Katalin R e s z e g i (Debrecen)

METONYMIC NAMEGIVING FROM A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

The paper focuses on metonymic toponyms relying on the findings of cognitive metonymy studies. In this framework, metonymy is seen as a cognitive process used for conceptualization, in which one conceptual entity (the source) provides mental access to another conceptual entity (the target). Proper names are also involved in cognitive metonymy research but only metonymic use of proper names has been examined. Places, however, may appear in metonymic processes also as target entities, i.e., as the object to be referred to. In such cases a unique spatial object is named by referring to a contiguous thing using its common noun or proper name denomination. After a brief introduction into the cognitive theory of metonymy, the paper provides an overview and a reinterpretation of the results of onomastic research along the main conceptual schemes of metonymic place namegiving. The overview of metonymic schemes reveals that a large part of the associations in toponyms are used specifically for the creation of elements of this proper name type and their linguistic realization occurs partly differently than in the case of common noun metonymy. It is also emphasized that there may be significant differences between languages in terms of the linguistic realization of the different metonymic schemes: a) without any formal change in the linguistic form of the designation of the source entity, b) with formants or c) lexical elements attached. In this respect, the characteristics of the language and the impact of the already existing metonymic toponyms are decisive. Therefore, all metonymically-motivated names need to be considered to gain more nuanced insights into how the mechanism of metonymy manifests itself in namegiving. By reinterpreting metonymic namegiving within the framework of cognitive metonymy theory, we also expand our knowledge on the cognitive mechanism of metonymy.

Key words
metonymy; metonymic namegiving; toponyms; cognitive theory of metonymy

1. Introduction

Metonymy plays a significant role in the creation of toponyms, however, there are numerous contradictions in connection with metonymic names in onomastic research. On the one hand, drawing the boundaries of the category of metonymic toponyms itself raises several problems, and on the other hand, we may encounter different categorizations for the various subtypes. In this paper I discuss this form of namegiving relying on the findings of cognitive metonymy studies. I argue that this way we can address some of the problems and contradictions inherent in earlier typologies. Besides this specific objective, my study has more general goals as well. The role of metonymy in namegiving has so far received no scholarly atten-

tion within cognitive linguistics. By reinterpreting metonymic namegiving within the framework of cognitive metonymy theory, we also expand our knowledge on the cognitive mechanism of metonymy.

The study consists of three larger sections: first, a brief overview of the cognitive theory of metonymy is provided, along with the metonymic use of names. In the second section, I define metonymic namegiving based on the principles of the cognitive theory of metonymy. In the third and longest section of the paper, I discuss the various schemes of metonymic namegiving. In this process I primarily rely on previous analytical works.

2. Cognitive theory of metonymy and the metonymic use of names

Cognitive metonymy theory has reinterpreted the mechanism of metonymy and its position within the linguistic system. In this framework, metonymy is seen as a cognitive process used for conceptualization that can be explained based on the notion of conceptual domains. The conceptual domains with different levels of complexity are made up by the networks of conceptual representations closely associated in experience (Langacker, 1987, pp. 154–166), i.e., things are represented with their perceived relationships in the mental system. Based on this organization, one conceptual entity (the more salient source) can activate (provides mental access to) another conceptual entity (the target). Such a conceptual link based on experiential contiguity serves as the basis of conceptual metonymy.[1] It is also emphasized that metonymy has primarily a referential function (Lakoff – Johnson, 1980, p. 36).

Conceptual metonymies are revealed by metonymic linguistic expressions. Metonymic expressions are interpreted based on the linguistic context and the metonymic organization of the conceptual system (for the cognitive operations involved see Ruiz de Mendoza, 2011). Based on the study of metonymic expressions, the typical schemes of metonymy can be identified, e.g., PART OF THE BODY FOR PEOPLE, MATERIAL CONSTITUTING AN OBJECT FOR THE OBJECT, THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION, etc. (Lakoff – Johnson, 1980, pp. 35–40; Kövecses – Radden, 1999; Kövecses, 2005, pp. 147–164). Conventionalized metonymic use of words may cause a change in the usage of the word and may lead to metonymically-motivated polysemy (Paradis, 2011). In some cases the schemes themselves may

[1] Langacker sees metonymy as an active zone phenomenon, that is, an attention and focal adjustments, which allows the speaker to highlight a particular aspect of a complex entity (profiling) (Langacker, 2009, p. 46; Verhagen, 2007). Zone activation is a more general cognitive process and metonymy is a part of it.

be reevaluated and become the basis for the emergence of polysemic meanings.[2] As we will see it is important in metonymic namegiving as well.

The phenomenon of metonymy is discussed in cognitive linguistics mostly in connection with common nouns and examples are brought at most in connection with the metonymic use of proper names; e.g., *America does not want another Pearl Harbor, Washington is negotiating with Moscow, Paris is introducing longer skirts this season, I love Shakespeare, I am reading Dickens, A smooth Bordeaux that was gutsy enough*. Metonymic name usage may be explained with the complex semantic structure of names that includes all the knowledge about the person or place designated by the name (Langacker, 2008, pp. 316–318; Tolcsvai Nagy, 2008; Reszegi, 2018). In a specific context one of these pieces of information may become salient and thus the name can be used with reference to this and we may use and interpret it practically as a common noun. In the background of the process, we can identify THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT, THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION (CAPITAL FOR THE GOVERNMENT), THE PRODUCER FOR THE PRODUCT, THE PLACE FOR THE PRODUCT, etc. conceptual schemes. In such structures the proper names are always present as source elements and they feature only such names the referents of which are associated by the community with a significant event, institution, etc. (Kövecses, 2005, pp. 148–149).

The metonymic use of proper names is rather frequent, according to some corpus studies toponyms appear in such a role in 17% of all mentions (country names in 20% of mentions) in the English-language texts examined (Markert – Nissim, 2002, 2006; cf. Brdar – Brdar-Szabó, 2009). Further pragmatic factors may also contribute to the frequency of metonymic name usage. For example, the toponyms used in the PLACE FOR THE EVENT scheme (cf. Langacker, 2008, pp. 250–251) frequently (although not exclusively) refer to negative events, e.g., *Pearl Harbor*, *Auschwitz*, *Hiroshima*, *Vietnam*, *Chernobyl*, *Fukushima*, *Mohács* ('Hungarians were defeated by the Turkish in 1526, who then occupied a significant part of the country'), the direct mentioning of which would be painful, impolite in certain situations. By using these names, the description of the specific negative event can be avoided (cf. Arimitsu, 2015; Shi – Sheng, 2011).

The above schemes are mostly universal. However, the metonymic use of certain names is typically culturally embedded. At the same time, due to globalization (as shown by the examples above) the metonymic use of certain names may also become more widespread.

---

[2] According to research findings in psycholinguistics, the conventional expressions of THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION metonymy are fixed in the mental lexicon (Frisson – Pickering, 1999, pp. 1369–1376).

3. Metonymic toponyms

Places may appear in metonymic processes not only as sources but also as target entities, i.e., as the object to be referred to. In such cases a unique spatial object is named by referring to a contiguous thing using its common noun or proper name denomination. The process may result in an occasional designation but it may also be a new name created with the specific purpose of namegiving; e.g., the *Gulya-kút* 'herd + well' name is also used to designate the surrounding area as *Gulyakút* (Jakab – Kálnási, 1987). In such a case, a new proper name meaning is created in the onomasticon of the name giver and its community, which is in a close relationship with the original conceptual representation of the word.

The different toponym typologies typically list only those names within this category in the case of which the mechanism of metonymy caused the emergence of a new name without any formal changes. This means that those names are not included in this category that despite being metonymically motivated were created in combination with some kind of a morphological or lexical formant (Hoffmann, 2007, pp. 116–118; Ainiala, 2016, pp. 75–79). For example, when analyzing the Hungarian onomastic corpus, the *Komló* 'hops' – *Komlód*, *Péter* – *Peterd* forms are distinguished: the basic forms are listed among metonymic toponyms, while the forms with suffixes are included in the category of names created with morphological name formation. The only function of the *-d* suffix featured in the examples above, however, is to make it more name-like and it has no other linguistic function, i.e., it has a very schematic semantic structure; therefore it is not justified to treat them separately. Using this model with the Slovak and Czech languages, it may seem that metonymy plays only a quite peripheral role in the creation of names and practically we cannot encounter the PERSON FOR THE PLACE metonymy. However, this approach is truly fundamental and widespread. What happens here, instead, is that in these languages metonymic namegiving usually manifests itself together with morphological name formation (Štěpán, 2018, 2012). If we wish to gain a better understanding of the role of metonymy in namegiving, we need to consider these names also.

In Finnish language, the new toponyms created from the name of the neighboring place are categorized in two different groups: a) the indirect cases of metonymic namegiving without a formant, b) among the direct names these make up the so-called annexe names (secondary names that include the primary name with some kind of a structural change) (Ainiala, 2016, pp. 75–79). Following this model, in Estonian the range of metonymic names is further narrowed: even in the process of metonymic namegiving without a formant the nominative form of the name is replaced (Laansalu, 2018). However, these are such linguistic features that do not invalidate the metonymic approach.

From the perspective of the cognitive system, it is more justified to treat associative mechanisms separately from their linguistic manifestations to a certain extent. In the cognitive linguistic framework, linguistic elements are described as the unit of conceptual meaning and linguistic form (cf. Langacker, 2013, p. 15), and namegiving processes can affect both poles. With the mechanism of metonymy, we can establish conceptual correspondence between things that are in relationship with one another; one of these may be a unique place, with which we can associate numerous things based on our experience (its flora and fauna, a related person, other places, events, etc.). Through the connection inherent between them, these may also recall the image of the place. These connections may also be reflected in the naming of the place, which may be linguistically expressed in multiple ways: a) without any formal change in the linguistic form of the designation of the vehicle entity, b) metonymy may also involve the linguistic change of the word, i.e., speakers use the metonymically-activated word to designate the target entity – in line with the characteristics of their language – with formants or lexical elements attached.[3] Therefore, all metonymically-motivated names need to be considered to gain more nuanced insights into how the mechanism of metonymy manifests itself in namegiving.

It is another question in onomastic research whether we need to talk about a) two names as a result of metonymic namegiving or b) one name having two referents (the latter represents the approach adapted by Scandinavian onomasticians, cf. Ainiala, 2016, p. 78). Using the cognitive approach, we may claim that toponyms are organized into subnetworks for each name type and thus a single name may be represented as part of two networks as well in a way that there is an organic, essential connection, an overlap between them. Thus this is a relationship that may be interpreted as a unique polysemic one in the mental system of the name giver at the time of the creation of the new name. Of course, this may change later in line with the evolution of name usage.

4. Schemes of metonymic toponyms

Numerous different associations based on contiguity may be present in connection with places. These metonymic schemes have been systematized in several ways. István Hoffmann introduced the schemes typical in the Hungarian onomastic corpus (2007, pp. 118–127). A somewhat different system and terminology is used by Pavel Štěpán when describing the onomastic corpus of Bohemia in the

[3] Barcelona claims that "explicit mention of the target is in principle not possible in metonymy" (2011, p. 32), however, in namegiving it is less essential as schemes of name structures impact namegiving partly differently compared to common noun expressions.

Czech Republic (2012), Sanda Rapa in connection with Latvian (2019), Staffan Nyström with Swedish (2013), Tiina Laansalu with Estonian (2018), and Vibeke Dalberg with Danish metonymic names (2008), for the typology of Finnish toponyms see Ainiala (2016). Despite the differing terminology, it is clear that the majority of the described metonymic schemes are general and probably describe universal conceptual relations. At the same time, there are also some more unique, language-specific schemes (cf. e.g., Štěpán, 2012). The general schemes of metonymic place namegiving are specifically related to the toponymicon, thus they do not necessarily correspond to the common noun metonymic schemes.

In what follows, I provide an overview of the results of onomastic research along the main conceptual schemes of metonymic place namegiving, using the cognitive approach. For my analysis, I used county-level toponym collections and former analytical works with reference to the Hungarian toponymic corpus (for contemporary toponyms cf. Balogh – Ördög, 1987; Jakab – Kálnási, 1987; Kováts, 2000; Hoffmann, 2007; for medieval toponyms Reszegi, 2007, 2011; Győrffy, 2011; Bába, 2016; Tóth, 2017), while in order to be able to draw more general conclusions, I also considered findings related to the onomastic corpus of other languages primarily relying on former analytical works in this respect (Ainiala et al., 2016; Paikkala et al., 2007; Štěpán, 2012; Rapa, 2019; Nyström, 2013; Laansalu, 2018; Dalberg, 2008; Jarring, 1997; Jett, 2011).

4.1 Place for the place (spatial relationship)

Most frequently, spatial contiguity serves as the basis of metonymic namegiving. In this process both toponyms and common nouns may be used to designate another place. The primary common noun meaning of the toponyms does not influence whether a given name can participate in metonymic namegiving or not; cf. Hungarian *Sárospatak* ‘muddy brook’, *Hegyeshalom* ‘pointed hillock’ settlement names. This may be explained with the functioning of names as linguistic units (cf. Langacker, 1987, pp. 57–76; Tolcsvai Nagy, 2008, pp. 37–38).[4]

The numerous subtypes of the place for the place scheme may be grouped according to different considerations. The most often used categories in descriptions are the general part for the whole and whole for the part, as well as part for the part schemes of metonymy.

[4] According to cognitive linguistics, the acquisition of proper names and their representation in the cognitive system is likely to be based on the storage of complete forms rather than analytical processing. That is, toponyms are linguistic units, and, as such, stored without analytic processing, and analytic processing can only supplement processing by units as a secondary method (cf. Tolcsvai Nagy, 2008, p. 32).

In the Hungarian onomastic corpus most frequently the name of a smaller part of the landscape standing out from the spatial environment as the background or the name of line-like places are used to designate the larger area. These are created based on the PART FOR THE WHOLE metonymic scheme. Within this, we can find associations between various place types: a river, spring, lake, road, path, building, terrain formation may appear as a source entity, e.g., Hungarian *Marcal* river (Illyrian origin) > *Marcal* area next to the river, *Büdös-kút* 'stinky well' > *Büdös-kúti-dűlő* 'stinky well' + *-i* name formant + 'plowland', *Kis-tó* 'small lake' > *Kistói-dűlő* 'small lake plowland', *Betekincs* 'peek inside' pub > *Betekincs* street (Hoffmann, 2007, pp. 119–121).

In those cases when a line-like object (river, road, path) serves as the intermediary concept, the process is almost always built on proper names in Hungarian; e.g., *Encsencs(i) út* 'road leading to Encsencs' road name > *Encsencs(i) úti dűlő* 'Encsencs road plowland' land name. Point or patch-like spatial objects (spring, building; lake, landform), however, often appear as common nouns in the designations of other places, cf. Hung. *kápolna* 'chapel' > *Kápolna* settlement part with a chapel; *rókalyuk* 'foxhole' > *Rókalyuk* area (Hoffmann, 2007, pp. 121–122).

There are much fewer examples in the Hungarian microtoponym corpus for the WHOLE FOR THE PART scheme, typically we can find only the association between the larger area and the building on it; cf., *Sőre-föld* (*Sőre* personal name + 'land') > *Sőreföld-tanya* (*tanya* 'farm'), which according to István Hoffmann, is due to the fact that the name of the larger area as a whole is less suitable for naming smaller parts (2007, p. 122). In the onomastic corpus of other languages, however, the proportion of such names is higher. In Latvian, Sanda Rapa's studies indicate that most of the metonymic toponyms were created based on the WHOLE FOR THE PART scheme, the name of the hill on which they are located is featured in the name of numerous fields and meadows (2019). In the Czech toponymic corpus, however, the PART FOR THE PART scheme is the most frequent in metonymic namegiving both among settlement names and other name types. *Most* (< *most* 'bridge') settlement, for example, was founded nearby an old fascine bridge leading across a marshland in northwest Bohemia and it was named after the bridge itself; similarly, a field close to a chapel was named *Kaple* < *kaple* 'chapel'. The same scheme may also lead to transonymization (Štěpán, 2012, pp. 772–773). Therefore, the frequencies of different schemes cannot be regarded as universal.

In case we consider names based on metonymic schemes as one group, irrespective of their morphological structure, we can examine how this namegiving method appears in different languages. In Hungarian, metonymic namegiving without changes in form is rather frequent, but formation with first or second constituents is not rare either, and there are also examples for the creation of both versions. In connection with the particular subschemes and the linguistic form,

there are also regional differences in the Hungarian onomastic corpus. In areas where two-component names are more dominant (in eastern Hungary), the new names created by means of metonymic schemes are also more likely to be added to the name system this way and this is where the proportion of single and two-component variants is also higher (cf. *Csárda* 'inn' – *Csárda-dűlő* 'inn plowland'). Whereas in areas where two-component names are less dominant (in the western Hungarian regions) their impact is less significant in the case of metonymic names as well. The preferred structures also varied over time. In Hungarian, in the 11th–13th centuries the single-component names were dominant, then two-component structures gradually became more central and speakers also often added a first or second constituent to toponyms that had previously been created through metonymy without any formal changes.

In Finnish and Estonian, such names were typically created with a geographical common noun as a second constituent (Ainiala, 2016, p. 68, 76). In Danish, there is a difference between toponym types in this respect. Settlement names were often created from names of natural places without changes in form; settlement names, however, typically become names of natural places in combination with a geographical common noun (Dalberg, 2008, pp. 45–46). This is explained by Vibeke Dalberg partly with the conserving effect of written culture. Settlement names appeared in written texts quite early and among these there were many that had been created from names of natural places without any formal changes and these were preserved in writing and they served as a model for further settlement names with a similar structure. Names of natural places, however, appeared in a higher proportion only later in official documents, their form was less fixed and a two-component structure became widespread among them in the 16th–17th centuries. Besides this, the different social significance of places might have also contributed to the structural differences (Dalberg, 2008, p. 46). Stefan Brink also highlights the hierarchy in the scope of toponyms (due to the different socio-cultural significance of the places): the settlement names have a higher status and this also impacts the linguistic structure of names. The Swedish *Björnsjön* 'bear lake' hydronym, for example, preserved this form in the metonymic designation of the nearby settlement and in order to avoid homonymy, the 'lake' lexeme was attached to the name of the lake once more: *Björnsjösjön* 'Bear lake-lake' (Brink, 2016, p. 164).

All this indicates that despite an identical approach and identical cognitive mechanism, the linguistic realization of the PLACE FOR THE PLACE metonymy may differ in namegiving. This is obviously due to the grammatical features and the unique attributes of the name system in the given language.

We need to mention one more issue in connection with the PLACE FOR THE PLACE scheme. According to Terhi Ainiala, "named locations by nature are clearly different and also, by their referents, indisputably separable from one another."

(2016, p. 78). The identical designations of places less closely associated based on the perception process may be considered clear cases of metonymically-motivated namegiving, for example, the settlement names created from names of natural places (e.g., Hungarian *Sárospatak* settlement < *Sárospatak* 'muddy brook' brook, *Hegyeshalom* settlement < *Hegyes-halom* 'pointed hillock' hillock). The semantic content of these metonymic names has clearly changed as they were also used to identify another type of place. And as this namegiving method was not rare, it could serve as a model for further metonymic toponyms also.

Certain place types, however, are distinguished to a lesser extent and this is visible also in their mental representation and namegiving. When studying Hungarian name usage, we can see that name users do not necessarily differentiate between the names of hills and the forest covering the hills, for example, the *Halyagos* (< *hólyagfa* 'bladdernut, Lat. Staphylea'), *Nagy-Milic* (Hung. *nagy* 'large' + Slavic *Milic*), *Farkas-hegy* ('wolf mountain'), *Őr-hegy* ('guard + mountain') toponyms refer to the mountain and the forest on it simultaneously (Kováts, 2000; Reszegi, 2007). As a result of the cognitive processes, the mountain and the forest covering it are perceived by the individual as a single referent. This approach is supported by name usage itself: the places belonging together do not have a separate name and thus they are not perceived as separate objects. In their cases, we cannot talk about metonymically-motivated name usage in consideration of the contemporary state (Reszegi, 2007), they can be explained as examples of zone activation (cf. footnote 2). This, of course, does not mean that in the case of closely-related places we cannot even consider metonymic namegiving at all. To say so, however, we must explore the knowledge of speakers in connection with the particular toponyms.

The two types introduced (names of natural places > settlement name; name of forest ~ oronym) may be interpreted as two endpoints of a scale. The further examples of namegiving of contiguous places (river name – name of the river bank, hill name – name of the castle on that hill, etc.) can be positioned mostly between the endpoints.

Those processes when a toponym designating a smaller area is used as the name of a larger place of the same place type including the given area (for example, the name of mountain peak becomes the name of the mountain, the name of a smaller land area is used as the name of a larger land) may also be explained with the PLACE FOR THE PLACE metonymy, based on the PART FOR THE WHOLE approach. For example, the *Mátra* oronym was originally used only to designate the highest point of the mountain in northern Hungary, however, with time it became the name of the entire mountain (Kiss, 1984, p. 107). People represent local relations in their cognitive system: the mental representations of larger areas are subdivided into smaller parts based on geographical knowledge or estate rights, etc. Based on these

relations, people create a multilevel, complex, hierarchical system about their geographical environment. The representations of places are in a special hierarchical relationship with each other. In line with this, the names of places also reflect this hierarchy. And the individual chooses from one of the levels of the hierarchy depending on the given communicative situation. A shift in the hierarchy, i.e., the use of a toponym for the overall designation of a new, larger area (also including the previously designated place) entails the emergence of a new meaning. We may also consider the reverse of this process based on the WHOLE FOR THE PART scheme. These can be considered the simplest examples of domain expansion (SOURCE IN TARGET) and domain reduction (TARGET IN SOURCE) that are considered as the basic cognitive operations of metonymy (Ruiz de Mendoza, 2011, pp. 106–107).

4.2 Person for the Place

Another typical type of metonymic toponyms expresses a relationship between the place and a person. There may be numerous underlying schemes in this case: the most typical is the association with the OWNER, but the name may also refer to the FOUNDER OF THE PLACE, ITS USER, THE RESIDENTS, sometimes the EVENT RELATED TO THEM that had taken place there, etc. These schemes are to a great part related to the conceptual content of settlement names. The metonymic association with the owner also appears in the case of other types of toponyms (land, field, lake, etc.); however, it is not typical in the case of larger rivers and mountain ranges in the Hungarian onomastic corpus (cf. Reszegi, 2011; Győrffy, 2011). In the case of natural places, there are also other schemes at work. For example, in the case of bodies of water, the OWNER OF FISHING RIGHTS or the PERSON WHOSE LAND THE WATER CROSSES could also serve as the basis (the source) of metonymic association. There may be significant differences in the proportion of different toponym types in terms of the metonymic schemes related to people.

It is a generally-held view in European onomastics that the role of personal names as toponym-constituents is significant in all languages (cf. e.g., Tóth, 2017, pp. 13, 183). This is certainly characteristic of all those societies where the ownership of land by individuals is a given. Yet, we need to be more cautious with such statements as the perception of the world and the landscape in traditional societies is fundamentally different and this cultural difference also impacts the perception of the relationship between the land and people. In these communities the land is not owned by individuals, they look at it within the framework of collective ownership and the given group received the land only for use and in line with this, they attempt to leave their mark on it as little as possible. In these societies the OWNER FOR THE PLACE scheme clearly could not develop. Thus the personal names themselves appear less frequently in the toponyms of traditional societies and in their case the motivation of namegiving is also different. As Stephen C. Jett wrote about

this type of namegiving of the Navajo people, "Navajos normally do not name anything after a person unless it belongs to him since this might attract to that person too much attention from the supernaturals; to the Navajo, a store can be owned but not the land or any part thereof." (Jett, 1970, p. 183, cf. Jett, 2011, p. 330).

Thus we may claim that in the European culture the above PERSON FOR THE PLACE schemes are all mostly present and resulted in toponyms that include personal names or common nouns denoting people. Of course, there are difference in proportions across languages in the extent to which different schemes prevail. Within the Hungarian toponym system, the productivity of the PERSON FOR THE PLACE scheme is rooted not only in cognitive foundations but also in the conditions of medieval Hungary. In the feudal state of the 11th–12th centuries, written culture was only spreading and under the circumstances of oral culture in the case of places named after their owner the identical personal and place names had a legal role. These names clearly referred to the owner and thus speakers consciously used this way of designation (Tóth, 2017, pp. 16–17, 106–113). With the emergence of legal writing, the legal function of the toponyms also gradually decreased in the Kingdom of Hungary, while the metonymic scheme itself remained active. Ownership is the most frequent basis of metonymic association in this category also in the case of the European languages mentioned above. In connection with this, we find examples in other languages as well whereby the change in ownership also entailed the changing of the name; for example, the Danish *Gökstrop-* (< *Gøk* male name) was replaced by the *Knutstrop* name (< *Knut* male name) (Dalberg, 2008, p. 55).

There may be significant differences between languages in terms of the linguistic realization of the PERSON FOR THE PLACE metonymic schemes. In this respect, the characteristics of the language and the impact of the already existing metonymic toponyms are decisive again. Besides this, we may also consider the influence of culture as well as settlement and estate history (Tóth, 2017, p. 161). In Finnish (just like in the case of metonymy based on spatial relations), namegiving by means of compounding is the most typical, e.g., *Matinpelto* 'Matti's field' (Ainiala, 2016, pp. 74–75, 81, 84). In Czech, the majority of toponyms are formed with morphological formants. There is a rather high number of endings used in this role, which may be used to indicate both individual and community ownership; e.g., *Radomysl* personal name > *Radomyšl* toponym, *Petrovici* 'Petr's people' > *Petrovice* 'of Petr's people' settlement (Štěpán, 2018, pp. 113–117).

In Hungarian, all three structures are used (*Bátor* personal name > *Bátor* settlement name, *Péter* personal name + *-d* topoformant > *Peterd* settlement name, *Mihály* personal name + 'village' < *Mihályfalva*),[5] their proportion, however, varies

[5] According to Langacker, metonymy is a type of reference point phenomenon. The essence of this is that we think of certain concepts in relation to other concepts (for example, when reci-

over space and time. The 13th century brought about significant changes in this respect, when the significance of the so far dominant toponyms created from anthroponyms without changes in form diminished and the proportion of two-component forms began to grow. This is partly due to changes affecting the name system as a whole, while indirectly it is also related to changes in the personal name system. The frequency of the given personal name strongly influenced the form in which it became a toponym. Rare anthroponyms became toponyms without a formant in a higher proportion than the frequent personal names. In this respect, the spreading of Latin anthroponyms brought about major changes in the 11th–12th centuries. The previous extensive and varied anthroponym corpus was replaced by a much less numerous name corpus and thus the frequency of certain names was much higher than before (Tóth, 2017, pp. 52–59). This also contributed to the fact that among toponyms formed from anthroponyms the proportion of toponyms created with formants increased. Yet, the personal name (> toponym metonymic namegiving process without changes in form) has been productive in Hungarian to this day.

For a long time, this namegiving method was considered to have nomadic origins (Rohlfs, 1956, p. 156, footnotes 17–18; cf. Bárczi, 1960, p. 7). Indeed, anthroponym (> toponym metonymic namegiving without a formant) can also be found in Turkic languages of Central Asia; e.g., *Dilgi*, *Dilger*, *Muk(k)úr*, *Sadak*, *Tujdale* (Jarring, 1997, pp. 129, 396, 484). However, a large part of these are names of watercourses, while in Hungarian this is typically a means of settlement naming. What is more, namegiving based on the PERSON FOR THE PLACE scheme may take place in other languages as well without formal changes, although it is mostly very peripheral. We can find examples for it also among Finnish settlement names: e.g., *Vaasa* (from the Swedish royal family in the 16th and 17th centuries), *Loviisa* (from Queen Lovisa Ulrika in the mid-18th century) (Paikkala et al., 2007, pp. 485–486, 244). It also occurs in Czech, for example, in the *Eliška* lake name < *Eliška* female name, *Kučera* lake name < *Kučera* surname (Štěpán, 2012, p. 774). At the same time, in certain Slavic languages, as a result of phonological changes related to the *-jь* Slavic topoformant during the Middle Ages, the name formant disappeared from the toponyms created with this formant and they became identical

ting the alphabet, each letter calls the next one to mind, or one cannot conceive of an object without its shape, cf. 1999, p. 173; 2008, pp. 83–85, 505–508). Another typical example of a reference point phenomenon is possession, which, like metonymy, appears in reference point structures. In possessive expressions, "one entity (the one we call the possessor) is invoked as a reference point for purposes of establishing mental contact with another (the possessed)" (Langacker, 1999, p. 176). Toponyms with anthroponym + appellative structure can be interpreted as a specific combination of the association mechanism of metonymy and the possessive reference point structure.

to anthroponyms. These toponyms could motivate further namegiving (Tóth, 2017, pp. 78–79; Kiss, 1999, pp. 109–110; Štěpán, 2012, pp. 113–114). There are such names in Romance languages as well, for example, in French *Corneille*, *Marceille*, Italian *Calvigno*, *Serviglio*, and Spanish *Cornelle*, *Oreja* (Rohlfs, 1956, p. 156, footnotes 17–18; cf. Bárczi, 1960, p. 7).

In Hungarian onomastics, this name type was claimed to have its roots in the nomadic lifestyle of Hungarians prior to the 11th century. During these times only people could be visited and not the permanent residence of people and thus the places were named after the people currently occupying it (Moór, 1936, p. 110). According to another explanation, this namegiving method could be the remnant of an old, prelogical way of thinking, in which the identical name represents the perfect identification of the people and the land (Kertész, 1939, pp. 33, 76–77).[6] (The close relationship between places and people is also characteristic of the spatial perception of children at the beginning of learning toponyms, cf. Reszegi, 2016.) From the perspective of the cognitive system, this name type can be explained in a way that in the conceptual system there is a strong link between the representation of the person and the land based on their experienced relationship and one can activate the other. This enables the linguistic realization of metonymy in communication. And this, in turn, may result in metonymic namegiving and polysemic meanings. As soon as this name type appears, it serves as a model for the creation of other names. In the case of these names, besides conceptual relationship of the two concepts, the impact of the toponym model of speakers is also decisive. The same correspondence can also be identified behind toponyms created from anthroponyms with some kind of a formant or lexical element. In this case, however, the name-like feature is created by the name giver through formal means (besides the reevaluation of the rules of name use). The frequencies of the typical toponym structures based on metonymic schemes are greatly dependent on the grammar of particular languages.

The designation of the person having some kind of a relationship with the place can also happen with a common noun. In Czech, this is especially frequent when naming ponds, with reference to the owner; e.g., *Komorník* ‘chamberlain’, *Písař* ‘scrivener’, *Rytíř* ‘knight’ (Štěpán, 2012, p. 774), cf. Hungarian *Horvát*, *Horváti* ‘Croat’, *Szakács*, *Szakácsi* ‘cook’, *Pásztor* ‘shepherd’ settlement names. In some cases, however, it is not easy to decide whether these types of names were created from a common noun or a proper name.

[6] Prelogical thinking has recently been referred to in psychology also as translogical, as it is not a stage of development prior to the “normal” way of thinking, but it refers to such a cognitive mechanism that does not follow the principles of formal logic which is also present in our everyday thinking even today (Mérő – Varga, 2000, p. 192; Mérő, 2001, p. 30).

4.3 Vegetation for the Place

The typical vegetation of the place or a specific tree are often associated with the particular place as a salient attribute. This feature may also be used to recall the image of the place and thus may also serve as the basis of namegiving, especially in the case of natural places. For example, Hungarian *Rekettye* 'genista', *Cseresznyés-dűlő* 'cherry' + *-s* topoformant + 'plowland' (Hoffmann, 2007, pp. 122–123). Some of the toponyms reflecting the plant for the PLACE scheme are quite close to direct descriptions. In Hungarian, there is another factor that contribute to the unique transitional status of these toponyms as names of plants often gain a meaning of 'where the given plant grows', e.g., *dinnye* 'melon' > 'melon land'; the emergence of the 'forest' meaning is especially frequent: *bükk* 'beech, beech forest', *cser* 'Turkey oak, Turkey oak forest' (Bába, 2016, pp. 41–43). Therefore, in the case of toponyms identical to plant names it is not easy to decide whether metonymic namegiving was really involved in their creation or through the simultaneous activation of the meanings they were created by more complex cognitive processes.

In toponyms based on the PLANT FOR THE PLACE scheme, a common noun becomes a proper name and this association may also be realized in multiple linguistic forms, e.g. Hungarian *Bükk* (< *bükk* 'beech, beech forest'), *Bükkös* (< *bükk* + *-s* suffix), *Bükk-patak* ('beech brook'), *Szőlő* (< *szőlő* 'grapes, vineyard'), *Szőlős* (< *szőlő* + *-s* suffix), *Szőlő-hegy* ('grapes mountain'). The proportion of the different structures depends on the grammatical features and the unique attributes of the toponym system in the given language. In Hungarian, at the same time, certain plant name + suffix structures were also lexicalized with a geographical common noun meaning (*bükkös* 'beech' + *-s* suffix meaning 'being supplied with something').

The common noun categorization of the plant names, however, is not straightforward in every language, in some cases they are included in the category of proper names (cf. e.g., Pamp, 1994; Dalberg, 2008, pp. 7–8). Nevertheless, from the perspective of the cognitive system, they clearly cannot be considered as prototypical proper names, they are rather at the borderline of the two categories (the proper name feature is more decisive only in the case of Latin plant names used in scholarly works, maybe because they are non-transparent which is a typical feature of proper names in general).

The street names with a plant name first constituent represent a special subcategory of metonymic names. In Finnish, they are especially frequent in certain areas, e.g., *Kielotie* 'lily-of-the-valley road', *Kortetie* 'horsetail road', *Kuminatie* 'caraway road', *Osmankäämintie* 'cattail road' (Ainiala, 2016, p. 104). We can find examples of plant names used in the designation of streets near one another in Hungarian street naming as well (for example, in district II in Budapest: *Gerbera*

utca ‘Gerbera street’, *Gyopár utca* ‘cudweed street’, *Gyöngyvirág utca* ‘lily-of-the-valley street’, *Liliom utca* ‘lily street’, *Rózsa utca* ‘rose street’, *Szegfű utca* ‘carnation street’). In these names, however, plant names are not used in a descriptive function but simply as a result of some sort of thematic street naming concept. Although the particular names were not created through metonymic correspondence motivated by the features of the specific place, the designation of nearby streets with plant names can still be explained as a metonymic process, through the activation of the elements of the same conceptual domain.

4.4 Animal for the Place

The fauna of the place and animal husbandry may also appear in metonymic names, cf. Hungarian *Compó* ‘tench’, *Hódos* ‘beaver’ + *-s* formant, *Rák-patak* ‘crayfish brook’, *Hattyas pataka* ‘swan brook’ hydronyms (Győrffy, 2011, pp. 58–59). However, we do not have to suspect the ANIMAL FOR THE PLACE metonymic scheme behind each toponym with an animal name in the Hungarian toponymic corpus as in the past animal names were often used as anthroponyms. Therefore, in a lot of cases it is not easy to decide if animal names were directly built in the toponyms or we may assume a complex animal name > anthroponym > toponym process. In the latter case, cognitive metaphor also plays a significant role in namegiving as Dunja Brozović Rončević and Milena Žic Fuchs pointed out (2005, pp. 39–41). They examined Croatian names formed with the *vuk* ‘wolf’ and *medvjed* ‘bear’ animal denoting appellative (common noun) > anthroponym > toponym process from a cognitive approach. In this process, the ANIMAL FOR THE PEOPLE conceptual metaphor could serve as the basis for endowing animals with human characteristics, through which the representation of the animal became more complex and served as a good basis for the naming of people either due to their physical strength, their courage or wildness. Later, these metaphorical personal names could become toponyms based on metonymic schemes (Brozović Rončević – Žic Fuchs, 2005).

4.5 Other schemes of metonymic toponym formation

Numerous additional metonymic schemes may be identified among metonymic toponyms. In the end, I would like to highlight some relatively typical ones to be able to provide an extensive overview of this namegiving method.

The MATERIAL FOR THE PLACE scheme prevails in the namegiving of Czech mining settlements, as in *Stříbro* ‘silver’, *Ruda* ‘ore’ (Štěpán, 2012, p. 775), cf. Latvian *Akmenājs* ‘stones’ (Rapa, 2019, p. 38). Some of the toponyms based on the EVENT/CIRCUMSTANCE FOR THE PLACE scheme feature events related to a person: *Borbélyhalála* ‘death of barber’, *Péterakasztó* ‘Peter + hanging place’ (Hoffmann, 2007, p. 124). The widespread Czech *Lhota* and Slovak *Lehota*-type settlement

names refer to the circumstance that the residents were relieved of serfdom duties or tax payment for a time, cf. *lhóta* 'relief for a given period of time' (Štěpán, 2012, p. 775). At the same time, the marketplace feature of a place is also often manifested in the name, for example, in the case of Hungarian *Szombathely* 'Saturday place', Czech *Pátek* 'Friday' (Štěpán, 2012, p. 775). The TOOL FOR THE RESULT OF THE ACTION scheme may be interpreted within the ACTION conceptual domain, which typically manifests itself in connection with common nouns but may also work in toponym creation, for example, the Czech *Sekera*, *Sekyra* 'axe' toponym refers to a deforested area (Štěpán, 2012, p. 776). The TOOL RELATED TO THE PLACE FOR THE PLACE scheme is behind the Swedish *Tunnan* 'the barrel' oronym. As Staffan Nyström explains "barrels were used when making geodesic investigations, i.e., when measuring the world with triangle points. The surveyors nailed a barrel at the top of a natural tree or a high pole to function as a point of aim. We have several names like *Tunnberget* 'barrel mountain', *Tunnkullen* 'barrel hill' etc. in Sweden reminding us of this old technique" (Nyström, 2013, p. 359). The Czech toponyms created based on the MOTION FOR THE OBJECT INVOLVED IN THE MOTION scheme located at the borderline of metaphors and metonymy represent another special group, for example, in the names of *Pád* 'fall' and *Běh* 'run' (Štěpán, 2012, p. 776).

5. Conclusion

The overview of metonymic schemes reveals that a large part of the associations in toponyms are used specifically for the creation of elements of this proper name type and their linguistic realization occurs differently than in the case of common noun metonymy. The mechanism of metonymy at the same time ensures dynamic passage between these two subnetworks of the mental lexicon (the common word lexicon and the onomasticon) in a direction opposite to appellativization as well as between the subnetworks of the proper name network.

With the interpretation of metonymy as a cognitive mechanism we can provide more comprehensive insights into metonymically-motivated toponyms and we can explore and identify the linguistic and toponym dialectal differences prevailing as a result of their linguistic realization. Metonymy has clearly played a significant role in the creation of names, and what is more, using the cognitive approach this role appears to be even more significant than it was revealed in the former categorizations.

This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the ÚNKP 2020-5 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology. It was carried out as part of Research Group on Hungarian Language History and Toponomastics (University of Debrecen – Hungarian Academy of Science).

LITERATURE

AINIALA, T. (2016): Place Names. In: T. Ainiala – M. Saarelma – P. Sjöblom (eds.), *Names in Focus. An Introduction to Finnish Onomastics*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, pp. 63–123.

ARIMITSU, N. (2011): Analyzing THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT-type Metonymies from the Perspective of Negative Evaluative Factors. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 15, 2, pp. 475–502. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-639820156138>.

BÁBA, B. (2016): Földrajzi köznevek térben és időben. *A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 39*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

BALOGH, L. – ÖRDÖG, F. (1987): *Veszprém megye földrajzi nevei 2. Pápai járás*. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság.

BARCELONA, A. (2011): Reviewing the properties and prototype structure of metonymy. In: R. Benczes – A. Barcelona – F. J. I. Ruiz de Mendoza (eds.), *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 7–60. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.28.02bar>.

BÁRCZI, G. (1960): Megnyitó [a Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság névtudományi konferenciáján]. In: S. Mikesy – D. Pais (eds.), *Névtudományi vizsgálatok. A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság Névtudományi Konferenciája*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 5–16.

BRDAR, M. – BRDAR-SZABÓ, R. (2009): The (non-)metonymic use of place names in English, German, Hungarian, and Croatian. In: K. Panther – L. Thornburg – A. Barcelona (eds.), *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 229–257.

BRINK, S. (2016): Transferred Names and Analogy in Name-formation. In: C. Hough (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 158–166. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199656431.013.43>.

BROZOVIĆ RONČEVIĆ, D. – ŽIC FUCHS, M. (2005): Metaphorical processes as the basis of proper names. In: D. Brozović Rončević – E. Caffarelli (eds.), *Denominando il mondo. Dal nome commune al nome proprio. Quaderni Internazionali di Rivista italiana di onomastica: RIOn International Series 1*. Roma, pp. 33–44.

DALBERG, V. (2008): Name and Place. Ten Essays on the Dynamics of Place-names. *Navnestudier udgivet af Afdeling for Navneforskning* 40. Copenhagen: Department of Scandinavian Research, Name Research Section.

FRISSON, S. – PICKERING, M. J. (1999): The processing of metonymy: Evidence from eye movements. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25, 6, pp. 1366–1383. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.25.6.1366>.

GYŐRFFY, E. (2011): *Korai ómagyar kori folyóvíznevek*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

HOFFMANN, I. (2007): *Helynevek nyelvi elemzése*. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

JAKAB, L. – KÁLNÁSI, Á. (1987): *Szabolcs-Szatmár megye földrajzi nevei 3. A nyírbátori járás földrajzi nevei*. Nyírbátor: Nyírbátor Városi Tanácsa.

JARRING, G. (1997): *Central Asian Turkic Place-Names. Lop Nor and Tarim Area*. Stockholm: Sven Hedin Foundation.

JETT, S. C. (1970): An Analysis of Navajo Place-Names. *Names*, 18, pp. 175–184.

JETT, S. C. (2011): Landscape embedded in language. The Navajo of Canyon de Chelly, Arizona, and their named places. In: D. M. Mark – A. G. Turk – N. Burenhult – D. Stea (eds.), *Landscape in Language. Transdisciplinary Perspectives*. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 327–342. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1075/clu.4.16jet>.

KERTÉSZ, M. (1939): A magyar helynévadás történetéből. *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 68, pp. 33–39, 67–77.

KISS, L. (1988): *Földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára 2*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

KISS, L. (1999): A Kárpát-medence régi helynevei. In: L. Kiss, *Történeti vizsgálatok a földrajzi nevek körében*. Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, pp. 104–116.

KOVÁTS, D. (2000): *Az abaúji Hegyköz helynevei*. Sátoraljaújhely: Kazinczy Ferenc Társaság.

KÖVECSES, Z. (2005): *A metafora. Gyakorlati bevezetés a kognitív metaforaelméletbe*. Budapest: Typotex.

KÖVECSES, Z. – RADDEN, G. (1999): Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 9, 1, pp. 37–77. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1998.9.1.37>.

LAANSALU, T. (2018): Nimesiire ja selle käsitus eesti toponomastikas. *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 10, pp. 747−763.

LAKOFF, G. – JOHNSON, M. (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LANGACKER, R. W. (1987): *Foundation of cognitive grammar 1*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

LANGACKER, R. W. (1999): *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter Mouton. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110800524>.

LANGACKER, R. W. (2008): *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>.

LANGACKER, R. W. (2009): Metonymic Grammar. In: K. Panther – L. Thornburg – A. Barcelona (eds.), *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 45–71.

LANGACKER, R. W. (2013): *Essentials of Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MARKERT, K. – NISSIM, M. (2002): Towards a corpus annotated for metonymies: the case of location names. In: *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Las Palmas: ELRA, pp. 1385–1392.

MARKERT, K. – NISSIM, M. (2006): Metonymic Proper Names: A Corpus-based Account. In: A. Stefanowitsch, – S. Th. Gries (eds.), *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 152–174. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199895.152>.

MÉRŐ, L. (2001): *Új észjárások. A racionális gondolkodás ereje és korlátai*. Budapest: Tercium Kiadó.

MÉRŐ, L. – VARGA, K. (2000): Transzlogika transz nélkül. In: Cs. Pléh – Gy. Kampis – V. Csányi (eds.), *A megismeréskutatás útjai*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 178–192.

MOÓR, E. (1936): Magyar helynévtípusok. *Népünk és Nyelvünk*, 8, pp. 110–117.

NYSTRÖM, S. (2013): Metaphorical and metonymical place names in Sweden. In: O. Felecan (ed.), *Name and naming. Proceedings of the second international conference on onomastics. Onomastics in contemporary public space, Baia Mare, May 9–11, 2013*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega – Editura Argonaut, pp. 355–363.

PAMP, B. (1994): Övriga namn och andra. Ett försök till gruppering av egennamnen. In: K. Jóhannesson – H. Karlsson – B. Ralph (eds.), *Övriga namn. NORNA-rapporter 56*. Uppsala, 49–57.

PAIKKALA, S. (ed.) (2007): *Suomalainen paikannimikirja. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskusten julkaisuja 146*. Helsinki: Karttakeskus.

PARADIS, C. (2011): Metonymization: a key mechanism in language change. In: R. Benczes – A. Barcelona Sánchez, F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.), *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics: Towards a Consensus View*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 61–88. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.28.04par>.

RAPA, S. (2019): Metonymy as a Basis of Toponymy. In: *Tikriniai žodžiai erdvėje ir erdvė tikriniuose žodžiuose. 4th International Scientific Aleksandras Vanagas' Conference. Abstracts*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, pp. 38–39.

RESZEGI, K. (2007): A hegynevek és más helynévfajták kapcsolata In: I. Hoffmann – D. Juhász (eds.), *Nyelvi identitás és a nyelv dimenziói*. Debrecen – Budapest: Nemzetközi Magyarságtudományi Társaság, pp. 37–43.

RESZEGI, K. (2011): *Hegynevek a középkori Magyarországon*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

RESZEGI, K. (2016): The Acquisition of Place Names in Mother Tongue Learning: Some Observations on Children's Spatial Cognition. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 13, 2, pp. 7–22. [online] <https://doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2016.13.2.015>.

RESZEGI, K. (2018): A nevek jelentésszerkezete (funkcionális kognitív keretben). *Magyar Nyelvjárások*, 56, pp. 5–23. [online] <https://doi.org/10.30790/mnyj/2018/01>.

ROHLFS, G. (1956): *Studien zur romanischen Namenkunde*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBÁÑEZ, F. J. (2011): Metonymy and cognitive operations. In: R. Benczes – A. Barcelona – F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.), *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 103–123. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.28.06rui>.

SHI, Y. – SHENG, J. (2011): The Role of Metonymy in the Formation of Euphemism in Chinese and English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2, 5, pp. 1175–1179. [online] <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.5.1175-1179>.

ŠTĚPÁN, P. (2012): Metonymical Transfers of Meaning in Toponymy. In: M. G. Arcamone – D. Bremer – D. De Camilli – A. Rossebastiano (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Onomastiche. Sezione 5. Toponomastica*. Pisa: ETS, pp. 771–778.

ŠTĚPÁN, P. (2018): Systematic Relationships Between Toponyms and Anthroponyms in Czech. *Onomastica Uralica*, 12, pp. 111–120.

TOLCSVAI NAGY, G. (2008): A tulajdonnév jelentése. In: A. Bölcskei – I. N. Császi (eds.), *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai*. Budapest: Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszék, pp. 30–41.

TÓTH, V. (2017): Személynévi helynévadás az ómagyar korban. *A Magyar Névarchívum Kiadványai 41*. Debrecen: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

VERHAGEN, A. (2007): Construal and perspectivization. In: D. Geeraerts – H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 48–81. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199738632.013.0003>.

METONYMICKÉ POJMENOVÁVÁNÍ V KOGNITIVNÍ PERSPEKTIVĚ

Článek se zaměřuje na metonymická toponyma a vychází z výzkumů kognitivní metonymie. Metonymie je zde chápána jako kognitivní proces využívaný pro konceptualizaci, kdy jedna konceptuální entita (zdroj) umožňuje mentální přístup k další konceptuální entitě (cíl). Vlastní jména jsou také do výzkumu kognitivní metonymie zahrnuta, ale zatím bylo zkoumáno pouze využití vlastních jmen jakožto zdroje pro metonymická pojmenování. Místa se však v metonymických procesech mohou objevit také jako cílová entita, tzn. jako objekt, ke kterému se odkazuje. V těchto případech je jedinečný prostorový objekt nazván odkazem na sousední nebo blízký objekt tím, že se použije jeho obecné označení (apelativum), nebo vlastní jméno (proprium). Kromě stručného úvodu do kognitivní metonymické teorie přináší článek přehled a reinterpretaci výsledků onomastického bádání spolu s hlavními konceptuálními schématy metonymického pojmenování míst. Přehled metonymických schémat ukazuje, že velká část asociací v toponymech je použita konkrétně za účelem vytváření prvků tohoto typu vlastního jména a jejich jazyková realizace se částečně odlišuje od využití metonymie u apelativ. Mezi jednotlivými jazyky mohou být výrazné rozdíly, pokud jde o realizace jednotlivých metonymických schémat, která se mohou projevovat následovně: a) bez jakékoliv formální změny jazykové podoby označení zdrojové entity, b) s pomocí formantů, c) s využitím lexikálních jednotek. V tomto ohledu jsou rozhodující vlastnosti daného jazyka a vliv už existujících metonymických toponym. Pro lepší pochopení metonymických mechanismů v procesech pojmenování je tedy nutné brát v úvahu všechna metonymicky motivovaná jména. Reinterpretace metonymického pojmenování v rámci kognitivní metonymické teorie napomáhá lepšímu pochopení celkového kognitivního mechanismu metonymie.

Klíčová slova
metonymie; metonymické pojmenování; toponyma; kognitivní metonymická teorie

Katalin Reszegi
kataszakall@gmail.com
reszegi.katalin@arts.unideb.hu
Department of Hungarian Linguistics
University of Debrecen
1 Egyetem tér
H–4010 Debrecen, Pf. 54
HUNGARY