

UDC 811.111'373.612.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.1/32.214476>**Oksana BORYSOVYCH,**
orcid.org/0000-0001-8709-2849*PhD in Philology,
Assistant Professor at the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication
Institute of Philology of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
(Kyiv, Ukraine) o.borysovych@knu.ua*

METONYMIC AND METAPHORICAL USE OF PROPER NAMES IN BOOK REVIEWS

The paper is devoted to the special use of proper names in book reviews in mass media. The main goal of the article is to analyse the figurative meaning of proper names and identify the contexts in which they are used. Proper names are explored within the framework of cognitive linguistics. Special consideration is given to the role played by metonymy and metaphor in the construction of the figurative meaning of proper names.

Proper names have been studied from various aspects in philosophy and linguistics. One of the main issues of linguistic research is the complex structure of the meaning of proper names. In addition to their primary use to refer to the bearer of the name, proper names may acquire a connotative meaning. In book reviews, names of well-known writers are used figuratively to retrieve information associated with the names of original referents about their style of writing. The material consists of proper names collected from British and American newspapers and magazines featuring book reviews. Proper names used in book reviews can be divided into two main groups: writers who belong to the literary canon and popular contemporary writers.

It is argued that a few tiers of metonymic models are involved in the construction of the figurative meaning of proper names, followed by the metaphorical transfer which maps a set of properties onto the target domain. Metaphorical and metonymical transfers change the grammatical status of proper names. Such names can be used with articles, can have a plural form and accept different types of restrictive modifiers. Adjectives derived from proper names are used to highlight a particular feature reminiscent of an author's style.

The results show that figuratively used proper names evoke properties associated with an author's style of writing. Through metonymic and metaphorical transfers salient properties of the names's referent are extended to other individuals. Names of famous writers that denote a stereotypical bearer of certain properties are used as a model to evaluate books of other writers.

Key words: proper names, metaphor, metonymy, cognition, conceptualization, cultural memory.

Оксана БОРИСОВИЧ,
orcid.org/0000-0001-8709-2849*кандидат філологічних наук,
асистент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації
Інституту філології
Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка
(Київ, Україна) o.borysovych@knu.ua*

МЕТОНІМІЧНЕ ТА МЕТАФОРІЧНЕ ВЖИВАННЯ ВЛАСНИХ ІМЕН У КНИЖКОВИХ РЕЦЕНЗІЯХ

Стаття присвячена особливим випадкам вживання власних імен у рецензіях на книги у засобах масової інформації. Основна мета дослідження полягає в аналізі переносного значення власних імен і визначенні контекстів, у яких вони використовуються. Власні назви вивчаються у межах когнітивної лінгвістики, особливу увагу приділено ролі метонімії та метафори у побудові переносного значення власних імен.

Власні назви розглядалися у різних аспектах у межах філософії та мовознавства. Одним із основних питань лінгвістичних досліджень є складна структура значення власних імен. Власні назви, що використовуються для ідентифікації відповідного референта, також можуть мати конотативне значення. У книжкових рецензіях імена відомих письменників використовуються у переносному значенні для концептуалізації інформації про літературний стиль автора. Матеріал дослідження складається із власних імен, зібраних методом суцільної вибірки із британських та американських газет і журналів, що містять огляди книг. Власні імена, які використовуються в рецензіях, можна розділити на дві основні групи: це письменники, котрі належать до літературного канону, і популярні сучасні письменники.

У статті розглянуто метонімічні моделі формування переносного значення власних імен, що поєднують з метафоричною проекцією стереотипних характеристик зі сфери-джерела на сферу-ціль. Метафоричні

та метонімічні перенесення значення змінюють граматичний статус власних імен, наближаючи їх до загальних назв. Такі імена можуть використовуватися із прикметниками, артиклями та мати форму множини. Похідні прикметники, утворені на основі власних імен, використовуються для виділення певної характерної риси авторського стилю.

Як показали результати дослідження, власні імена, вжиті у переносному значенні, викликають певні асоціації, пов'язані зі стилем автора. Внаслідок метонімічного та метафоричного переосмислення значення характерні властивості референта імені переносяться на творчість письменників, книги яких розглядаються у рецензії. Імена відомих письменників, що постають в уяві мовців як носії низки стереотипних характеристик, використовуються у ролі моделі для оцінки творів інших авторів.

Ключові слова: власна назва, метафора, метонімія, когніція, концептуалізація, культурна пам'ять.

Introduction. The investigation of proper names is a broad subject which has always been of interest for linguists, philosophers and psychologists. In linguistics, proper names have been analysed from semantic (Kripke, 1980; Ziff, 1960), pragmatic (Searle, 1958; Pietarinen, 2010), stylistic (Smith, 2016) and cognitive (Marmaridou, 1998; Barcelona, 2004; Brdar M and Brdar-Szabó, 2007) perspectives. In recent years proper names have become the object of corpus-based studies (Markert and Nissim, 2006; Motschenbacher, 2020). One of the areas of research in modern linguistics is the connotative meaning acquired by proper names in a specific cultural context and the mechanisms of metaphorical and metonymic use of proper names. The figurative use of literary names in book reviews in mass media is based on the retrieval of the associated information about typical features characteristic of a style of a particular writer. Such names are integrated into the cultural memory of a certain nation, as they constitute the literary canon.

Literature review. Connotations acquired by proper names have been studied by Marmaridou (1998) and Baltes (1991), metonymic and metaphorical use of proper names is discussed in the research of Barcelona (2004), Brdar and Brdar-Szabó (2007), Langendonck (2005) and Wee (2006). Proper names that have a connotative meaning are referred to as metaphorically used proper names (Wee, 2006) or paragons (Lakoff, 1980; Barcelona, 2004).

The study of proper names in metaphorical expressions is linked to the debate about their lexical status. According to some theorists, proper names have no lexical meaning, as their main function is referential (Kripke, 1980; Ziff, 1960). They refer directly to their bearers and identify them as unique items. Other scholars claim that proper names may have denotational and connotational meanings based upon specific referents (Jespersen, 1965; Marmaridou, 1998; Langendonck, 2005). Jespersen argues that a name is “the complex of qualities characteristic of the bearer of the name” (Jespersen, 1965: 67, as cited in Baltes, 1991: 78).

Connotations develop “through individual and communal experiences such that the words and the objects or ideas they represent may acquire both personal and/or shared associations. These socially shared associations may be used to convey information and thereby attribute meaning to the name without invoking a specific referent” (Baltes, 1991: 76). When proper names are used connotatively “they stand as a shorthand for whatever characteristics a specific individual may at one time have been associated with” (Marmaridou, 1998: 355). From this point of view “proper name connotations are viewed as metaphors” (Marmaridou, 1998: 356).

Barcelona (2004) and Brdar and Brdar-Szabó (2007: 131) study the construction of the figurative meaning of proper names using conceptual metonymy and Lakoff's metonymic models. Brdar and Brdar-Szabó (2007: 135) argue that the figurative meaning of a proper names is construed through the interaction of metonymy and metaphor.

The aim of this article is to analyse the figurative use of proper names in newspaper book reviews and identify the contexts in which they occur. The data for analysis has been collected from book reviews in The Guardian, The Financial Times, The New York Times and The Times.

Metonymic and metaphorical expressions involving proper names. Figurative meaning of proper names used in book reviews is analyzed through the interaction of metonymy and metaphor as the borderline between them is often blurred. In this paper the terms metaphor and metonymy are used within the framework of cognitive linguistics. The metaphorical and metonymic use of personal names is studied as one of the mechanisms of the retrieval of information associated with a particular writer or literary work. Proper names conceptualize literary knowledge and activate implicated assumptions in the addressee.

As a complex phenomenon, metaphor is approached from different angles. In a broad sense, the term metaphor applies to any figurative use of words. The study of metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon led to the understanding of human thought processes as metaphorical in nature (Lakoff, 1980). Metaphors

transfer the image of one fragment of reality to another fragment and provide its conceptualization by analogy with the existing system of concepts. Within the cognitive paradigm, metaphors have been widely studied in different types of discourse.

Metonymy as a conceptual phenomenon is represented by the schema X for Y, where X stands for the source meaning and Y symbolizes the target (Panther & Thornburg, 2004: 95). In recent research, metonymy is presented as “a cognitive trigger providing access to a target concept” (Panther & Thornburg, 2003: 2). A proper name used metonymically acts as a reference point to provide access to the stereotypical properties associated with it.

The construction of the figurative meaning of proper names in book reviews involves a few metonymic models. Initially there is a metonymic transfer AUTHOR FOR WORK (e.g. *characters who might have stepped out of Dickens or P.G. Woodehouse*). When we use a proper name to indicate that some properties associated with the style of a particular writer are exhibited by another writer, we “activate THE BEARER OF PROPERTY FOR CHARACTERISTIC PROPERTY metonymy with further metaphoric mapping” (Brdar & Brdar-Szabó, 2007: 135).

If a reviewed book is reminiscent of the novels of Charles Dickens, it may apply to a range of properties, for example, poor conditions in which characters live or the naming of characters. A reviewer argues that an author of the reviewed book “has properties that are similar to the contextually relevant salient properties” (Jeshion, 2015: 373) of Dickensian style. The peculiarity of the metaphoric and metonymical use of proper names in book reviews is that they are used in mappings where the source and the target belong to the literary sphere.

Proper names used figuratively reflect the intersection between metaphor and culture as they are rooted in the cultural and historical context. Connotative meanings triggered by proper names are shared by all members within a given speech community or culture. In book reviews proper names used as critical tools fall into two main groups which consist of the writers that belong to the literary canon and popular contemporary writers whose works have already formed stereotypical associations. Although, potentially any well-known literary name may be used as a model for comparison, the collected data shows there is a group of recurrent proper names in book reviews. Our quantitative analysis indicates that Dickens is the most frequently used name in book reviews both in British and American mass media.

Figuratively used proper names that serve as an ideal representative of the class have a positive evaluative implication, which makes them an effective tool for reviewing a new book by comparing and contrasting it with the authors and books known to the reader. Comparison drawn between two or more writers can be used to praise a reviewed book when it has similar features (1) or criticise it when it departs from the model or lacks the required properties (2, 3).

(1) *The book's language is Faulknerian. It has a timeless, universal quality that is possible because it has emerged out of so particular a place* (The Guardian 20.09.2018).

(2) *No, she isn't Henry James or Nabokov or even Dickens* (The Times 28.07.2007).

(3) *But Baker's quasi-Faulknerian prose can be almost comically overwrought* (The New York Times 09.03.2003).

Proper names in metaphorical expressions assume the characteristics of common nouns such as the use of articles, plural forms (4) and modification by adjectives (e.g. *present-day Hemingway, modern Dickens*).

(4) *Give me a Sarah Waters, an Ali Smith, a Jackie Kay any day over the Tom Spanbauers of the world* (The Guardian, 22.09.2007).

Proper names frequently used in book reviews are productive in word formation. The largest group of derived words is represented by adjectives (*Dickensian, Joycean, Kafkaesque, Byronic, Austenish, Dickens-like, Tolkien-style* etc.) which apply to one particular property of an author's style as in (5).

(5) *Lady Eleanor speaks – or rather writes in her journal – in sly but prim, Jane Austenish prose* (The New York Times 17.10.2003).

A reviewer uses proper names or its derivatives to claim that the author of a reviewed book imitates a certain writer in plot construction, character development, language or other stylistic features. For example, an adjective Hemingwayesque is used to review a war novel, while a ‘Conradian novel’ is associated with sea voyages. There are two distinctive patterns in which the names of writers and derived adjectives occur. One of the models of metaphorical transfers is based on our perceptual experience: eyesight (*through a Kafkaesque lens; Mr. Cartwright's Updikean eye*), taste (*a flavour of Thurber's lonelier stories*) and hearing (*lightly seasoned with some Dickensian overtones*). Distinctive features that make up a writer's style may also be referred to as a separate world, terrain or landscape shared by other authors. The patterns are exemplified in (6) and (7).

(6) *Mr. Doescher adopts a stylized Shakespearean voice in recasting this saga that is chock-full of father-son showdowns, mysterious knightly orders and planet-hopping adventures* (The New York Times 24.12.2015).

(7) *The book became an instant bestseller and there Palliser has stayed, in a foggy and cobblestoned Dickensian world, for his subsequent novels* (The Financial Times 13.12.2013).

Derived adjectives are used to conceptualize knowledge about writers and evoke resemblance to an author's style in a shorthand way.

Conclusions. We have studied specific uses of proper names in book reviews in mass media. As the analysis of the collected data has demonstrated,

reviewers refer to a group of writers whose reputation has been established critically to assess new books. The proper names used in book reviews serve as a model for evaluating and discussing new books. The transfer of typical features associated with a writer to other authors is based on tiers of metonymic models and metaphorical mappings.

Proper names acquiring a more abstract type of meaning may be used in a way typical for common nouns. It is reflected in the use of proper names in the plural form, with articles and modifiers. Adjectives derived from the stem of an author's name conceptualize a wide range of meanings attributed to it. Future research might explore cultural differences between the use of proper names in British and American book reviews.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baltes P. Semantic variation in the connotations of personal names. *Deseret Language and Linguistic Society Symposium*. 1991. Vol. 17, Iss. 1. P. 75–85. URL: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/dlls/vol17/iss1/13> (retrieved 25.07.2020).
2. Barcelona A. Metonymy behind grammar: the motivation of the seemingly “irregular” grammatical behavior of English paragon names. *Studies in Linguistic Motivation* / G. Radden, K. Panther (Eds.). Mouton de Gruyter : Berlin, 2004. P. 357–374.
3. Brdar M., Brdar-Szabó R. When Zidane is not simply Zidane, and Bill Gates is not just Bill Gates: Some thoughts on the construction of metaphonymic meanings of proper names. *Aspects of Meaning Construction* / G. Radden, K.-M. Köpcke, T. Berg, P. Siemund (Eds.). Amsterdam-Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2007. P. 125–142.
4. Jeshion R. Referentialism and predicativism About Proper Names. *Erkenn*. 2015. Vol. 80. P. 363–404.
5. Jespersen O. The philosophy of grammar. New York : Norton, 1965.
6. Kripke S. Naming and necessity. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press, 1980. 172 p.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1980. 242 p.
8. Langendonck van W. Proper names and proprial lemmas. *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (Uppsala, 19–24 August 2002)* / Brylla E., Wahlberg M (Eds.). Uppsala : Språk-och Folkminnesinstitutet. 2005. Vol. 1. P. 315–323.
9. Markert K., Nissim M. Metonymic proper names : a corpus based account. *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy* / A. Stefanowitsch, S. Gries (Eds.) Mouton de Gruyter : Berlin, 2006. P. 152–174.
10. Marmaridou S. Proper names in communication. *Journal of Linguistics*. № 25. 1989. P. 355–372.
11. Motschenbacher H. Corpus linguistic onomastics: A plea for a corpus-based investigation of names. *Names*. 2020. Vol. 68. № 2. P. 88–103.
12. Panther K-U., Thornburg L. Introduction: On the nature of conceptual metonymy. *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing* / K-U. Panther, L. Thornburg (Eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. P. 1–20.
13. Panther K-U., Thornburg L. The role of conceptual metonymy in meaning construction. *Metaphorik.de*. 2004. Vol. 6. P. 91–116.
14. Pietarinen A.-V. Peirce's pragmatic theory of Proper names. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*. 2010. Vol. 46. № 3. P. 341–363.
15. Searle J. Proper names. *Mind*. 1958. Vol. 67. P. 166–173.
16. Smith G.W. Theoretical foundations of literary nomastics. *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming* / C. Hough with assistance by D. Izdebska (ed.) Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2016. P. 295–309.
17. Wee L. Proper names and the theory of metaphor. *Journal of Linguistics*. № 42 (2). 2006. P. 355–371. URL: www.jstor.org/stable/4176987 (retrieved 23.07.2020).
18. Ziff P. About proper names. *Mind*. 1977. Vol. 86. P. 319–332.
19. The Guardian. URL: www.theguardian.com.
20. The Financial Times. URL: www.ft.com.
21. The New York Times. URL: www.nytimes.com.
22. The Times. URL: www.thetimes.co.uk.

REFERENCES

1. Baltes P. (1991) Semantic variation in the connotations of personal names. *Deseret Language and Linguistic Society Symposium*, 17 (1), pp. 75–85. Retrieved July 25, 2020, from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/dlls/vol17/iss1/13>.
2. Barcelona A. (2004). Metonymy behind grammar: the motivation of the seemingly “irregular” grammatical behavior of English paragon names. In: G. Radden, K. Panther (Eds.). *Studies in Linguistic Motivation*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 357–374.

3. Brdar M., Brdar-Szabó R. (2007). When Zidane is not simply Zidane, and Bill Gates is not just Bill Gates: Some thoughts on the construction of metaphonymic meanings of proper names. In: G. Radden, K.-M. Köpcke, T. Berg, P. Siemund (Eds.), *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 125–142.
4. Jeshion R. (2015) Referentialism and predicativism about proper names. *Erkenntnis* 80 (S2), pp. 363–404.
5. Jespersen O. (1965). *The philosophy of grammar*. New York: Norton.
6. Kripke S. (1980). *Naming and necessity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 172 p.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 242 p.
8. Langendonck van W. (2005). Proper names and proprial lemmas. In E. Brylla, M. Wahlberg (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (Uppsala, 19–24 August 2002)*. Uppsala: Språk-och Folkminnesinstitutet, pp. 315–323.
9. Markert K., Nissim M. (2006). Metonymic proper names : a corpus based account. In: A. Stefanowitsch, S. Gries (Eds.), *Corpus-based approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 152–174.
10. Marmaridou S. (1989). Proper names in communication. *Journal of Linguistics*, 25, pp. 355–372.
11. Motschenbacher H. (2020) Corpus linguistic onomastics: a plea for a corpus-based investigation of names. *Names*, 68 (2), pp. 88–103.
12. Panther K-U, Thornburg L. (2003) Introduction: On the nature of conceptual metonymy. In: K-U. Panther, L. Thornburg (Eds.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1–20.
13. Panther K-U., Thornburg L. (2004). The role of conceptual metonymy in meaning construction". *Metaphorik.de*, 6, pp. 91–116.
14. Pietarinen A.-V. (2010) Peirce's pragmatic theory of proper names. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 46 (3), pp. 341–363.
15. Searle J. (1958). Proper names. *Mind*, 67, pp. 166–173.
16. Smith G.W. (2016) Theoretical foundations of literary onomastics. In: C. Hough, with assistance by D. Izdebska (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 295-309.
17. Wee L. (2006). Proper names and the theory of metaphor. *Journal of Linguistics*, 42(2), pp. 355–371. Retrieved July 23, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/4176987
18. Ziff P. (1977). About proper names. *Mind*, 86, pp. 319–332.
19. The Guardian. URL: www.theguardian.com
20. The Financial Times. URL: www.ft.com
21. The New York Times. URL: www.nytimes.com
22. The Times. URL: www.thetimes.co.uk