

Saarni Laitinen  
University of Helsinki

### **Metonymy and metaphor in Finnish-Estonian and Estonian-Finnish dictionaries: case study of three frequent verbs**

When I worked as a lexicographer, I became interested in how polysemy was dealt with in bilingual dictionaries. There were many questions that remained unanswered during the practical work: how different meanings of polysemic words are chosen and organised in the dictionary entries, what the reasons behind those decisions are, how metaphor and metonymy are taken into account (if they are taken into account at all), what kind of differences are there in “traditional” and corpus-based dictionaries in this sense, to name but a couple. That is why I decided to have a closer look on metonymy and metaphor in the newest Estonian-Finnish online dictionary (VISU 2019) and its older and larger sibling, the Finnish-Estonian dictionary (SUVI 2003). It seems fruitful to compare two closely related Finnic languages in the context of metalexicography.

The theoretical background of this study comes from cognitive semantics (e.g. Langacker 1987; Geeraerts 2010). One of the cornerstones of research on metaphor and metonymy is written by Lakoff & Johnson (1980; see also for definitions of these terms); in the 21<sup>st</sup> century important works on the same phenomena have been written by Barcelona (2000), and Dirven & Pörings (2002), among many others. I aim to dig deeper in how these two types of polysemy – which can also be seen as a continuum rather than two different phenomena, see e.g. Wojciechowska (2012) – are presented in the above-mentioned bilingual dictionaries, and in addition I hope to find some new perspectives on metonymy and metaphor by using dictionaries as research material.

In my presentation, I will discuss results of one part of the research, a case study concerning dictionary entries of three verbs: Finnish *antaa*, *saada*, *pitää*; Estonian *andma*, *saama*, *pidama* (approximately ‘give’, ‘get’, ‘keep’, but since both the Finnish and the Estonian verbs have several meanings, it is impossible to give accurate equivalents). Besides being highly polysemic, these verbs are very frequently used in both languages. Many of their meanings and ways of use differ a great deal depending on the language, which makes them even more interesting to look at metalexicographically. The focus is on how metaphor and metonymy are presented in the entries, but I also look at how the different meanings are

organised into main groups and subgroups in general. There will be comparisons both between the entries inside each dictionary, and between the dictionaries.

## References

- Barcelona, Antonio (ed.) 2000: *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dirven, René – Ralf Pörings (eds) 2002: *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Geeraerts, Dirk 2010: *Theories of lexical semantics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, George – Mark Johnson 1980 [2003]: *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar I: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- SUVI 2003 = *Suomi–viro-suursanakirja. Soome-eesti suursõnaraamat* 2003: Valdek Pall et al. (eds). Tallinn/Helsinki: Eesti Keele Instituut / Kotimaisten kielten keskus. Available: [www.eki.ee/dict/soome/](http://www.eki.ee/dict/soome/)
- VISU 2019 = *Viro–suomi-sanakirja. Eesti-soome sõnaraamat* 2019. Heikki Hurttä et al. (eds). Tallinn/Helsinki: Eesti Keele Instituut / Kotimaisten kielten keskus. Available: [www.eki.ee/dict/efi/](http://www.eki.ee/dict/efi/)
- Wojciechowska, Sylwia 2012: *Conceptual metonymy and lexicographic representation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.