Press.
- Panther, K.-U. and L. Thornburg.** 2007. Metonymy. Geeraerts, D. and H. Cuyckens (Eds.). 2007. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*: 236-263. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paradis, C.** 2004. Where Does Metonymy Stop? Senses, Facets and Active Zones. *Metaphor and Symbol* 19(4): 245-264. Available: <http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordId=135358&fileId=1590153>.
- Peirsman, Y. and D. Geeraerts.** 2006. Don't Let Metonymy Be Misunderstood. An Answer to Croft. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(3): 269-316.
- Philip, G.** 2006. Metaphor, the Dictionary, and the Advanced Learner. Corino, E., C. Marelllo and C. Onesti (Eds.). 2006. *Proceedings of the Twelfth EURALEX International Congress, Torino, Italia, September 6th–9th, 2006. Volume 2*: 895-905. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. Available: <http://amsacta.unibo.it/2062/1/MetaphorDictionary.pdf>.
- Radden, G. and Z. Kövecses.** 1999. Towards a Theory of Metonymy. Panther, K.-U. and G. Radden (Eds.). 1999: 17-59.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, J.F.** 2000. The Role of Mappings and Domains in Understanding Metonymy. Barcelona, A. (Ed.) 2000. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*: 109-132. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Seto, K.** 1999. Distinguishing Metonymy from Synecdoche. Panther, K.-U. and G. Radden (Eds.). 1999: 91-120.

- Tono, Y.** 2001. *Research on Dictionary Use in the Context of Foreign Language Teaching: Focus on Reading Comprehension*. Lexicographica. Series Maior 106. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Ungerer, F. and H.-J. Schmid.** 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London/New York: Longman.
- Van der Meer, G.** 1997. Four English Learner's Dictionaries and their Treatment of Figurative Meanings. *English Studies* 78(6): 556-571.
- Van der Meer, G.** 1999. Metaphors and Dictionaries: The Morass of Meaning, or How to Get Two Ideas for One. *International Journal of Lexicography* 12(3): 195-208.
- Van der Meer, G. and R. Sansome.** 2001. OALD6 in a Linguistic and a Language Teaching Perspective. *International Journal of Lexicography* 14(4): 283-306.
- Warren, B.** 1999. Aspects of Referential Metonymy. Panther, K.-U. and G. Radden (Eds.). 1999: 121-138.
- Wojciechowska, S.** 2010. Metonymy Representation in English Monolingual Learners' Dictionaries: Problems and Solutions. Dykstra, A. and T. Schoonheim (Eds.). 2010. *Proceedings of the 14th EURALEX International Congress, Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, The Netherlands, 6-10 July 2010*: 1436-1449. Ljouwert: Afûk. Available: [http://www.euralex.org/elx\\_proceedings/Euralex2010/136\\_Euralex\\_2010\\_9\\_WOJCIECHOWSKA\\_Metonymy%20representation%20in%20English%20monolingual%20learners%20dictionaries\\_Problems%20and%20solut.pdf](http://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex2010/136_Euralex_2010_9_WOJCIECHOWSKA_Metonymy%20representation%20in%20English%20monolingual%20learners%20dictionaries_Problems%20and%20solut.pdf).
- Wojciechowska, S.** 2012. *Conceptual Metonymy and Lexicographic Representation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

José Antonio Jódar Sánchez  
San José State University  
San José, California  
United States of America  
(jjodarsa7@alumnes.ub.edu)