

Investigating Conceptual Metonymies in Iraqi Arabic

دراسة استقصائية للمجازات المرسلة الإدراكية في العربية العراقية

Asst. Lect. Hassan Wyrawish Marai
General Directorate of Education
in Najaf
wyrawish@gmail.com

م. حسن وريوش مرعي
مديرية التربية في النجف الاشرف

تاريخ القبول: 2025/9/20 تاريخ النشر: 2026/1/1 تاريخ الإسلام: 2025/8/30
Received: 30 / 8 / 2025 Accepted: 20 / 9 / 2025 Published: 1 / 1 / 2026

Abstract

The study aims to investigate the types of metonymies encountered in Iraqi Arabic in accordance with the cognitive theory of linguistics. Besides, it also seeks to explore the functions of those types as well, drawing on the data at hand. Ideally, all informants were involved in natural conversations, but individually. The conversations

were being recorded and then decontextualized into written forms. Yet, the selected utterances are randomly taken from various lengthy conversations and are analyzed according to an eclectic model. The study has shown that the types of conceptual metonymy are alike in English as well as in Iraqi Arabic and that they have exhibited multifunctional

purposes.

Keywords: *Conceptual Metonymy, Cross-Functional, Illocutionary, Toth (2018), Panther and Thornburg (2007), Predicational, Property-Metonymy, Propositional, Referential.*

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى استقصاء أنواع المجاز المرسل كما يظهر في العربية العراقية، وذلك وفقاً للنظرية الإدراكيَّة في اللسانيات. وتسعى أيضاً إلى استكشاف الوظائف التداولية لتلك الأنواع، بالاعتماد على المعطيات المتوفرة. تم جمع البيانات من خلال محادثات طبيعية مع عدد من المخبرين، كُلُّ على حدة. وقد تم تسجيل هذه المحادثات صوتياً، ثم تحويلها إلى صيغ مكتوبة خارج سياقاتها الأصلية. أما العبارات المختارة للتحليل، فقد تم انتقاءها عشوائياً من محادثات طويلة ومتعددة، وتم تحليلها وفق نموذج انتقائي يجمع بين عدد من الأساليب التحليلية. وقد أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن أنواع المجاز المرسل الإدراكي في العربية العراقية تشبه نظيراتها في اللغة الإنجليزية، وأنها تؤدي وظائف متعددة ذات أبعاد دلالية وتداولية مختلفة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المجاز المرسل

الادراكي، متعدد الوظائف، إنجازي، توثر (2018)، بانثر وثورنبرغ (2007)، إسنادي، مجاز مرسل قائم على الخاصية، اقتراحي، مرجعي.

1. Introduction

In their daily talk, people tend to make use of their knowledge of language to reach the ultimate possible potential for conveying their messages. To do so, speakers often utilize many aspects of language; therefore, conceptual metonymies are no exception in this respect.

Traditionally, metonymy is seen as “a type of figurative language used in everyday conversation, a form of shorthand that allows us to use our shared knowledge to communicate with fewer words than we would otherwise need” (Littlemore, 2015). As in the field of cognitive linguistics, metonymy is treated differently; for example, Panther and Thornburg (2018) view metonymy as a conceptual entity, referring to it as “associative thinking” which entails the mental process of mapping between the source domain and the target one



evoking conceptual thinking by both speaker and hearer. According to Abdul-Raof, it has been proposed that there are only three types of metonymies in Arabic. Namely, attribute, modified and affinity metonymy (2006). More importantly, those types are studied within the area of rhetoric rather than within cognitive linguistics. Therefore, this paper seeks to investigate the applicability of the types of conceptual metonymy in Iraqi Arabic considering an English eclectic model.

1.1 Research Aims

1. To identify and classify the main types of conceptual metonymies utilized in Iraqi Arabic across different domains.
2. To investigate the functions of conceptual metonymy utilized in Iraqi Arabic and to explore the ways in which they contribute to meaning in everyday discourse.
3. To reveal cultural and cognitive motivations underlying the utilization of particular metonymic patterns in Iraqi Arabic, situating them within the context of Iraqi

social and cultural practices.

4. To contribute to the field of cognitive linguistics research through empirical data on conceptual metonymy from a less-examined variety of Arabic, thereby enriching cross-linguistic analyses.

1.2 Research Problems

1. While conceptual metonymy has been investigated in English and some other languages, there is little research on its patterns in Iraqi Arabic.
2. Iraqi Arabic is rarely discussed in global literature on metonymy, leaving a scholarly gap.
3. Many metonymies in Iraqi Arabic are highly context-bound, making them difficult to isolate and classify in a purely linguistic framework.

2. Metonymy

1.1 Literature Review

The study of metonymy in cognitive linguistics as a cognitive process of conceptual contiguity is first associated with the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). In this regard, they (ibid:37) state that the ability to conceptualize one entity through its association



with another is made possible by the utilization of metonymic concepts, which structure not only our language but also our thoughts, perspectives, and behaviors. Metonymic concepts, such as “THE PART FOR THE WHOLE”, are ingrained in both our regular, everyday reasoning and interaction.

Ding (2015) points out that Lakoff and Johnson view metonymy not only as a linguistic phenomenon, but rather as a conceptual phenomenon. He further adds that Lakoff (1987) sees metonymy as a manifestation of Idealized Cognitive Model. In the same line of thought, Langacker (1993: 30) argues that it is “a process consists in mentally accessing one conceptual entity via another entity”.

Langacker (1999) further emphasizes that metonymy is a cognitive process that provides a conceptual mechanism for another mental entity. However, unlike the traditional definition of metonymy set by rhetoricians as a figure of speech, Panther and Thornburg

(2007: 236) view metonymy as a cognitive entity rather than as a rhetorical device, supporting the prototypical notion by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) who see metonymy as metaphor in that it is not just a poetic or rhetorical device; they believe in the notion that metonymy is not just a matter of language.

By the same token, Toth (2018) states that there are two aspects of metonymy to be highlighted:

- 1)Like metaphor, metonymy is a common occurrence in language and/or thought.
- 2)There have been claims that conceptual-psychological processes operate implicitly, that is, the utilization of figurative language is controlled by cognitive principles. Similarly, Lakoff (1987: 77) defines metonymy as one of the fundamental aspects of cognition, and Barcelona (2011: 52) views it as an asymmetrical correspondence occurs when one conceptual domain (the source) is projected onto another (the target). The target can be mentally activated since both domains are part of the



same functional domain and are connected through a pragmatic function.

Metonymic mapping, in this respect, can be seen as Ruiz de Mendoza (2000: 114–15, cited in Geeraerts & Cuyckens, 2007) proposes that it can be of two kinds: either “source-in-target” metonymy where the target is the source of the metonymic activity, a phenomenon known as “target-in-source” metonymy.

A local example is of a great interest for the writer to elucidate Barcelona’s definition. To begin with, it is within the typical rituals of shiat Muslims that they break their fasting of Ramadan, the ninth month of the Islamic calendar, after almost always the Fatwa (statement) of Eid al-Fitr. This Fatwa is announced by well-known religious authorities (known as Almarja’iah) at the end of Ramadan relying on certain astronomical sums which marks the end of Ramadan and signals out the beginning of Shawwal. In such a happy occasion, people are used to exchange the news

of that Fatwa via saying the mainstream and most commonly used statement: ‘the office has announced that the next day is the first day of Eid al-Fitr’. On the other hand, people from the other provinces of Iraq tend to say ‘Annajaf has announced that the next day is the first day of Eid al-Fitr’. By saying the office or Annajaf, people are referring to the authority himself and/or the people working at that office and are in charge of announcing the Fatwa.

According to Barcelona’s definition, the source (the office/ the city) is asymmetrically mapped to indicate the target (Almarja’iah or the people working there). In this case, the source and target are linked by a pragmatic function that the people working at the office or city. And hence, the target is mentally activated.

Moreover, the conceptual view of metonymy, according to Toth (2018:32), aligns inherently with the foundational orientation of cognitive linguistics, which concentrates on our cognitive



system and its mechanisms rather than just linguistic phenomena. Metonymy, as Radden and Kövecses (1999: 3) define, a cognitive operation wherein, within the same cognitive framework, one conceptual element recognized as the vehicle, allows mental access to another conceptual element, the target.

Panther and Thomburg (2007: 242) outlines the qualitative features of conceptual metonymy as described below:

- a) Conceptual metonymy indicates a process of thought where a source content (the office/the city) provides access to a target content (Almarja'ah or the people working there) in the scope of one cognitive domain
- b) The association between source and target content is conceptually non-essential, meaning it is theoretically defeasible.
- c) The source content is given a supporting or secondary role, while the target content is given primary emphasis.
- d) The conceptual distance between the source and the target

content, as well as the prominence of metonymic source, are two factors that may affect how strong the metonymic connection is between the source and target.

Metonymy often involves the use of a simple or concrete concept to refer to what is more complex or even more abstract. The advantage of so doing is that it allows us to communicate economically via the use of our shared knowledge with others so that it spares extra explanations and paves the way for further understanding (Littlemore, 2015:1).

All in all, in using metonymy, one attempts to indicate something conceptually, an entity for example, by the use of another one with which is closely associated. Understanding metonymy, in this regard, depends heavily upon the foreground and background knowledge of both speaker and addressee.

1.2 Previous studies

Over the past three decades, conceptual metonymy has gained a significant concern in the field of cognitive linguistics. It is no longer



treated as a mere rhetorical device, but now metonymy is recognized as a central cognitive process to shape the structure of meaning and communication (Panther & Radden, 2005). Scholars generally agree that metonymy connects two elements of a single domain by giving mental access from one entity, often called the 'vehicle' to a 'target' concept within the same field.

A central concern of previous studies is to clarify how metonymy differs from metaphor as well as to analyze its structural mechanisms. Truszczyńska (2003) suggests that metonymy functions within idealized cognitive models, drawing on contiguous relations such as "PART-WHOLE or INSTRUMENT-AGENT." Such patterns make linguistic reference efficient and contextually sensitive, revealing that metonymy is conceptually structured rather than lexical mechanisms.

Barcelona, through his study, highlights the pervasiveness of metonymy, arguing that it not only functions as a cognitive

phenomenon but also contributes to the formation of metaphors. This perspective leads to academic controversy concerning whether metaphor is rooted in metonymy, encouraging scholars to investigate their interdependence more closely.

In a similar vein, Radden and Matthis (2002) provide typologies that classify between structural, functional, and spatial varieties of metonymy. They also show that metonymy serves pragmatic functions, including guiding implicatures and ensuring coherence in discourse. Moreover, drawing from prior research, Panther and Radden (2005) emphasize both the cognitive and pragmatic aspects of metonymy, showing how it shapes inference and structures across languages. Empirical studies such as Benczes (2005) shows that compounding depends on such metonymic relations as "PRODUCER-PRODUCT" and "PLACE-INSTITUTION." Hence, the scope of research has extended to cover the study of metonymy,



incorporating cross-linguistic and multimodal perspectives. Studies using corpus-based analyses demonstrate repeated metonymic patterns in various registers, and gesture studies have shown frequent use of part-for-whole representations in nonverbal expression (Taylor & Francis Online, 2024).

Bibliometric evidence has shown an increasing trend toward interdisciplinary, empirical work that integrates experimental methods, corpus data, and multimodal analysis (PMC, 2024–2025). Although much progress has been made, significant problems remain unresolved, notably in distinguishing metaphor from metonymy and how salience operates in real time. Such unresolved problems stress the need for empirical research that can refine theoretical models and deepen the cognitive underpinnings of metonymy.

1.3 Classification

Traditionally, the association between the source and target is the most used foundation for creating

a metonymy typology (Toth, 2018:143). As for Panther and Thornburg (2007: 237) metonymy, then, stands for the relationship between the source or vehicle (office/Annajaf) which is used to refer to the target (Almarja'iah or the people working there) adjacent to. It is known as the substitution theory of metonymy. It is called so for in the sentence 'Annajaf announced that the next day is the first day of Eid al-Fitr', the city name Annajaf (source) may stand for the Almarja'iah or the people working there (target). Toth (2018:143) argues against this in which he says that these classifications try to enumerate, characterize, and group all potential and actual connections between two distinct concepts within the same pattern of knowledge.

The following classifications of metonymy types are taken after Panther and Thornburg (2007) and Toth (2018). In principle, they will be dealt with jointly:

1.3.1 Referential Metonymy

Traditionally, metonymy used to indicate the contiguous relation



between the source or vehicle (office/Annajaf) and the target (Almarja'iah or the people working there); namely, the name of one thing is used to refer to another. It is, then, a means of indirect reference. For example, in the sentence 'the saxophone does not perform tonight', the saxophone whether vehicle or source is utilized to denote the saxophone musician (the target) (Panther and Thornburg, 2007:237, 246).

In principle, Toth (2018) has the same notion of referential metonymy as that of Panther and Thornburg (2007), yet, Toth (2018) only differs in terminology, he maintains that thing-metonymies can be seen as metonymies that have an item as their target or intended referent, and that can be accessible through relevant reference point content in the same frame or ICM. In such a case, an item may be indirectly accessible to the mind through other items, a property of the item, or its function or role within a context or frame. However, in contrast to Panther and Thornburg (*ibid*), Toth (2018:

147) labelled referential metonymy as **Thing-Metonymy**. In calling it so, for him, there are two reasons: firstly, he considers it the prototypical form of metonymy. Secondly, it is utilized at the very beginning of the process of constructing meaning. To put it another way, the employment of such metonymies is to identify and target conceptual content that underlies an assertion or statement.

1.3.2 Predicational Metonymy

In this type of metonymy, the idea is that "a potential event stands for [a past] actual event". For instance, in the sentence 'The saxophone player had to leave early'. It is interpreted metonymically through the "actual event", 'The saxophone player had to leave early' to induce the "potential event" that the 'The saxophone player left early' Panther and Thornburg (2007: 246).

On his part, Toth (2018: 151) comes also with different terminology to indicate this type of metonymy. This time he calls it **Event-Metonymy** and the reason for this is that he believes the term



event can be an umbrella term for actions, changes, events. The mutual notion of both predicational and that of event-metonymy is that they both refer to the same target which is an event. This event is cognitively approached through its constituent participants, sub-events, properties, pre-conditions or consequences and as in the following example:

“Rick, I get it, you don’t want to risk another *Woodbury*.”

In this instance, the place (Woodbury) where a past event occurred (obviously known to the hearer) refers metonymically to the event that might be a potential event. In this respect, Toth (ibid: 154) maintains that “event-metonymies are manifested on the level of linguistic expressions in an extreme heterogeneity of forms due to the immense variety of the cognitive reference points which can provide mental access to events.”

1.3.3 Propositional Metonymy

Propositional metonymy, for Panther and Thornburg (2007: 246), is the combination of a

referential metonymy with a predicational metonymy as in ‘The saxophone had to leave early’ in which the saxophone, musical instrument, stands for the saxophone player which is referential metonymy whereas the predicational metonymy is an obligatory action for actual action. Then, the target meaning ‘The saxophone player left early’.

As for Toth (2018: 156-9), the target in this case is the proposition being referred to; it is possible to access propositions via the use of other ones as well as via their individual parts as in the following example: A: ‘How did you get to the party?’ B: ‘I hopped on a bus.’ (Lakoff, 1987: 79)

In B, the utilization of a proposition is to serve as a point of cognitive reference so that it can mentally access another related proposition. In ‘I got to the party by bus’ (proposition B) is accessed through the proposition ‘I hopped on a bus’ (proposition A), where proposition A is a pre-condition of proposition B, which leads to the realization of B with a high



probability.

Assumably, a proposition can be approached through one of the elements it has as in:

“I don’t want to end up with a bullet in my brain.” (Langacker 1999: 200)

As a proposition, getting shot with a bullet in the brain is a mental indication to a big proposition, meaning dying because of getting a bullet in the brain.

1.3.4 Illocutionary Metonymy

According to Thornburg and Panther (2007: 247), many scholars claim that illocutionary acts, particularly indirect illocutionary acts may be examined by the employment of conceptual frameworks, situational contexts, scenarios, Idealized Cognitive Models, and similar constructs.

The fundamental premise is that, just as a characteristic of a speech act may represent the speech act, an attribute of a person may likewise function as a reference to the person themselves.

Gibbs (1994: 354–57, cited in Geeraerts & Cuyckens, 2007) presents experimental findings

showing that such conventional indirect requests as will/Can you give me the book? or Would you mind giving me the book? are not only arbitrary forms that are utilized as substitute for the direct request Give me the book. The source expression (and accordingly, the source content) is intentionally selected by the speaker and not randomly chosen so as to respond to possible “obstacles” to the fulfillment of the request.

Although he calls it speech act, Toth (2018: 159) agrees with others, such as Thornburg and Panther (2007) to use the label illocutionary metonymy as well. This type involves approaching a particular communicative intention via the utilization of a linguistic form.

Panther and Thornburg’s (1999: 346) illustrate an example of the potentiality-for-actuality metonymy:

Can you pass the salt? (ibid)

Seemingly, the question form indicates the intention of the speaker to get information about the ability of the hearer to do



something, but with the help of the contextual cues as well as that of a metonymic inferential schema, the addressee indirectly identifies the speaker's implicit request.

1.3.5 Cross-Functional Metonymies

This type of metonymy proposed by Thornburg and Panther (2007: 247). In conceptual metonymies, a particular conceptual metonymy can perform referential, predicational, and illocutionary functions, as shown in:

“Her ability to convince the board of trustees impressed everyone.”

It indicates the referential function of metonymy concerning actuality, though it can likewise function predicationally as illustrated by:

“She was able to convince the board of trustees.”

In each instance, the target meaning is metonymically derived to convey that the act of persuading the board of trustees truly occurred.

As for the illocutionary level, this can be illustrated as in:

“I can assure you that your application will be taken into consideration.”

It seems that in many situations, the speaker indeed affirms the validity of the complement clause to the addressee of the content even though it is mitigated by the utilization of the hedge modal 'can'.

1.3.6 Property-metonymies

This type of metonymy proposed by Toth (2018: 154-6) is not included in the model given by Panther and Thornburg (2007). However, in the case of property-metonymies, the target is a property, more specifically a scale serving to measure the property itself, or a subpart of such a scale, as in:

high temperature (Radden 2002: 409, cited in Toth, 2018:154)

Thus, a property of a scale measuring temperature facilitates cognitive reach to the property of the temperature measured. Consider the following example as well.

“How tall are you?”

It indicates one end of a scale serves as a cognitive reference point to the whole scale. It can be stated, according to Radden and



Kövecses (1999: 31-2, cited in in Toth, 2018:155), that both the properties of things and those of events can be reached through the mediation of one end of the scale as in:

“Henry is *speeding* again.”

One can also mentally approach a property through reference to its opposite, given that a property and its reverse belong to one scale, such shift may be regarded as metonymic. Taking that view into account, verbal irony grounded in conceptual metonymy may be treated as a subordinate type of property-metonymies. Within linguistic expressions, property-metonymies are predominantly shown via the employment of adverbs or adjectives as manifested in”

“That’s **great** news!”

3. Methodology

3.1 Subjects

The subjects comprise (14) Iraqi people of (7) males and (7) females. They are of (24-54) years old and are selected randomly to participate in this study. All informants live in the same regional di-

alect. However, they are from various sectors of Annajaf city.

3.2 Data Elicitation and Procedure

The procedure employed in this study for eliciting the data is via conversing with the informants. Admittedly, the informants are told in advance that their conversations are being recorded for latter analysis, without telling them about the specific nature of the study in order to avoid any potential impact on the conversations. Yet, each informant is involved in a random discussion. This is to guarantee that the conversations are elicited naturally. Finally, all of the analyzed sentences are extracted from lengthy utterances that could serve the purpose of the study. The whole data are translated from Arabic into English by the researcher.

3.3 Data Analysis

The study mainly depends on an eclectic model that is basically based on two aspects: First, pragmatic functions of metonymy by Panther and Thornburg (2007) and second, the conceptual con-



tent associated with the metonymic correspondence introduced by Toth (2018).

This section is deemed to demonstrate the main findings of the paper at hand. The findings have shown that all the types of metonymy, according to the adopted models, have been observed in the data under examination. Moreover, each of those types will be discussed with illustrative examples extracted from the conversation data compiled for the purpose of the present paper.

3.3.1 Referential Metonymy

As a matter of indicating the association between source domain and the target one or of substituting the name of one thing to refer to another that with which is relatively associated, referential metonymy has been observed in Iraqi Arabic as such. Consider the following findings.

1. الجامع اذن قبل شوية.

The mosque has just called for prayer.

In this utterance, one can find that the name of a building, the mosque which is inanimate, is

used to occupy the role of animate, human beings whose role is to call for prayer. Apparently, the speaker uses this type of metonymy for two reasons:

- a) For the sake of putting emphasis on the word 'mosque' which designates the religious significance of the place, and
- b) For the sake of economy. In Arabic, it sounds easier to utter the word 'mosque' rather than Mu'adh-dhin, especially under the same syntactic structure and under the same sequence of the lexical items.

2. النجف مدینتی تکول ولا اصابة الیوم.

Annajaf Madeenati says that there is no casualties today.

Using the name of a locally recognized Facebook page (Annajaf Madeenati) to have the function of human beings (to say) is a type of referential metonymy which is employed to refer to those people who run that page.

Without a doubt, this utterance indicates that there is another function of using referential metonymy: it can be used to substitute a



known entity (Annajaf Madeenati) for the unknown, in this case, the unknown are the people who run the Facebook page of Annajaf Madeenati.

3. **خل نشوف الوزارة
شتتنطي.**

Let's see what the ministry will announce.

Clearly, the referential metonymy utilized in this utterance is intended to accomplish the same functions found in the two previous examples altogether. In plain English, using the name of an entity to refer to the people associated with might indicate a situation where the speaker does not know or he is not sure of the precise target. In the case of this utterance, the precise target might be the minister himself or a committee in which both of them work at the ministry, and hence, the employment of the ministry is seen appropriate by the speaker for the sake of being precise and honest. To sum up, referential metonymy can be used for:

a) Putting emphasis on the significance of a certain entity such as a place.

- b) Having phonological, morphological, syntactic purposes.
- c) Substituting a known entity for the unknown.

3.3.2 Predicational Metonymy

The act of using past events to provoke certain common knowledge of history that mutually shared by speaker and hearer is known as predicational metonymies. Let us examine the following:

4. **وين رايح للطيفية؟!**

Are you going to Al-Latifiya?!

In order for the speaker of this utterance indicate a potential event that might be taken place, he is using the name of a city (Al-Latifiya) known for Iraqis of having a horrible history of massacres during the ultimate period of sectarianism in Iraq after 2003. In this case, the use of predicational metonymies have the function of triggering future expectations that might have negative or positive consequences on the speaker/hearer as related to past events. This type of metonymy can be worked out with any speech act. It is worth mentioning that the speaker in this utterance is mocking his addressee by denoting that



your current destination is not as dangerous as Al-Latifiya.

5. راح يرجعونه للتسعينات، ثق!

They will have us returned to the 1990s, trust me!

By this utterance, the speaker is exploiting a particular period of time (the 1990s) that has been distinguished of being a dark era for Iraqis as it was ruled by a dictatorship regime. As so, the speaker is referring to a past event to convey his expectations shortly. Indisputably, predicational metonymies are used to summarize lists of concepts, events, feelings by the use of a single word or phrase. In such a case, the interpretation of the utterance is left to personal experiences and knowledge.

6. صايره كربلاء.

It has become Karbala.

Seemingly, both the speaker and hearer are well-acquainted with an event associated with the name of the city of Karbala. The name evokes a heroic epic where an army of almost 70 fighters honorably confronts an army of at least 30000 fighters. Therefore, the use of Karbala as a metonymy can also in-

dicate many aspects and concepts related to that events depending on the intended meaning as associated with its context. In short, it can be concluded that predicational metonymies can be executed to achieve the following functions:

- Expressing negative or positive expectations on the speaker/hearer.
- Conveying concepts, aspects, events, feelings shortly and effectively.
- Implicating intended meaning by virtue of the context of utterance.

3.3.3 Propositional Metonymy

Eliciting a proposition out of another to reach at the communicative value is a matter of using propositional metonymy. It is the way by which the speaker uses referential and predicational metonymy in the same utterance to convey a related proposition. As in the following utterances.

7. شنو النتيجة؟

خطوط حمر.

What is the result?

Red lines.

When the asker raises a question

asking about the result of his addressee, the latter responds with 'red lines' indicating an aspect associated with the atmosphere of failure, as a matter of fact, it is within the norms, especially within the context of schools, that failed results are usually underlined red in order to highlight the subject the student has not passed yet. However, since the source is an aspect associated with the target, then, the addressee is conducting a referential metonymy. More importantly, instead of providing a complete answer as in 'the result is red lines', the addressee makes use of predicational metonymy saying "red lines". In this case, the ultimate proposition is predicted as 'the result is failure' which is conceptually predicated. Literally, this type of metonymy manifests the tendency of saving time and effort in that it is short and to the point.

8. الـكـيـا مـا كـانـت سـرـيـعـة.

The Kia (minibus) was not going fast.

Referentially, the speaker in this utterance is using the brand of a car to refer to its driver and in

the same utterance he is also using predicational metonymy when says 'not going fast', giving the proposition 'it was driving slow'. Ultimately, the speaker uses referential and predicational metonymies resulting in propositional metonymy with the meaning 'the Kia driver was driving slow'. One may say that the function of this type of metonymy is to serve two purposes:

- Highlighting a potential expectation by the hearer as 'the Kia was going **fast**'.
- Ensuring the opposite of the potential expectation as in 'the Kia was not going **slow**'.

9. للـصـدـر ولـلـطـابـق الـسـادـس.

To Al-Saddar (hospital), the sixth floor!

Successfully, the speaker conducts propositional metonymy in that a referential and predicational metonymy are combined in the same utterance. Obviously, in the utterance 'to Al-Saddar (hospital), the sixth floor!', the speaker does not use the officially associated name with that medical establishment, Al-Saddar hospital, instead, he



only says Al-Saddar. This can be conceptually accessed via the hearer as Al-Saddar hospital employing a referential metonymy. However, it is worth of note that there are many places and institutions that are referred to by Al-Saddar, therefore, the precise meaning of the utterance can be determined by the embodiment of the predicational metonymy. As so, 'the sixth floor' is meant to predicationally signify a floor at the hospital specialized for serving fracture cases. This can be holistically judged in correspondence with the context of utterance. As a result of having the referential metonymy (Al-Saddar) combined with the predicational metonymy (the sixth floor), then, the appropriate interpretation is 'Go to the fracture floor at Al-Saddar hospital!' which is a propositional metonymy.

Accordingly, one can say that propositional metonymies function as:

- Being short and to the point.
- Emphasizing an expectation on the part of speaker/hearer.

c) Ensuring the opposite of an expectation.

3.3.4 Illocutionary Metonymy

The conceptual interpretation of any indirect speech act can lead to this type of metonymy. However, there is a relevancy in that interpretation drawing upon the speaker's intention in relation to the context of utterance.

10. تکدر تکلی شسمک؟

Can you tell me what your name is?

Explicitly, depending on the function of the modal auxiliary 'can', this utterance is seen as a question asking about the ability of the addressee to do something.

Pragmatically, this utterance is not intended to serve its direct function, and so, it is meant to be a polite request. Generally, the illocutionary metonymy in this utterance is used to convey politeness since the asker could have said what is your name?

11. بیها مجال نستخدم سکایپ؟

Is it possible to use Skype?

Structurally, the utterance is in the form of Yes/No question and is typically answered by either Yes



or No. This means that the asker is looking for an answer of confirmation. While, depending on the context of utterance, the speaker is not asking for his students' permission to use Skype or not; in fact, he is asking them to use it.

The intended meaning of the utterance is pragmatically conceived by the hearers. The use of illocutionary metonymy in this utterance is utilized for the sake of politeness as in the previous one. As far as the study has shown, one may say that illocutionary metonymies have a single function in communication which is expressing politeness.

3.3.5 Cross-Functional Metonymies

In this type of conceptual metonymy, multi-functions might be exhibited referentially, predicationally and illocutionarily. Consider the following.

12. اني اكدر اكلك انو الکیا ما
بیها صوح.

I can tell you that the Kia was not wrong.

In saying that utterance, seemingly, the speaker is employing multi-functional metonymies in

that he starts his utterance with illocutionary metonymy making use of the modal auxiliary 'can' not to indicate the possibility of telling something but to assure it, since he is telling it anyway. Besides, he is also using a referential metonymy in having the brand of a car 'the Kia' to refer to its driver. In short, the speaker indeed provides the addressee with the content contained in the complement despite using the modal hedge can.

However, the data under discussion have revealed that there is another type of metonymy that is not adopted by Panther and Thornburg (2007). This type of metonymy is termed property-metonymy by Toth (2018). It has been encountered along with the other types covered by the cross-functional metonymies. As in the utterance at hand 'the Kia was not wrong' meaning the Kia was right. And so, the final targeted meaning can possibly be viewed as 'the Kia driver was right.'

3.3.6 Property-metonymies

In this type of metonymy, measuring a property or part of

it on a scale can serve as a point of mental reference for the entire scale. As in the following examples.

13. **ما كان يشي سريع**.

He was not driving fast.

In this utterance, the targeted meaning can be metonymically reached by the conceptual interpretation of the source utterance 'was not driving fast', meaning was driving slowly. And hence, the speed in this respect can be measured within certain limits to be distinguished as fast or slow. In such a case, property-metonymies can be used to serve as having the function of attacking opposite opinions for one's favor.

14. **مبين، خوش فكرة.**

I see, such a splendid idea!

According to the context of the utterance, the speaker ironically uttered 'splendid' motivating conceptual metonymy and denoting the opposite of splendid, dull. In so doing, the hearer can access the target meaning mentally drawing on that verbal irony. Seemingly, property-metonymies can be used to function as indirect negative responses that can be conceptually

determined considering the context of the utterance.

3.3.7 Findings and Discussion

The study shows that metonymy is not limited to stylistic usage. It serves fundamental communicative, cognitive, and pragmatic functions. This finding aligns with Panther and Radden (2005), who stress the cognitive and pragmatic aspects of metonymy, and corresponds to Barcelona's assertion regarding its ubiquity in language use.

A key contribution of the study is its identification of predicational, referential, illocutionary, cross-functional, propositional, and property-based metonymies in Iraqi Arabic. Such categories expand the typologies suggested by Radden and Matthis (2002) through empirical data from a less-examined language variety. The Iraqi Arabic data confirm similar conceptual mechanisms that are employed cross-linguistically. For instance, the use of place names such as Al-Latifiya, mosque, or Karbala as metonymic triggers evokes the profound cultural and historical



connections unique to Iraq. These results align with Truszczyńska's (2003) argument that metonymy is structured by idealized cognitive models.

It has been shown that while referential metonymies primarily function to fulfill economy and emphasis, predicational metonymies convey shared historical or social knowledge efficiently. Yet, propositional metonymies show how the combination of metonymic mechanisms convey layered meaning. On the other hand, illocutionary metonymies reveal how indirectness is utilized as a strategy of politeness, indicating with the pragmatic functions proposed by Panther and Radden (2005). Unlike traditional PART-WHOLE or INSTRUMENT-AGENT patterns, property-metonymies utilize continuum-based oppositions (e.g., fast vs. slow, splendid vs. dull) to express nuanced, and ironic meanings. This advances Tóth's (2018) theory and highlights the necessity of more comprehensive typological models.

The results validate the cognitive

and pragmatic significance of metonymy (Panther & Radden, 2005; Radden & Matthis, 2002) while highlighting the utilization of its cultural embeddedness found in Iraqi Arabic.

Overall, the study affirms metonymy as a fundamental cognitive process and manifests its cross-linguistic and cultural variation.

4. Conclusion and Suggestions

This study has come up with the following remarks:

1. Conceptual metonymies are pervasive and multifunctional and that they are utilized identically in English as well as in Iraqi Arabic with reference to the types adopted in this study.
2. It has been revealed that metonymies are not only rhetorical devices; they are communication facilitators counting on mental representations and mutual shared knowledge of both speakers/hearers.
3. The context of utterance is essential in the determination of the precise meaning of conceptual metonymies.



4. It has been shown that metonymy works at multiple levels of communication. Conceptual metonymies have multi-functional purposes to convey certain meanings under certain context.

5. Ultimately, this study is a contribution to cognitive linguistics through empirical data from a less-examined variety of Arabic to address a substantial gap in the literature of metonymy.

6. It is suggested that further study might be executed with reference to (1) a contrastive study of conceptual metonymies in English and Arabic with regard to a specific genre, and (2) investigating the most dominantly used types of conceptual metonymies in English as opposed to Iraqi Arabic in formal settings and that of informal ones to find out the most used types and the different functions that they serve in each setting.

References

Abdul-Raof, H. (2006). Arabic Rhetoric: A pragmatic analysis. New York: Routledge.

Barcelona, A. (Ed.). (2003). *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*. (Selected chapters and surveys). Barcelona, A. (2011): Reviewing the properties and prototype structure of metonymy. In: Benczes, R., Barcelona A. & Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez, F. J. (eds.): *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics: Towards a Consensus View*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 7-57.

Benczes, R. (2005). Metaphor- and metonymy-based compounds in English: A cognitive-linguistic approach. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 52(2-3).

Brinton, L. J. (1996): "Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions". In: Herman Wekker (ed.). *Topics in English Linguistics*. Germany: Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 29-65.

Ding, F. (2015). Rethinking the cognitive study of metonymy.



Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5(9), 1836–1841. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0509.10>

Geeraerts, D., & Cuyckens, H. (Eds.). (2007). *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

..... (1987): *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. (1993). Reference-Point Constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4, 29-40.

Langacker, R. (1999). Grammar and Conceptualization. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Littlemore, J. (2015). *Metonymy: Hidden shortcuts in language, thought and communication*. Cambridge University Press.

Panther, K.-U., & Radden, G. (2005). Metonymy as a conceptual and pragmatic phenomenon.

Panther, K.-U., & Thornburg, L. L. (2018). Metaphor and metonymy in language and thought: A cognitive linguistic approach.

Synthesis Philosophica, 32(2), 271–294. <https://doi.org/10.21464/sp32202>

Radden, G. & Kovecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy.

Radden, G., & Matthis, C. (2002). How metonymic are metaphors?

Toth, M. (2018). *Linguistic metonymy: Implicitness and co-activation of mental content*. Peter Lang GmbH.

Truszczyńska, A. (2003). Conceptual metonymy. *Between Metaphor and Metonymy: A Cross-Linguistic Study* (2024).

Journal article (cross-linguistic empirical study). [Taylor & Francis Online](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/online)

Bibliometric analysis of metonymy research (2024/2025). *Frontiers/PMC article* (bibliometric review).



