

УДК 811.581.11'37

Юй Чен, аспирант

Минский государственный лингвистический университет, Минск, Беларусь
эл. почта: cr added51@outlook.com

Yu Chen, PhD Student

Minsk State Linguistic University, Minsk, Belarus
e-mail: cr added51@outlook.com

МЕТОНИМИЯ И МЕТАФОРА КАК МАРКЕРЫ СТАТУСА
СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИХ ПРИЗНАКОВ В СТРУКТУРЕ ИСХОДНОГО
ЗНАЧЕНИЯ (на материале наименования 眼, *yan* 'глаз' в китайском языке)

Обсуждаются результаты пилотного проекта по выявлению семантических признаков значения слова на основании анализа производных от него выражений. Метонимические и метонимические переносы, сопровождающие формирование значений дериватов, профилируют разные по своему статусу семантические признаки исходного значения: релевантные и салиентные.

Ключевые слова: релевантность, салиентность, лексическое значение, деривация, метонимия, метафора

METONYMIC AND METAPHORIC SHIFTS AS DETERMINANTS OF FEATURE STATUS IN SOURCE MEANING STRUCTURE (based on the Chinese body term 眼, *yan* ‘eye’)

The abstract reveals the results of a pilot study on semantic features in the word meaning profiled via its derivatives accompanied by metonymic and metaphoric shifts. Different types of derivatives suggest a different status of profiled features: either relevant (essential) or salient (vivid).

Key words: relevance, salience, lexical meaning, derivation, metonymy, metaphor

Assessing feature weights and status in word meaning or conceptual structure has been the topic of a whole range of research publications (see S. A. Sloman, B. C. Love, W.-K. Ahn, F. Keil, E. Rosch, M. A. Khalidi, G. L. Murphy, D. Geeraerts, A. Ortony, A. Twersky, etc.). Depending on the taken perspective the scholars suggest various criteria for determining feature weights: ability of a feature to cause other features, mutability of a feature, its omnipresence, vividness, validity to the designated category, etc. This is often checked on psycholinguistic and introspective data. Yet, a closer look at word derivation accompanied by metonymic and metaphoric shifts shows that the features profiled differ in their status in the source meaning: some of them being relevant (essential) and others – salient (vivid) (see for ref. Харитончик, З. А. Салиентность и релевантность знания как факторы деривационной активности лексических единиц // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2019. № 36. С. 432–442). A case study¹ of a Chinese body term 眼, *yan* ‘eye’ allowed singling out the features in its meaning profiled via its derivatives and assert feature statuses in the source meaning as salient or relevant.

The study revealed that even though many of the figurative uses of the word 眼 (*yan*) involve metaphoric shifts, they are quite often preceded by metonymy via ‘instrument – action’ model triggered by the classifier ‘body part’ in the source meaning of the word. So, it’s the relevant feature ‘function’ which gets profiled in suchlike contexts. For example, the meaning of the derivative *yan-guang* (eye-light) ‘sight; foresight; insight; vision’ is formed as a result of two consecutive shifts: a metonymy ‘eye (instrument) – ability to see (action)’ and a metaphor ‘ability to see – ability to predict’. The same refers to the derivatives *fang-yan* (let go/set free-eye) ‘take a broad view; scan widely’; *zhuo-yan* (put to-eye) ‘see/view from the angle of; have smth. in mind’ etc.

Apart from the functional component, the relevant knowledge in the meaning of the word 眼 (*yan*) includes features ‘contents’ and ‘container’. For example, the derivative *nong mei da yan* (thick brow big eye) means ‘good looking’, with EYE (part) referring the FACE (whole). So, like in the previous examples, the classifier ‘body part’ triggers the figurative use of the word, only this time it’s the feature ‘contents’ which is profiled. Cf. other bahuvrihi-type derivatives like *mei-yan*

¹ The gathered corpus of derivatives consists of 1350 expressions with 眼 (*yan*). The variants 目 (*mu*), 睛 (*jing*) and 眼睛 (*yanjing*) for EYE were not analyzed within the scope of this paper.

(brow-eye) ‘appearance; looks’; *bai yan* (white eye) ‘dislike’. The ‘container’ feature is found in examples like *zei mei shu yan* (thief brow rat eye) ‘shifty-eyed; crafty-looking’ where the input space is an animal’s eye (rat eye) metaphorically transferred to a person’s eye (just as small as the rat’s) and then conceptualized as suggestive of a person’s character (‘containing’ character).

As for salient features in the meaning of the word 眼 (*yan*) revealed in derivation, they are ‘shape’ and ‘function’. For example, the derivative *zhen yan* (needle eye) ‘eye of a needle’ is a metaphor which is based on the similarity of the shape of a person’s eye and a needle’s hole. ‘Function’ as a salient feature is profiled in the derivative *quan yan* (fountain/spring eye) ‘the mouth of a spring or fountain’ (the similarity is in being the source of water / tears) which focuses not on ‘primary’ function of the eye as a body part (e.g. seeing), but on its ‘secondary’ function (e.g. crying). The input space in conceptual blends accompanying derivation processes may be constituted by a more detailed image: an animal’s eye, an eye of a certain size, color, shape, etc. And it may be these additional details that serve as anchors of a metaphor, not the features of the word meaning ‘eye’.

Thus, metaphoric and metonymic shifts that accompany derivatives of a word allow revealing features in the source meaning that have different, but equally important cognitive status compared to other features. The relevant and salient features may be of one type (e.g. the above-mentioned feature ‘function’) but their concrete realizations tend to be different. These preliminary conclusions need to be checked on a wider material.