PERSPECTIVATION AND PERSPECTIVE.
OUTLINES ON CONCEPTUAL METONYMY

Perspectivation as a new term introduced by Graumann & Kallmeyer in 2002 is about to give the more widely used term perspective a complement to emphasize the relation between process – the perspectivation – and its result – the perspective – and as a common cognitive and communicative practice as well. As Graumann & Kallmeyer suggest, both perspective and perspectivation are founding instances of any discourse. The study of perspectivation poses questions with respect to the role that communication of perspectives plays in text and interaction, and what important strategies of perspectivation one can observe in different contexts. For the analysis of human strategies of orientation in space and time spatial reference ... proved to be of primordial interest (Weissenborn & Klein, 1982). From here it is only a short step to the analysis of referential movements in texts (Klein & Stutterheim, 1989) and its interpretation as representation of perspectival moves [1, p. 5].

Considering this, perspectivation can be taken as a form of conceptual movements within the mental space of contiguity, in short terms: a metonymical movement. Different perspectivations, which allow some certain focusing on subjects, are not strictly bound to syntactic categories like active voice or passive voice. Baldauf [2, p. 45] calls such constructions like Germ. Das Land steigt vom Fluss aus steil an – Das Land fällt zum Fluss hin steil ab ‘The land rises steeply from the river – The land drops steeply towards the river’. Other well known examples in German can be told: den Tisch abwischen – den Schmutz abwischen ‘wipe the table – wipe off the dirt’ [3, p. 33]. Also, such formulations appear, which not only allow to tell different perspectives to subjects but perspectivations grounding in different speakers’ attitudes to subjects: Germ. der Saal ist halb leer – der Saal ist halb voll ‘the hall is half empty – the hall is half full’.

Dirven introduces the concept of CONVERSION into the discussion about metonymy. The kind of “conversion” he has in mind does not appear in syntax in general but on the level of predicate-argument relation. Certain arguments of an argument structure – Dirven namely calls INSTRUMENT – are metonymically moved especially onto the position of ACTION (or PROCESS) [4, p. 277–278]. Dirven summarizes these metonymical movements under the term EVENT-SCHHEME metonymy and distinguishes five types:

a) object verbs (to fish, to crew, to anger);
b) instrument verbs (to harpoon, to head, to veto);
c) manner verbs (to queue, to balloon, to spoon);
d) locative verbs (to bottle, to shelve, to record);
e) essive verbs (to author, to nurse, to knight) [4, p. 280].

Additionally, Dirven presents three canonized EVENT-SCHEMES, which constitute the basis of that what he calls conversational metonymy: 1) the action scheme, 2) the localization or movement scheme, 3) the essive scheme [Ibid, p. 280], however, the latter I would call causative or ornative. Generally, this systemizing idea is something like a schematic construction of a mental space with its typical feature of processuality including its components. The consequence of this idea is the fact that grounding on principles of contiguity metonymic movements within the mental space are possible.

Illustrating this principle of metonymic movements within mental spaces, this article presents examples from a study in translation I carried out in 2015 by analysing the ways of rendition of culture-bound words in the translations of the Grimms’ Fairy Tales (GFT) from German into English and Lithuanian by taking two different translations into the mentioned languages [5].

**Metonymical movements as a rendering technique in translations**

Metonymically created correspondences appearing in translations are the result of linguistic and cognitive movements within a mental space that is basically characterized by contiguity. These correspondences are lexically realized by semantically autonomous words, phrases and partially by other linguistic items constituting a semantic and cognitive relation within the mental space. Grounding on the study from 2015, I can distinct the following types of metonymical movements:

1. **Metonymical shift** can be seen as a semantic and cognitive movement on a vertical axis of concepts, in which a basic category is centred. This basic category can coincide with a hyperonym. Usually, movements are done towards the basic category, beyond or below it.

2. **Metonymical twist** is grounding in the idea of a spatial imagination of the mental space of contiguity. Within this mental space, metonymical movements can happen, which use the semantic and cognitive relations within concepts for the twist. This leads to alternative points of view, to different angles of comprehension and interpretation of concepts.

3. **Metonymical distortion** is a kind of movement within the mental space of contiguity, which goes far beyond shifts or twists. This leads to a semantic and cognitive distance to the original term or concept, so that the term used in the target language can only be understood by interpreting the target language term including such more general concepts like ABSTRACTION and/or VAGUENESS.

All these three metonymical movements can be found in translations, though the metonymical twists play a crucial role because of their manifold forms of perspectivation. There is no doubt that the single categories of the metonymical twists remind of adverbial components in linguistic performances. Therefore, in the following section, I will focus on the LOCAL RELATIONS metonymical twists are done by the translators’ creativity to create different perspectives to the story told in the GFT.
Metonymical perspectivation in translations – an empirical study

Alongside to codified lexical equivalents used to render culture-bound words, translations contain very often instances of metonymical twists, which are not codified equivalents but according to context, to communicative characteristics of sorts of texts and to a translators’ creativity they might be called correspondences to the source language term. Creating a different perspective by translating a text is a special linguistic and cognitive procedure. However, metonymical twists of perspective appear in a manifold, complicated way.

One sort of metonymical twists is called PERSPECTIVATION, which expresses changes in points of view to or changes in understanding an event, an object, individuals and their activities. Lexical and semantic forms of this sort of twists are conversion, semantically and syntactically they appear as adverbial changes, or they come as a twist by changing the perspective of activities. A typical occurrence of the metonymical twist of perspective in translations are LOCAL RELATIONS, which are given as relations between an object and its (typical) place of existence. A metonymical twist of this LOCAL sub-sort is done by twisting from the object onto the place of that object instead of naming the object. In GFT 169 Herd ‘hearth’ [6] > virtuvė ‘kitchen’ [8]. A variant of this metonymical twist appears as a twist from a PLACE onto PERSON(S) AT THIS PLACE, e.g. in GFT 97 Hof ‘royal court’ [6] > ministers [10]; in GFT 179 Schloss ‘castle’ > pas karalių ‘with the King’ [7]. Another variant of this metonymical twist appears as a twist from an EVENT onto a PLACE OF THAT EVENT, in GFT 51 auf die Jagd gehen ‘to go hunting’ [6] > išeiti į mišką ‘go into the forest’ [7].

Some instances of metonymical twist of perspective in translations appear as combinations of PLACE and MOVEMENT within the LOCAL RELATIONS. While in the given example “to go hunting” the event is focused on, in the case of Tor ‘gate’ or Hof ‘yard as a part of a construction’ an equality of place and movement might be stated. The metonymical twist goes with both PLACE and MOVEMENT, which shall be illustrated and explained using an excerpt from GFT 116.

How Germanic zum Tor hinaus machen was rendered into LT and EN versions of the text (source: author, highlighting: author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Am andern Morgen ließ der König in der ganzen Stadt den Schuh seiner Tochter suchen: er ward bei dem Soldaten gefunden und der Soldat selbst, der sich auf Bitten des Kleinen zum Tor hinaus gemacht hatte, ward bald eingeholt und ins Gefängnis geworfen [6].</th>
<th>LT 1: Kitą ryta karalius liepė po visą miestą ieškoti dukters šlepetės. Ją rado pas tą kareivį, kuris jau buvo žmoglio pamokytas ir išbėges iš miesto, pavijo ir įmetė į kalėjimą [7].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT 2: Kitą ryta karalius liepė po visą miestą ieškoti dukters kurpaitės, ir rado ją pas kareivį, o patį kareivį, kuris mažylio įprašytas buvo pasitraukęs iš miesto, greitai pasivijo ir uždarė į kalėjimą [8].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EN 1:
Next morning the King had every inch of the town searched for his daughter’s shoe. It was found at the soldier’s, and the soldier himself, who at the entreaty of the dwarf had **gone outside the gate**, was soon brought back, and thrown into prison [9].

EN 2:
The next morning the king had the entire city searched for the shoe. It was found in the soldier’s room, but the soldier himself had **left the city** at the behest of the little dwarf. He was soon overtaken, however, and thrown into prison [10].

The different ways to render the Germanic phrase *zum Tor hinaus machen* show, putting all variants together, the whole of possible combinations of different techniques to handle the given phrase:

> *išbėgti iš miesto* ‘to run away from the town’ [7] including the metonymical twist of perspectivation of Germ. *Tor ‘gates’ > “town”* (Lith. *miestas*, genitive case *miesto*) as a PART > WHOLE metonymical twist, and Germ. *hinaus machen > “run away”* (Lith. *išbėgti*) as another, more precise kind of physical movement;

> *pasitraukti iš miesto* ‘to withdraw from the town’ [8] including the same metonymical twist PART > WHOLE combined with a twist of the way how to move “withdraw“ (Lith. *pasitraukti*);

> *to go outside the gate* [9] including the codified equivalents *gate* and *to go outside*, in which *to go* appears as a universal expression in English to name all kinds of movement by semantically being quite vague and therefore similar to the vague Germ. phrase *hinaus machen*;

> *to leave the city* [10] including the metonymical twist Germ. *Tor ‘gates’ > city* as a metonymical twist PART > WHOLE and Germ. *hinaus machen > to leave* as another perspective to the given physical movement.

A special form of the metonymical twist within the LOCAL RELATIONS is performed by means of grammar, thus, it is possible to name this special form local-adverbial twist. One of the frequent instances of that adverbially performed twist can be observed, for example, in GFT 4 *Stube ‘parlour’* [6] > *vidus ‘the inside’* [7]; in GFT 85 *Stube ‘parlour’* [6] > *i vidų ‘into inside’* [7]; in GFT 26 *Stube ‘parlour’* [6] > *kai jeisi ‘if you enter’* [8]; in GFT 27 *Stube ‘parlour’* [6] > *i vidų ‘into inside’* [8]. In GFT 62, *konnte man in die Stube sehen ‘they could look into the parlour’* [6] was rendered into *galėjai vidun pažvelgti ‘they could look into the inside’* [8]. Translating GFT 15 and 108, *inside* [10] was also used for Germ. *Kammer ‘chamber’*.  
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To complete the overview to the perspective twists within LOCAL RELATIONS, the following will present in short terms more of its instances: (1) from PLACE onto OBJECT/PERSO/EVENT IN THE PLACE: in GFT 60 Hühnerhof ‘chicken farm’ [6] > vištos ‘chicken’ [7; 8]; (2) from OBJECT/PERSON onto PLACE OF OBJECT/PERSON: in GFT 82 Bäcker ‘baker’ [6] > kepykla ‘bakery’ [7]; (3) perspective twist containing a metonymical twist from an individual to his/her activity: in GFT 127 Küchenmädchen ‘kitchen maid’ [6] > dirbtis virtujoje ‘to work in a kitchen’ [7; 8]; (4) perspective twist by naming a direction instead of an object: in GFT 169 Treppe ‘stairs’ > upstairs [9; 10].

Instead of conclusions: additional remarks on perspective twists

Amongst the three major metonymical movements rendering a certain vocabulary, the metonymical twist appears in the most manifold way including especially perspective twists within the local relations. However, not only local relations are an area for perspective twists. Additionally, perspective twists can appear within other types of semantic and cognitive relations, as they are: 1) causal relations, esp. mutual twist between cause and effect; 2) within events including activities, persons, objects; 3) between events and parts of this event; 4) within functional relations including persons, objects, activities and their functions; 5) within instrumental relations; 6) within relations of existence and identification; 7) on the basis of conversion; 8) perspective twist from active voice to passive voice.
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“WIDESPREAD IDIOMS IN EUROPE AND BEYOND”: BENEFITS FOR LANGUAGE WORLDVIEW?

The starting point of this paper is new insights into the uniformity of European standard languages in the realm of phraseology. Recent multilingual research has shown that cross-linguistic similarities are much greater than previously known. There are many widespread idioms (WIs for short), i.e. idioms that occur in a large number of languages in almost the same lexico-semantic structure. These are results of the long-term project “Widespread Idioms in Europe and Beyond” which now has been brought to an end for the time being.

The present paper intends to relate these new insights to the general theme of the International Conference “The Universal and the Culture-based in the Language Worldview”. The idea that the world is principally perceived through the medium of language, which determines the speakers’ worldview (proposed by W. v. Humboldt and later reformulated by Sapir and Whorf as the theory of “linguistic relativity”) can be found in several branches of phraseological research. This conception is usually accompanied by postulates that the analysis of figurative language allows insight into the speech community’s own culture and mentality, if not into its “national character”. My paper wants to point to some points of contact between the two research directions – widespread idiom research and language worldview research – although it will not be able to answer general questions as to what extent phraseology may be involved in constituting a worldview of a language community. Therefore, there is a question mark in the title of the paper.

In the following, I first want to discuss the terminology used here and briefly outline the project “Widespread Idioms”, especially with regard to the causes of the wide distribution of idioms across a number of languages. Subsequently, we will have a look at the opposite, at two lesser-used languages at the edge of Europe, which differ fundamentally from the standard European languages in terms of their phraseology. Along with this the question arises as to whether connections to the problem of language worldview can be established.