HIGH-LEVEL ACTION METONYMIES IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH: THE CASE OF THE ACTION FOR PROCESS, ACTIVITY FOR EVENT, AND ACTION FOR RESULT METONYMIES

NURIA ALFARO MARTÍNEZ
Universidad de La Rioja

ABSTRACT. *In this article we present a contrast of three high-level metonymies in English and Spanish. The ACTION FOR PROCESS, ACTIVITY FOR EVENT, and ACTION FOR RESULT metonymies are here discussed and exemplified. We demonstrate through a series of examples the shared metonymic motivation for both languages, though they are realised in different grammatical forms, especially through valency reduction and extension in English and reflex passive in Spanish. The degree of productiveness in both languages is also a matter that concerns the article. In a broader sense, what the article analyses is the relationship that metonymy and grammar hold in action frames.*

KEYWORDS. *High-level metonimies, ACTION FOR PROCESS, ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT, and ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonimies, valency, reflex passive.*

RESUMEN. *En este artículo contrastamos tres metonimias de alto nivel en inglés y en español. En concreto, se discuten y ejemplifican las metonimias de ACCIÓN POR PROCESO, ACTIVIDAD POR EVENTO y ACCIÓN POR RESULTADO. A través de una serie de ejemplos, se demuestra la motivación metonímica compartida por ambas lenguas, aunque se realizan por medio de diferentes formas gramaticales, especialmente de la reducción y extensión de valencias en inglés y la pasiva refleja en español. El grado de productividad en ambas lenguas también será un tema a discutir. En un sentido más amplio, lo que el artículo analiza es la relación que metonimia y gramática sostienen en los marcos de acción.*

PALABRAS CLAVE. *Metonimias de alto nivel, ACCIÓN POR PROCESO, ACTIVIDAD POR EVENTO, ACCIÓN POR RESULTADO, valencia, pasiva refleja.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Within cognitive linguistics metaphor and metonymy are not considered mere rhetorical devices, but basic tools for the conceptual organisation of experience. In the

well-known seminal studies by Lakoff (1987, 1993) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) metaphor and metonymy are defined as mappings or sets of correspondences across conceptual domains. The difference between them relies basically on the nature of the relationship between the concepts involved. Thus, in metaphor there is a mapping between two distinct domains, whereas in metonymy the domains stand in a domain-subdomain relationship. Together with propositional and image-schematic structure, metaphor and metonymy are regarded by Lakoff as forms of knowledge organisation called idealised cognitive models or ICMs. Lakoff has not given a standard definition of ICM. However, it is clear from the accepted usage of this term that an ICM is a conventionalised knowledge structure of encyclopaedic nature (i.e. open-ended; see Langacker 1987) with an underlying organising principle.

Unlike metaphor, metonymy has not received much attention until fairly recent times, when there has been an upsurge of interest in this phenomenon (see as an example the collection of articles found in Panther and Radden 1999 and Barcelona 2000). In this connection it is worth mentioning the attempts to define the term 'metonymy' (Langacker 1993; Croft 1993; Seto 1999), the elaboration of a typology of metonymies (Dirven 1993; Kövecses and Radden 1998; Radden and Kövecses 1999), and the study of the interaction between metaphor and metonymy (Goossens 1990; Ruiz de Mendoza 1999; Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez 2001).

In addition to these studies, part of the focus of attention in metonymic research has been on the description of high-level metonymies (i.e. metonymies that make use of a propositional generic ICM). For instance, Panther and Thornburg (1999) have dealt with the operativeness of the POTENTIALITY FOR ACTUALITY and RESULT FOR ACTION metonymies and have compared the different patterns of realisation across different languages. Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez (2001) have gone a step further and have contended that high-level metonymic mappings have grammatical consequences for the development of several aspects and levels of clause structure.

Thus, Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez have given an initial sketch of the grammatical import of a large number of these metonymies, among them AGENT FOR ACTION (e.g. *to author a book*), ACTION FOR RESULT (e.g. *a deep cut*), ACTION FOR PROCESS (e.g. *The door opened*), ACTIVITY FOR CAUSED EVENT (e.g. *John walked the dog*), and ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT(e.g. *These clothes wash well*). Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez, unlike Panther and Thonburg, have not attempted to test the cross-linguistic validity of their analysis. With a view to extending a relevant part of their wide-ranging study in this regard, it will be the intention of this paper to deal in some detail with three of the generic metonymies put forward by these authors. These metonymies prove basic for the understanding of some key grammatical processes within the predication and provide us with interesting points of contrast between English and Spanish. The resulting analysis will contrast the different patterns of realisation for these metonymies in Spanish and English. In so doing, it will be possible to see the degree of coincidence of such patterns between these two languages.

2. ACTION FOR PROCESS METONYMY

For Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez, this high-level metonymy underlies certain grammatical phenomena in English, particularly the intransitivisation and transitivisation of verbs. Consider the following examples:

(1) The glass broke.

(2) The door closed.

Examples (1) and (2) denote processes, that is to say, non-controlled dynamic states of affairs[1]. This means that in these examples there is not an agent who determines whether the states of affairs will take place or not. In consequence, they can be regarded as representations of kinds of process denoted by other examples like:

(3) The river flows.

(4) The Earth revolves around the Sun.

But a closer look at examples (3) and (4) reveals that there exists an important difference between them. There is no possibility of finding an agent who may cause the state of affairs, while in (1) and (2) it is clear that there is such an agent, although it is not explicitly stated in these sentences. There is no doubt that someone or something must have broken the glass or closed the door. In consequence these sentences can be reworded including an agent as examples (5) and (6) evidence:

(5) John broke the glass.

(6) John closed the door.

Examples (5) and (6) are defined as actions, that is to say, controlled dynamic states of affairs. We can observe that in (1) and (2) there is a process of intransitivisation of a typically transitive predicate. This grammatical phenomenon has received a great deal of attention in linguistic theory. Dik (1989) has explained this as a matter of valency reduction of a predicate. Valency reduction occurs whenever one of the arguments of a predicate is taken away. For example, *break* is a two-argument predicate, but in (1) one of its arguments is deleted so that it works as if it were a one-argument predicate, and the same holds for the verb *open* in (2). Moreover, it can be seen that valency reduction involves a change in the state of affairs from controlled to non-controlled, as is evident from the contrast between examples (1) and (5) and (2) and (6).

Levin (1993: 27-30) has studied the difference between constructions like (5) and (1), on the one hand, and (6) and (2), on the other, as cases of the causative/inchoative alternation. Levin's research is based on the idea that the behaviour of a verb is largely determined by its meaning. The causative/inchoative alternation is found within what Levin calls causative alternations. These involve verbs with transitive and intransitive uses, "where the transitive use of a verb V can be paraphrased as roughly *cause to V-intransitive*" (Levin 1993: 30). For example the verb *break* is one of this kind. In (5) it is used intransitively and means 'cause to break'. *Break* has an inchoative variant (see

25

example (1)) and a causative variant (see example 5). For Levin, the inchoative construction needs not have an understood agent, it may have specific time reference, and it does not have to include adverbial or modal elements (in contrast with the middle construction as we will see later on).

Dik's and Levin's explanations of this phenomenon focus on its grammatical peculiarities; however, they fall short of accounting for its underlying motivation. Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez (2001) have suggested that the reason why we can express a prototypical action as a non-controlled dynamic event is a matter of high-level metonymy. Thus, although the agent is not overtly expressed in (1) and (2), we understand that there is someone or something who has either broken the glass or closed the door. The kind of conversion process here involved can be seen in terms of an action standing for a process, since we have seen that in a process proper (see examples (3) and (4)) there is no agent available at all. Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez gather these metonymies under the generic label ACTION FOR PROCESS.

The closest Spanish equivalents of (1) and (2) are illustrated respectively in (7) and (8) below:

(7) El vaso se rompió. ('The.Msg glass$_i$. itself$_i$. break.PAST.3sg.')

(8) La puerta se cerró. ('The.Fsg. door$_i$. itself$_i$. close.PAST.3sg.')

The Spanish construction makes use of *se*, which is usually taken to be a reflexive particle. In Spanish the use of *se* with certain verbs is related to intransitivisation. There are a number of transitive verbs in Spanish which, when used reflexively, lose their fundamental transitivity feature, i.e. the idea of somebody acting on something, as in *Se movió, Se tumbó* '(he)$_i$ 'himself$_i$. move.PAST.3sg', '(he)$_i$ himself$_i$. lie.PAST.3sg'.

Traditionally, examples (7) and (8) have been regarded as cases of the so-called reflex passive in Spanish. Reflex passive and the use of *se* are controversial topics for Spanish linguists and there have been several ways of dealing with it. Thus, *se* has been treated as a morphological index of the passive voice (cf. Benot 1910; Castro 1908) or as a morphological index of middle voice (cf. Monge 1955). *Se* has also been described as an indefinite pronoun functioning as subject (cf. Feldman 1974; and Bull 1963). More recently, Alarcos (1972, 1994) and Hernández Alonso (1966) have argued against the existence of a reflex passive.

Typically, the reflex passive is a passive sentence expressed by reflexive means, in Spanish by the use of *se*. For reflexibility to occur, the agent has to be at the same time the patient of the action (e.g. *María se lava*, 'María$_i$. herself$_i$. wash.PRES.3sg', in which *María* performs and receives the action at the same time). On the other hand, cases of reflex passive do not express any reference to the actor of the action (e.g. *Se espera el premio*, '(he)$_i$ himself$_i$. expect.PRES.3sg the.Msg. award', instead of *Juan espera el premio*, 'Juan. expect.PRES.3sg. the.Msg. award').

In contrast to this traditional analysis, other studies defend the non-existence of the reflex passive or, at least, question the applicability of a passive structure to examples of the like of (7) and (8). An important point to test the validity of this idea is to find out

whether the Spanish speaker considers these examples to be cases of passive or not. We agree with Alarcos (1994), who has posited the non-existence of the reflex passive. Although Alarcos' line of thinking may need further development, we can use his ideas to argue that the use of the reflexive in *La puerta se cerró* ('The.Fsg. door$_i$ itself$_i$ close.PAST.3sg') has the same status as in *María se lavó* ('María$_i$. herself$_i$. wash.PAST.3sg'). Both instances of *se* would be cases of coreference and both are cases of reflexive construction without any trace of passive meaning. The use of this type of construction for sentences like (7) and (8) is related to the absence of an explicit agent. In *María se lavó*, *María* is easily seen as the agent of the action; but in (8), *puerta* is not regarded by the Spanish speaker as the agent of the predicate at all. Thus, having an external agent, (8) can be related to passive meaning, because many passive sentences also have an external agent (e.g. *La puerta fue cerrada* 'The.Fsg. door be.PAST.3sg. close.PAST.PART'). However, it is possible to postulate that *La puerta se cerró* and *La puerta fue cerrada* differ widely, especially concerning the role of their external agents. This can be shown by adding an explicit agent to each sentence: *?La puerta se cerró por Juan* ('The.Fsg. door$_i$ itself$_i$ close.PAST.3sg by. Juan.') is an extremely awkward construction, while *La puerta fue cerrada por Juan* ('The.Fsg. door be.PAST.3sg. close.PAST.PART by. Juan.') is perfectly correct. But the situation changes if instead of an agent we specify the cause of the action, that is, *La puerta se cerró por el viento* ('The.Fsg. door$_i$. itself$_i$. close.PAST.3sg. by. the.Msg. wind.') and *La puerta fue cerrada por el viento* ('The.Fsg. door be.PAST.3sg. close.PAST.PART by. the.Msg. wind.') are both correct in Spanish. Therefore, the sentences motivated by the ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy typically involve an animate agent or force.

Underlying Alarcos' insight there may be an explanation related to the fact that Spanish is reluctant to valency reduction. Spanish needs *se* to convey many meanings that in English are expressed through valency reduction. In the case of *María se lava* ('María$_i$. herself$_i$. wash.PRES.3sg'), the Spanish speaker cannot say *María lava a María* ('María. wash.PRES.3sg to. María.'), since the second NP would not be taken to be coreferential with the first. So the Spanish speaker uses *se* (*María se lava*) to express the reflexive meaning. Relating these ideas to our topic, we observe in example (6) that valency reduction is perfectly feasible in English, while in Spanish it is not. Thus, we cannot say *La puerta cerró*, which, if it were possible, would in any case involve that *la puerta* is the agent of the predication[2]. In Spanish *La puerta cierra la puerta* is not possible either. Since in Spanish valency reduction is not possible, we substitute *se* for the agent, which is then omitted (cf. *La puerta se cerró* and *El viento cerró la puerta*).

If we take into account the fact that examples (7) and (8) cannot be regarded as instances of passive, in Spanish –the same as in English– we have an ACTION FOR PROCESS conversion. The Spanish examples are also parallel to the English ones in that in Spanish we also need the 'existence' of an agent or cause. In both languages we have an ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy. On a conceptual level Spanish and English work in much the same way as far as this metonymy is concerned.

The ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy is quite productive in both languages as can be seen from the following table[3] (cf. Levin 1993):

English	Spanish
I baked the potatoes. The potatoes baked.	Cocí las patatas. ('(I) bake.PAST.1sg. the.Fpl. potatoes.') Las patatas se cocieron. ('The.Fpl. potatoes$_i$. themselves$_i$. bake.PRES.3pl.')
I bent the bar. The bar bent.	Doblé la barra. ('(I) bend.PAST.1sg. the.Fsg. bar.') La barra se dobló. ('The.fsg. bar$_i$. itself$_i$. bend.PAST.3sg.')
I broke the glass. The glass broke.	Rompí el vaso. ('(I) break.PAST.1sg. the.Msg. glass') El vaso se rompió. ('The.Msg. glass$_i$. itself$_i$. break.PAST.3sg.')
I burnt the paper. The paper burnt.	Quemé el papel. ('(I) burn.PAST.1sg. the.Msg. paper') El papel se quemó. ('The.Msg. paper$_i$. itself$_i$. burn.PAST.3sg.')
I coiled the rope around the post. The rope coiled around the post.	Enrollé la cuerda alrededor del poste. ('(I) coil.PAST.1sg. the.Fsg. rope. around. the.Msg. post') La cuerda se enrolló alrededor del poste. ('The.Fsg. rope$_i$. itself$_i$. coil.PAST.3sg. around. the.Msg. post.')
I dried the clothes. The clothes dried.	Sequé las ropas. ('(I) dry.PAST.1sg. the.Fpl. clothes') Las ropas se secaron. ('The.Fpl. clothes$_i$. themselves$_i$. dry.PAST.3pl.')
Peter interconnected the pieces. The pieces interconnected.	Pedro interconectó las piezas. ('Pedro interconnect.PAST.3sg. the.Fpl. pieces.') Las piezas se interconectaron. ('The.Fpl. pieces$_i$. themselves$_i$. interconnect.PAST.3pl.')
I mixed the soap and the water. The soap and the water mixed.	Mezclé el jabón con el agua. ('(I) mix.PAST.1sg. the.Msg. soap. with. the.Msg. water.') El jabón y el agua se mezclaron. ('The.Msg. soap. and. the.Msg. water$_i$. themselves$_i$. mix.PAST.3pl.')
I separated the cream from the milk. The cream separated from the milk.	Separé la nata de la leche. ('(I) separate.PAST.1sg. the.Fsg.cream. from. the. Fsg. milk') La nata se separó de la leche. (The.Fsg. cream$_i$. itself$_i$. separate.PAST.3sg. from. the.Fsg. milk')

Table 1. *Examples of the ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy in Spanish and English.*

From this contrast between the English and Spanish realisations of the ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy we can conclude first that the full semantic import of expressions involving intransitivisation in English and *se* reflexive in Spanish is better captured by postulating an underlying ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy. Second, it can be said that the different linguistic realisation of this metonymy in Spanish and English is due to the fact that while English allows for valency reduction of predicates, Spanish is reluctant to this process. This accounts for the Spanish use of *se* to preserve the overall valency configuration.

3. ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT METONYMY

This type of high-level metonymy is exemplified in (9):

(9) John walked the dog.

This sentence denotes a controlled action. Here, unlike in the inchoative/causative alternation, we have a transitivisation of the verb (*walk* is typically intransitive). For Dik (1989), a transitive use of an intransitive verb is a case of valency extension whereby the predicate acquires a new argument and augments its quantitative valency.

On the other hand, Levin (1993: 29) calls these grammatical realizations cases of induced action alternation, in which there is a causee (typically an animal) induced to act by a causer. For example, in the alternation *Mary jumped the horse over the fence / The horse jumped over the fence*, Mary would be the causer and *the horse* the causee.

In our view, this alternation also has a metonymic basis. The intransitive alternate of (9) is seen in (10):

(10) The dog walked.

In Spanish, we have the following renderings of sentences (9) and (10):

(11) Juan paseó al perro. ('Juan. walk.PAST.3sg. the.Msg. dog.')

(12) El perro paseó. ('the.Msg. dog. walk.PAST.3sg.')

For these particular examples, the grammatical situation and construction of the sentences is the same in English as in Spanish. But we cannot conclude that there is a complete parallel between both languages. For example, there are other cases such as:

(13) The sergeant marched the recruits.

which has no literal rendering in Spanish, as evidenced by (14) below:

(14) *El sargento marchó a los reclutas. (*'the.Msg. sergeant. march.PAST.3sg. the.Mpl. recruits.)

A correct Spanish version of (13) would make use of a more complex construction involving causative *hacer* ('make'): *El sargento hizo marchar a los reclutas* ('theMsg. sergeant make.PAST.3sg. march. the.Mpl. recruits'). In it we highlight the use of the

periphrastic construction *hacer* + *infinitive* (*make* + infinitive), which expresses the idea of somebody inducing another entity to do something. This periphrasis could also be applied to example (11), which can be reworded as *Juan hizo pasear al perro* ('Juan. make.PAST.3sg. the.Msg. dog. walk.'); however, there is a change in meaning. From our point of view, the difference in meaning between *John walked the dog* and *John made the dog walk* is a matter of the involvement of the instigator of the action. Any time we wish to dissociate the instigator from the action we use *make* + verb. While in *John walked the dog* the instigator participates in the action (we imagine John walking by the dog, or guiding it), in *John made the dog walk* the instigator is only a causer of the action but does not take part in it (John could have made the dog walk by making a loud noise, using a whistle, etc.). In the case of *The sergeant marched the recruits* and *The sergeant made the recruits march*, it is also the feature of personal involvement of the instigator that applies. In the former, which exploits the ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy, we infer that the sergeant marches with the recruits; in the latter, we find compulsion and less involvement, since it implies that the sergeant may have just given an order and he can just sit watching the recruits as they march.

Regarding the Spanish examples, we find that in this language, the feature of involvement is not conveyed in such a way; as a matter of fact, it is very difficult to find examples without the use of *hacer* + *infinitive*. In this sense, while in English it is possible to have *The sergeant marched the recruits* and *The sergeant made the recruits march*, in Spanish only *El sargento hizo marchar a los reclutas* (**El sargento marchó a los reclutas* *'The.Msg. sergeant. march.PAST.3sg. the.Mpl. recruits') is possible.

It is hard to find additional examples both in English and in Spanish, something that points to the restricted productiveness of this metonymy in both languages (**John ran the dog*, **John strolled Peter*). In English this could be explained by the fact that most of the expressions that could be considered to be an ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy are nowadays conventionalised, though they still retain their metonymic motivation. As Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez (2001) have pointed out, this is the case of many uses of *run*, such as *John ran his fingers across her hair* ('John moved his fingers across her hair'), *John ran a business* ('John managed a business'), *John ran me home* ('John gave me a lift home'). It is true that these meanings of *run* are already fixed, but they still preserve a causal element, which is the motivation for the ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy. That is, *John ran his fingers* means that he caused his fingers to move, *John ran a business* brings about the idea that John made his business progress, and *John ran me home* means that John caused me to arrive home.

Still, we can find some particular examples in English such as *The lion tamer jumped the lions through the loop* or *The scientists ran the rats through the maze* (Levin, 1993: 35). They are not even applicable to Spanish, in which again the use of periphrasis is needed: *El domador hizo saltar a los leones a través del aro* ('The.Msg. lion tamer. make.PAST.3sg. jump.INF. the.Mpl. lions. through. the.Msg. loop.'; *Los científicos hicieron correr a las ratas por el laberinto* ('the.Mpl. scientists. make.PAST.3sg.

run.INF. the.Fpl. rats. through. the.Msg. maze'). We can finally remark that the use of a periphrastic construction is also possible for those instances where the metonymic motivation does not work: *John made the dog run* (instead of **John ran the dog*).

Our examination of some English and Spanish examples reveals that the ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy is the same in the two languages both at the conceptual and linguistic levels (see for example the case of *John walked the dog* and *Juan paseó al perro*). There is only a difference in terms of the greater productivity of this metonymy in English.

4. ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT METONYMY

Consider the following examples:

(15) These clothes wash well.

(16) This bread cuts easily.

(17) This soap powder washes whiter.

For Levin (1993) these examples could be considered as cases of what she calls middle alternation. This type of alternation is characterised by the intransitivisation of the verb, the lack of specific time reference, and the lack of an agent, though it is understood to be one (e.g. someone washes the clothes, someone cuts the bread).

As in other cases of metonymic motivation, here we find a different type of metonymy, which Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez have labelled ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT. The actions in the examples above have a result which is highlighted by the expression (for example, as a result of washing we get something cleaner). The examples also show an intransitivisation of *wash*, as happened in ACTION FOR PROCESS, but it is not the same at all, since in these examples the focus is on the result which stands for the action, and not the event which causes the action.

An important characteristic of this grammatical phenomenon is that the adverb is absolutely essential in order to have a coherent sentence (**These clothes wash, *This bread cuts, *This soap powder washes*) as a necessity of assessing the result (*easily, well, fine*), which is the focus of the action. This need of assessment of the result is an indication of this metonymic mapping; because, otherwise, the reader is inclined to interpret it as an ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy, and that is what makes it sound awkward (we cannot think of bread cutting by itself, whereas we can imagine a door closing, for example, by the effect of the wind). Moreover, we can observe that in assessing the result there is a tendency to specify. For example, it is possible to say *These clothes wash well* while is it rather awkward to say *Clothes wash easily*, as we tend to think of all clothes. This specification is done by means of defining articles (e.g. *The bread cuts easily*), determinants (*These clothes wash easily*), or modifiers (e.g. *Whole wheat bread cuts easily*). Nevertheless, this specification will depend on the context.

The Spanish translations also have a metonymic base:

(18) Estas ropas se lavan bien. ('These.Fpl. clothes$_i$. themselves$_i$. wash.PRES.3pl. well.')

(19) Este pan se corta fácilmente. ('This.Msg. bread$_i$. itself$_i$. cut.PRES.3sg. easily.')

(20) Este jabón lava más blanco. ('This.Msg. soap. wash.PRES.3sg. more. white.')

In (18) and (19) we find again the discussion of the use of *se* in Spanish, with which we have already dealt when revising the ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy. As we have seen in previous sections, Spanish and English use different linguistic realisations for the same metonymic mapping: remember that Spanish makes use of *se* in cases where English makes use of valency reduction.

Concerning the use of *se*, example (20) seems to create an apparent asymmetry with respect to (18) and (19) in the use of *se*. But on closer inspection, we observe that in (18) and (19) the focus is on the grammatical subjects as goals of the action in (18) and (19) rather than as instruments, as in (20), and there is no coreferenciality with this instrument. Therefore, we see that passive reflex in Spanish, regarding the ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonymy, is only needed when we highlight the goal, but not when we focus on the instrument.

Also, this metonymy is very productive in English and Spanish, and both share a metonymic mapping, though they have different grammatical realisations. Generally speaking, we can apply this metonymy to verbs of change of state. Among others we can mention the following examples in the table.

English	Spanish
She baked the potatoes.	Coció las patatas.
	('(she) bake.PAST.3sg. the.Fpl. potatoes.')
The potatoes baked easily.	Las patatas se cocieron fácilmente.
	('The.Fpl. potatoes$_i$. themselves$_i$. bake.PRES.3pl. easily.')
He bent the bar.	Dobló la barra.
	('(he) bend.PAST.3sg. the.Fsg. bar.')
The bar bends easily.	La barra se dobló fácilmente.
	('The.Fsg. bar$_i$. itself$_i$. bend.PRES.3sg. easily')
He broke the crystal vase.	Rompió el jarrón de cristal.
	('(he) break.PAST.3sg. the.Msg. vase. of. crystal.')
Crystal vases break easily.	Los jarrones de cristal se rompen fácilmente.
	('The.Msg. crystal vases$_i$. themselves$_i$. break.PRES.3sg. easily')
She carved marble.	Ella talló mármol.
	('(she) carve.PAST.3sg. the.Fsg. marble.')
Marble carves easily.	El mármol se talla fácilmente.
	('The.Msg. marble$_i$. itself$_i$. carve.PRES.3sg. easily')

English	Spanish
I coiled the rope around the post. That kind of rope coils easily around the post.	Enrollé la cuerda alrededor del poste. ('(I) coil.PAST.1sg. the.Fsg. rope. around. the.Msg. poste') Ese tipo de cuerda se enrolla fácilmente alrededor del poste. ('That.Msg. kind. of. rope$_i$. itself$_i$. coil.PRES.3sg. easily. around. the.Msg. post.')
She cut the whole wheat bread. Whole wheat bread cuts easily.	Ella cortó el pan integral. ('(she) cut.PAST.3sg. the.Msg. whole wheat bread.') El pan integral se corta fácilmente. ('The.Msg. whole wheat bread$_i$. itself$_i$. cut.PRES..3sg. easily')
I dried the cotton clothes. Cotton clothes dry easily.	Sequé la ropa de algodón. ('(I) dry.PAST.1sg the.Fpl. clothes. of. cotton') La ropa de algodón se seca fácilmente. ('The.Fpl. clothes$_i$. of cotton. themselves$_i$. dry.PRES.3pl. easily')
She interconnected the pieces. The pieces interconnect easily.	Interconectó las piezas ('(she) interconnect.PAST.3sg. the.Fpl. pieces.') Las piezas se interconectaron fácilmente. ('The.Fpl. pieces$_i$. themselves$_i$. interconnect.PAST.3pl. easily')
I mixed the eggs with cream. Eggs mix well with cream.	Mezclé los huevos con nata. ('(I) mix.PAST.1sg. the.Mpl. eggs. with. cream') Los huevos se mezclan bien con la nata. ('The.Mpl. eggs$_i$. themselves$_i$. mix.PAST.3pl. well. with .theFsg. cream.')
I separated the cream from the milk. Cream separates easily from milk.	Separé separé la nata de la leche. ('(I) separate.PAST.1sg. the.Fsg. cream. from. the.Fsg. milk') La nata se separa fácilmente de la leche. ('The.Fsg. cream$_i$. itself$_i$. separate.PRES.3pl. easily. from. theFsg. milk')
He slid the books across the table. The books slid across the table easily.	Deslizó los libros por la mesa. ('(he) slid.PAST.3sg. the.Mpl. books. across. the.Fsg. table') Los libros se deslizaron por la mesa fácilmente. ('The.Mpl. books$_i$. themselves$_i$. slid.PAST.3pl. across theFsg table easily')
She taped the label to the cover. Labels tape easily to that kind of cover.	Pegó la etiqueta a la cubierta ('(she) tape.PAST.3sg. the.Fsg. tape. to. the.Fsg. cover') Las etiquetas se pegan fácilmente a ese tipo de cubierta. ('The.Fpl. labels$_i$. themselves$_i$. tape.PRES.3pl. easily. to. that.Msg type. of. cover')
I unscrewed the handle. The handle unscrews easily.	Desatornillé el mango. ('(I)$_i$ unscrew$_i$.PAST.1sg. the.Msg. handle') El mango se desatornilla fácilmente. ('The.Msg. handle$_i$. itself$_i$. unscrew.PRES.3sg. easily.')

Table 2. *Examples of the ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonymies in English and Spanish.*

NURIA ALFARO MARTÍNEZ

As a conclusion, we can say that the ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonymy appears both in Spanish and English at the conceptual level, whereas its linguistic realisation differs. As with to the ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy, the difference lies in the Spanish use of *se* instead of the English strategy of valency reduction.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has analysed the close relationship between metonymy and grammar in action frames where metonymy underlies the full semantic import of some grammatical constructions. This motivation has been neglected by other authors that have studied the grammatical phenomena but who have failed to see the conceptual metonymic motivation underlying them.

We have demonstrated through a series of examples in Spanish and English that both languages share the metonymic motivation in the three metonymies we have dealt with: ACTION FOR PROCESS, ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT, and ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT. Nevertheless, though their conceptual motivation is the same, they are realised in different grammatical forms in the two languages we have taken into account. On the one hand, we find that in the ACTION FOR PROCESS metonymy and the ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonymy, English makes use of valency reduction, while Spanish speakers use the controversial reflex passive. On the other hand, the ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy is the same in Spanish and English both at the conceptual and grammatical levels. The degree of productiveness also seems to be correlated in both Spanish and English in the EVENT FOR ACTION and ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonymies, though English may present a variety of examples, whereas English and Spanish differ in the productiveness of the ACTIVITY FOR (CAUSED) EVENT metonymy, which is greater in English than in Spanish.

A study of these high-level metonymies in other languages may also be interesting, as well as research in all the possible examples we have briefly mentioned above.

6. NOTES

1. This terminology has been adopted from Dik's (1989) typology of states of affairs within his theory of Functional Grammar. Although his perspective does not belong to cognitive linguistics proper, his grammatical description is compatible with many of the assumptions taken for granted in cognitive linguistics and it is useful to describe and explain some grammatical phenomena related to the topics that cognitive linguistics deals with.
2. The construction is possible if we include an adverb of evaluation (e.g. *La puerta cierra bien*; 'TheFsg. door. closePRES3sg. well'), but it would fall within the ACTION FOR (ASSESSED) RESULT metonymy, which we will explain later on.
3. Verbs are related among them according to their meaning. For example *bake* can be related to *boil, cook, fry, roast, simmer, stew, toast* among many others.

7. REFERENCES

Alarcos Llorach, E. 1972. "Valores de se". *Estudios de Gramática funcional del español.* Madrid: Gredos. 156-165.

Alarcos Llorach, E. 1994. *Gramática de la lengua española.* Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Barcelona, A., ed. 2000. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Benot, E. 1910. *Arte de hablar. Gramática filosófica de la lengua castellana.* Madrid: Sucesores de Hernando.

Bull, W. 1963. *Spanish for Teachers. Applied Linguistics.* New York: The Ronald Press.

Castro, A. 1908. "La pasiva refleja en español". *Hispania.* 1, 2: 81.

Croft, W. 1993. "The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies". *Cognitive Linguistics.* 4-4: 335-370.

Dik, S. C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Vol. 1. : The structure of the clause.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Dirven, R. 1993. "Metonymy and metaphor: different mental strategies of conceptualisation". *Leuvense Bijdragen* 82: 1-25.

Feldman, D.M. 1974. *Apuntes históricos sobre las frases verbales de modo en español.* Madrid: Playor.

Goossens, L. 1990. "Metaphtonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action". *Cognitive Linguistics* 1, 3: 323-340.

Hernández Alonso, C. 1996. *Gramática Funcional del Español.* Madrid.

Kövecses, Z. and Radden, G. 1998. "Metonymy: developing a cognitive linguistic view". *Cognitive Linguistics* 9, 1: 37-77.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. 1993. "The contemporary theory of metaphor". *Metaphor and Thought.* Ed. A. Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 202-251.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: the embodied mind and its challenge to western thought.* New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, R. W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I. Theoretical Prerequisites.* Standford, Cal.: Standford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. 1993. "Reference point constructions". *Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 1-38.

Levin, B. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations. A Preliminary Investigation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Monge, F. 1955. "Las frases pronominales de sentido impersonal en español". *Archivo de Filología Aragonesa,* 7: 7-102.

Panther, K. and Radden, G., eds. 1999. *Metonymy in Language and Thought.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Panther, K. and Thornburg, L. 1999. "The potential for actuality metonymy in English and Hungarian". *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Eds. K. Panther and G. Radden. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 333-359.

Radden, G. and Kövecses, Z. 1999. "Towards a theory of metonymy". *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Eds. K. Panther and G. Radden. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17-60.

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez, F.J. 1999. "From semantic underdetermination via metaphor and metonymy to conceptual interaction". *Linguistic LAUD Agency*. University of Essen. Series A. General and Theoretical Papers. Paper no. 492.

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez, F. J. and Pérez, Lorena. 2001. "Metonymy and the grammar: motivation, constraints, and interaction". *Language and Communication* 21, 4: 321-357.

Seto, K. 1999. "Distinguishing metonymy from synecdoche". *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Eds. K. Panther and G. Radden. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 91-120.