A Grammatical Metonymic Explanation of Non-stereotypical Verb+Location Noun Construction in Chinese

Qiaoxia Wu
PhD student in Eötvös Loránd University
Budapest, Egyetem tér 1-3, 1053 Hungary
wuqiaoxia0108@foxmail.com

Abstract
The stereotypical construction verb+noun or VO (verb-object) construction presents that the action encoded by the verb is carried out on the patient exhibited by the noun. A prototypical meaning for VO construction is affectedness on the part of patient for the patient is undergoing the effect of some action, often undergoing some change in state (Saeed 2000: 140). However, in Chinese, there is a non-stereotypical verb+location noun construction which goes against the conventional semantic explanation of the VO structure. The location noun in this structure does not function as the patient of the verb from the point of view of semantics. The present paper explores the cognitive motivation of non-stereotypical construction verb+location noun. The study shows that the location noun in the construction has three distinct meanings, and its generative mechanism is attributed to three kinds of grammatical metonymy: *container for content* and *location for patient* in Vt.+location noun construction and *activity for state* in Vi.+location noun construction.

Keywords: grammatical metonymy; verb+location noun; context

1. Introduction

Verb+noun construction, in which the noun acts as the patient on which the action encoded by the verb (usually the transitive verb and intransitive verb with a preposition), is a very common syntax structure in many human languages. For example, in the sentence "I eat apples", "I" is the agent, "eat" is the action and "apples" is the "patient". But this can not explain the VO structure like "chi shitang (吃食堂, eat the canteen)", because "shi tang (食堂, canteen)" is not the patient of "eat", instead, it is the location to indicate the place where "chi (吃, eat)" happens. This construction is non-prototypical and works against the traditional grammar. Like English, based on Chinese grammar, the above saying is wrong. However, such sayings are very common and abundant in number in Chinese, such as "chi shitang (吃食堂, eat canteen)", "pei chuang (陪床, accompany bed)", "ti gutou (剔骨头, scrape bones)", "fei Shanghai (飞上海, fly Shanghai)", etc.

This non-stereotypical verb+location noun construction attracts a lot of scholars' and grammarians' attention. Pragmatically, Xing (1991) proposes the notion of anomalous patientive object. Guo (1998) regards "fan (饭, food)" in "chi fan (吃饭, eat food)" as a prescriptive object and "shi tang (食堂, canteen)" in "chi shitang (吃食堂, eat canteen)" as a non-prescriptive object. The collocation between the verb and the non-prescriptive objects cannot be semantically analogized but pragmatically expounded. In recent years, some Chinese grammarians have dealt with such a problem within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics. Wang (2000) thinks that "shitang (食堂, canteen)" is neither an object of location nor of manner, but a metonymic form of a patientive object. Ren (2000) directly points out that "chi shitang (吃食, eat canteen)" is a structure of grammatical metonymy. He believes that "chi shitang (吃食堂, eat canteen)" is grammatical because of certain cognitive factors. Once a metonymic form has come out, the semantic type of this form is to be determined by its target rather than the source. That is, as "fan (饭, food)" is patientive object, "shi tang

(食堂, canteen)" is also an object of that kind. Liu & Liu (2003) study the Vi.+noun construction with the theory of cognitive decategarization, holding that Vi.+NP construction is actually the result of decategarization of Vt.+O (patient) and Vi. He claims that Vi tends to be 'invaded' by Vt. through two processes, namely, the combination of the preposition into Vi. and metonymic extension. Besides, Vi. and O undergo a change in terms of semantic features. Therefore, "the channel" in "Susan swam the channel" not only refers to a place, but more importantly, is something that is challenging and has been overcome by Susan. Zhang (2004) believes that the anomalous objects after an autonomous verb are patientive and their patientivity is on a scale. She uses the theory of linguistic categorization to explain this scale. That is, there is a scale from strongly patientive objects to weakly patientive objects.

Based on the previous studies on non-stereotypical Verb+(location) noun construction, it is safe to say that the anomalous construction in Modern Chinese have neither classified nor explained the internal semantic meanings of the construction, therefore failing to provide a comprehensive cognitive mechanism for its generation and interpretation. The present paper explores the cognitive motivation of non-stereotypical verb+location noun construction within the framework of grammatical metonymy, aiming to provide a comprehensive cognitive mechanism for the generation and interpretation of the construction.

According to the class of verbs, the verb+location noun construction are divided into two sub-types, namely, Vt. (transitive verb)+location noun construction, for example, "rou yanjing (揉眼睛, rub eye)" and Vi. (intransitive verb)+location noun construction like "fei Shanghai (飞上海, fly Shanghai)", with the hypothesis that *container for content* metonymy and *location for patient* underlie in the former, and *activity for state* metonymy in the latter. What is worth mentioning is that social and cultural contexts play a very important role during the production and interpretation of the construction. In the following part, first, a detailed introduction of metonymy and grammatical metonymy will be given. Then, the verb+location noun construction will be explored systematically within the framework of grammatical metonymy with expressive examples. Then, cognitive principles and different contexts, which lead to the construction will be demonstrated. Finally, a conclusion will be presented to put an end to the study.

2. Metonymy and Grammatical Metonymy

As we all know, metonymy is traditionally considered as special kind of rhetorical device. Nowadays, the study of the metonymy is one of the focuses of Cognitive Linguistics, which holds that metonymy is also a reflection of people's thinking and behavior. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) think that metonymy is a kind of indirect reference, that is, to use one thing to refer to another. Later on, Lakoff (1987) proposes Ideal Cognitive Model (ICM). ICM is a reflection of the real-world structure in the brain. Croft (1993: 348) interprets metonymy as a conceptual effect of domain highlighting within one domain matrix (opposing it to metaphor as a conceptual effect of domain mapping across different domain matrices). Radden & Kövecses (1999: 21) establish the cognitive theory in combination with the ICM. They believe that "metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealized cognitive model.

With regard to grammatical metonymy, Waltereit (1999) takes the lead in the study of syntactic constraint on metonymy. Taking grammar as his research target, he proves that metonymy in some arguments, like subject and direct object, occurs easily. However, before Waltereit, Langacker (1993: 30) studies metonymy in grammar, which can be regarded as a special theory of grammatical metonymy. He holds that metonymy is our ability to make use of one conceptualized entity as a reference point to access to another entity. Panther and Thornburg (1999: 333-357, 2000: 215-231) study grammatical metonymy as part of their

speech act. Their study of grammatical metonymy concerns the metonymic concepts that give rise to grammatical phenomena in languages. Ruiz de Mendoza (2002) has a systematic and theoretical research on grammatical metonymy. He first proposes the definition of grammatical metonymy, and revises research on metonymy by other scholars. Ruiz de Mendoza & Otal (2002) develop Croft's (1993) concepts of domain matrix and highlight, and proposes domain expansion and domain reduction, as well as two kinds of mapping, namely source-in-target and target-in-source. Source-in-target is domain expansion and target-in-source is domain reduction.

Besides the Western scholars' research on grammatical metonymy, in China, Shen (1999), Yang (2008), Wu (2011, 2012) have studied grammatical metonymy from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. Shen (1999) proposes the notion of grammatical metonymy when he applies the theory of Cognitive Linguistics to the study of "de" construction in Chinese. Yang (2008: 97) defines Grammatical metonymy as metonymic conceptual structure that is used to solve the semantic conflict between formal structure and logical structure. Technically, it studies the grammatical interrelations of formal structure, conceptual structure and logical structure. Wu (2011) studies the implication, characteristics and operational model of the grammatical metonymy. Meanwhile, Wu (2012) makes a review of the research on grammatical metonymy abroad.

The studies above have covered grammatical metonymy from different perspectives, on different focuses and scope of metonymy. Nevertheless, they share and emphasize the same feature of grammatical metonymy that grammatical metonymy is conceptual metonymy which affects the grammatical structure.

3. Non-stereotypical Vt.+location noun construction
3.1. *Container for content* metonymy
In modern Chinese, the syntax structure of Vt.+location noun is very common in language use, especially in spoken language. What differs it from the conventional V+N (Verb+Noun) construction or VO structure is that the noun is not the patient of the action from the sense of semantics, instead, the noun denotes location. Generally, the construction can be further divided into two kinds based on subtle different semantic features of the location noun. The first kind is the one in which the location noun denotes the location concerning the affected entity encoded by the patient. The relation between the location noun and the patient can be considered as the modifier and the modified, with the modifier (the location noun) describing and attributing the modified (the patient), which qualifies them as an endocentric structure or attributive-center structure in terms of grammar. For instance,

(1) 揉眼睛-揉沙子（揉眼睛里的沙子）[1]
Rou yanjing-rou shazi (rou yanjing li de shazi)
Rub eye-rub sand (rub in eye "de" sand)
Rub the eye-rub the sand (rub the sand in the eye)
(2) 陪床-陪病人（陪床上的病人）
Pei chuang-pei bingren (pei chuangshang de bingren)
Accompany bed-accompany patient (accompany on bed "de" patient)
Accompany the bed-accompany the patient (accompany the patient on the bed)
(3) 剔骨头-剔肉（剔骨头上的肉）
Ti gutou-tirou(ti gutou shang de rou)
Scrape bone-scrape meat (scrape on bone "de" meat)
Scrape the bones-scrape meat(scrape meat off the bones)

---

[1] All the examples listed in the article are represented in the order: Chinese character, Chinese Pinyin, English word by word translation and standard English translation.

As observed, all the nouns in these expressions are not the patients of the verbs, but the locations where the logical patients locate. In other words, there is *container for content* metonymy underlying these linguistic forms. (1) is a target-in-source metonymy, with "yanjing (eye)" as the source domain and "shazi (the sand) as the target". If we retrieve back to its non-metonymic counterpart, the expression should be "rou yanjing li de shazi (rub the sand in the eye)". Here, instead of "rou shazi (rub the sand)", we say "rou yanjing (rub the eye)", in which the logical patient 'shazi (the sand)" is omitted, with "yanjing (the eye)", which initially, together with the preposition "in", indicates the location of "shazi (the sand)", as the object of verb "rou (rub)". (2) is another instantiation of the *container for content* metonymy, whose non-metonymic counterpart should be "pei bingren (accompany the patient)", while "chuang (bed)" denotes the location of the patient. Again, the location noun "chuang (bed)" is promoted to the position of the patient "bingren (the patient)". The high metonymy *container for content* also works in (3) "ti gutou (scrape the bones)". When saying "ti gutou (scrape the bones)", triggered by the vehicle "gutou (the bones)", the hearer will automatically resort to the matrix domain of scraping the meat off the bones with a knife. The direct patient that the action of scraping is carried on is meat, rather than the bones, which are the location or container where meat locates. Therefore, they are conceptually contiguous, which allows the stand-for relation.

3.2. *Location for Patient* metonymy
Besides the Vt.+location noun construction motivated by *container for content* metonymy, the other type is the one in which the location noun donates the location where the action takes place (rather than the location with which the patient is concerned as in the previous case). The location is defined based on the semantic relation between the action and the patient, with the location noun playing a semantic role in the whole ICM of the event encoded by the verb. In specific, the event structure should include agent, action, patient, location and other semantic roles. Therefore, the relationship between the location noun and the patient can be considered as preposition-object phrase from the grammar's point of view, which, in Chinese is realized by prepositions of "wang (to)" or "chao (towards)", "zai...shang (on)", "zai...li (in)", etc. Therefore, when the location noun, which indicates the place where the action takes place, occupies the position of the patient of the action, the *location for patient* metonymy is realized. In other words, it is the *location for patient* metonymy that motivates the construction. For instance,
(4) 写信封-写地址（在信封上写地址）
Xie xinfeng-xie dizhi (zai xinfeng shang xie dizhi)
Write envelope-write address (write on envelope address)
Write the envelope-write the address (write the address on the envelope)
(5) 碰墙-碰头（在墙上碰了头）
Peng qiang-peng tou (zai qiangshang peng le tou)
Bump wall-bump head (on the wall bump head)
Bump the wall-bump head (bump one's head against the wall)
(6)接站-接人 (在车站接人）
Jiezhan-jieren (zai chezhan jieren)
Pick up station-pick up person (at station pick up person)
Pick up the station-pick up the person (pick up the person at the station)
In (4), "xin feng (the envelope)" is a ready object, and one can not write an envelope. Instead, in a post office, when one is asked to write the envelope, he is supposed to write on the envelope the address to which the letter is expected to send. Therefore, it is obvious that in "xie xinfeng (write the envelope)", "xinfeng (the envelope)" stands for the address on the envelope, with the location noun "xinfeng (the envelope)" denoted as the location where the

action of writing the address is carried out. Thanks to the sharing of the whole ICM of writing address on an envelope in a post office, it requires little effort for the participants to conceptualize the *location for patient* metonymy. In (5), "peng qiang (bump the wall)" actually violates the logic structure (see Yang Henghu), which should be one's head that is bumped against the wall. However, the semantic conflict between the formal and the logic structure of "zhuang qiang (bump the wall)" can only be cleared by thinking that there is grammatical metonymy *location for patient* underlying the saying. To be more specific, the verb "bump" functions as a trigger that evokes the ICM of one's bumping his head against the wall. Therefore, "zhuang qiang (bump the wall)" here stands for "zhuang tou (bump one's head)", while "qiang (the wall)" originally plays the role of the location where the action of one's head being bumped takes place. Being part of the domain matrix of action qualifies it to stand for the logic patient and occupy its position as well. (6) is also another instantiation of the *location for patient* metonymy. "Jie zhan (pick up the station) goes disagreeable with the logic structure from the point of view of semantics since one can never pick up the station under any kind of circumstances. However, the construction can be understood by the participants of the conversation if it happens in daily life, with little or even no effort on the part of them since they share the ICM of picking up people at the station which is activated by the location noun of the event, "zhan (the station)", at the time when the conversation happens. "Zhan (the station)", originally plays the semantic role of location of the action of picking up a person, stands for the person who is at the station to be picked up, thus it is promoted to the position of the logic patient. Therefore, the semantic conflict disappears.

3.3 Ambiguous cases
There are cases which exemplify the construction but can be considered to be motivated by both *container for content* metonymy and *location for patient* metonymy. When the location noun is related to the affected entity, the logic patient, the relation between the location noun and the patient can be considered as the modifier and the modified. In the latter, the location noun refers to the location where the action takes place. The location noun plays a semantic role in the whole ICM of the event denoted by the verb. The relationship between the location noun and the patient can be considered as preposition-object phrase from the grammar's point of view. For instance,

(7) 吃食堂-吃饭（吃食堂的饭；在食堂吃饭）
Chi shitang-chifan (zai shitang chifan; zai shitang chifan)
Eat canteen-eat food (eat canteen "de" food; in canteen eat food)
Eat canteen-eat food (eat the canteen's food; eat food in the canteen)
First and foremost, it is obvious that "shitang (the canteen)" metonymicly stands for food. However, further question will arise when we want to define the function of the location noun, "shitang (the canteen)". We can either say that one eat the canteen's food compared with eat homemade food or any other kinds of food. However, we can also say one eats in the canteen rather than at home or at any other place. Therefore, it is safe to say that the metonymy that motivates the saying is both of *container for content* metonymy and *location for patient* metonymy. I think the only way to tell them is to take the pragmatic context into consideration. There are more examples like "chi shitang (eat the canteen)" in Chinese, such as

(8) 教大学-教课（教大学的课；在大学教课）
Jiao daxue-jiaoke (jiao daxue de ke; zai daxue jiaoke)
Teach university-teach lesson (teach university "de" lesson; in university teach lesson)
Teach university-teach lessons (teach university students' lessons; teach lessons in university)

(9) 喷果园-喷果树（喷果园的果树；在果园喷果树）
Pen guoyuan-pen guoshu (pen guoyuan de guoshu ; zai guoyuan pen pen guoshu)

Water orchard-water fruit tree (water orchard "de" fruit tree; water in the orchard fruit tree)
Water the orchard-water the fruit trees (water the orchard's fruit trees; water the fruit trees in the orchard)

4.Non-stereotypical Vi.+location noun construction
In Chinese, a lot of intransitive motion verbs can be followed by location nouns motivated by the *action for state* metonymy. Action is state of affairs that are dynamic and controlled and state denotes a stable and continuous state. Concerning Vi.+location noun, I think the location noun functions as an adverbial adjunct if we resort to its non-metonymic counterpart. However, what Chinese differs from English in this construction is that the order of the predicate and the adverbial conjunct is the opposite. For instance,
(10) 走人行道-在人行道上走
Zou renxingdao-zai renxingdao shang
Walk pavement-on pavement walk
Walk pavement-walk on the pavement
In (10), "zou (walk)" is an intransitive verb that should not have logic patient or object. Nevertheless, in "zou renxingdao (walk the pavement)", "zou (walk)" is changed into a transitive verb because of the metonymic cognitive construction of "renxingdao (the pavement)", which, in case of its non-metonymic counterpart, realizes the syntax role of adverbial conjunct to indicate the place where the action of walking takes place or the state of walking exists. Since "renxingdao (the pavement)" takes the semantic role as the adverbial of place in the ICM of waking on the pavement, it can, together with "zou (walk)", stands for waking on the pavement. Why does the speaker bother saying "zou renxingdao (walking the pavement)" instead of its non-metonymic counterpart, "zai renxingdao shang zou (walking on the pavement)"? In other words, what motivates the *action for state* metonymy? The metonymy is established between a matrix domain and its sub-domain, which is, in specific, the target-in-source metonymy (Ruiz de Mendoza 2000). Pérez Hernández (2013: 36) points out that a target-in-source mapping in which the matrix domain serves as a reference point for one of its subdomains. The conceptual fabric of each of the matrix domains includes a rich amount of information. She proves her argument by analyzing the brand like Amancio, the grandfather who founded the winery conveys a sense of "tradition" and "knowledge passed on from generation to generation". Nevertheless, the fact that he was also a modern entrepreneur for his time contributes notion of "innovation" and "quality", therefore showing the wine as an intimate, personal wine, which respects tradition without rejecting innovation. So she claims that branding a wine by naming a wider conceptual domain has obvious advantages in terms of the distinctiveness of the resulting brand and also of its inheritance of a wealth of connotations derived from the semantic fabric of the matrix domain. I argue that the same cognitive and pragmatic mechanism also work in the current case of "zou renxingdao (walk the pavement)" standing for "zai renxingdao shang zou (walk on the pavement)" because the former expression produces more   communicative effects. The matrix domain of "zou renxingdao (walk the pavement)" not only includes the sub-domain of the state of walking on the side pavement, but also explicitly conveys the message that the pavement is safer and the action is regulated by transport law and is morally praised. On the contrary, "zai renxingdao shang zou (on the pavement walk)", which only presents the state of walking with no more denotations. As far as I am concerned, this can account for many of sayings structured by non-stereotypical Vi.+location nouns, such as
(11) 飞上海-往上海飞
Fei Shanghai-wang Shanghai fei
Fly Shanghai-to Shanghai fly
Fly Shanghai-fly to Shanghai

(12) 睡地板-在地板上睡
Shui diban-zai diban shang shui
Sleep floor-on the floor sleep
Sleep floor-sleep on the floor
(13)逛公园-在公园逛
Guang gongyuan-zai gongyuan guang
Stroll park-in park stroll
Stroll the park-stroll in the park
(14)晒太阳-在太阳下晒
 Shai taiyang-zai taiyang xia shai
Stay sun-in sun stay
Stay sun-stay in the sun

In (11), "fei Shanghai (fly Shanghai)" seems to indicate that one is busy in his career and the thing he is dealing with is emergent apart from expressing the fact that he is flying to Shanghai. In (12), "shui diban (sleep the floor)", compared with "zai diban shang shui" (sleep on the floor) indicates that the person has no choice but to sleep on the floor because of some special situations. Usually, such sayings appear in spoken conversation, so the context under which the conversation happens should be taken into consideration. In (13), compared with the non-metonymic counterpart, "zai gongyuan guang (stroll in the park)", the metonymy-motivated saying, "guang gongyuan (stroll the park)" also conveys the information that the person involved in the action is enjoying himself on a good day with sunshine and has nothing to worry about. While "zai gongyuan guang (walking in the park)" only tells the place where he is strolling. The same communicative effects are also conveyed in the case of (14), in which the metonymy-motivated sayings, apart from presenting the state of one's actions, imply his joy, happiness and freedom from worries or other kinds of trivia going on in his life.

5. Cognitive principles and context for the V.+location noun construction
5.1. Cognitive salience
Langacker (1993) pointed out that metonymy is the ability of a human conceptual entity as the alleged point to refer to another entity. In the first case *container for content* metonymy, the location noun acts as the reference point and provides mental access to the target entity, the patient, related to the location. Different nouns can follow the same verb to describe a situation, leading to the phenomena that a verb goes with different nouns. For example, in (4), "peichuang (accompany the bed)" and "pei bingren (accompany the patient)", the verb "pei (accompany)" can go with "chuang (bed)" and "bingren (patient)" and the "chuang (bed)" activates "bingren (patient)" in the bed. The conceptual structure of "chuang (bed)" includes many profiles or conceptual aspects, such as accompanying the patient, feeding him, washing his body or rubbing his body, etc.. When the valence of the verb does not agree with the semantic requirement of the verb, semantic conflict arises and the location noun will require metonymic interpretation. Furthermore, the source (the location noun) has to be salient enough in the action ICM to be the reference point and be able to provide mental access to the target (the patient). For instance, in the case of "rou yanjing (rub the eye)" for "rou shazi (rub the sand)", "yanjing (the eye)" is more salient than the target, "shazi (the sand)", therefore, can be the reference point to the access to the target. In (5), within the ICM of writing, "xinfeng (the envelope)" functions as the semantic role of location, "dizhi (the address)" is the patient. However, under a certain circumstance, "xinfeng (the envelope)" is more salient and by it, the target concept "dizhi (the address)" is activated, demonstrating the realization of the *location for patient* metonymy, also showing the metonymic relation between semantic roles.

5.2. Semantic role and semantic correlation

Langacker (1991) points out that semantic roles are conceptual structures rooted in people's daily experience. An action ICM includes many participants and scenes that play different semantic roles. What is more important is that there is conceptual contiguity between every semantic role, leading to the activation of one concept from another.

Theoretically, all the nouns denoting location role in a general action ICM can be the object as location noun does, for instance, based on what have been discussed in "chi shitang (eat the canteen)" for "chifan (eat food)" in the canteen, one may ask how productive the construction is and if it is possible to say "chi jiali (eat home)", chi "qinshi (eat in the dorm)", ect. instead of "chifan (eat food)" at home or in the dorm, which are the same as "chi shitang (eat the canteen)" for "chifan (eat food) in the canteen". The answer is no. Because there is no close and conventional correlation in terms of semantic meaning between the verb and the location nouns. "Shitang (the canteen)" is the place where food is sold. Speaking of "chi shitang (eat the canteen)", people will automatically think of "chi shitang li de fan" (eat the canteen's food), "chi (eat)" and "shitang (the canteen)" have the close correlation as far as semantic meaning is considered. However, "chi (eat)" and "jiali (home)" or "qinshi (the dorm)" do not closely connected in terms of semantic meaning because once "jiali (home)" or "qinshi (the dorm)" is mentioned, one can think of them as the place for eating, sleeping, spending time with families or roommates, studying, etc.. In a word, when the locations are mentioned, providing food is not the most salient semantic feature of them and without specific context, providing food and such places are not likely to be connected. Therefore, the location noun can occupy the object position only if its semantic meaning is closely and highly correlated to the one of the verbs, in which case the location noun can work as a reference point and can provide mental access to the target (the patient), leading to the metonymy conceptualization.

5.3. Social and cultural context

Ren (2000: 66) points out that social and cultural contexts should be taken into consideration when judging whether a sentence is accepted as well as its degree of acceptability. People often say, from the perspective of grammatical metonymy, "chi shitang(eat the canteen)", not "chi jiudian (eat the hotel)", because "shitang (the canteen)" is highly and conventionally correlated to the verb, "chi (eat)" in terms of semantic meaning, while "jiudian (hotel)" does not share the close semantic mental access to the target, "fan (food)". However, with the development of the economy and society, eating and entertaining in "jiudian (hotel)" are becoming more and more common and gradually have become one part of people's life, for example, those businessmen who often go for business around the world live and eat in hotels, and also some couples or families often spend holidays in hotels. As a result, the sayings of "chi jiudian (eat the hotel)" is gradually accepted by people and conventionalized both conceptually and linguistically since a regular semantic correlation has been built between "jiudian (the hotel)" and "jiudian li de fan (the hotel's food)", therefore, "jiudian (the hotel)", the location, is salient enough in people's cognition to function as a reference point to provide mental access to the target, the hotel's food.

Cultural context also plays a role in the case of Vi.+location nouns and the denotations of such construction can only be understood within a special community or the group of people who speaks the language. For instance, "fei Shanghai (fly Shanghai)" denotes a busy working state compared with "wang Shanghai fei (fly to Shanghai)" which only describes a state of flying. "Guang gongyuan (stroll the park)" conveys the message that one is enjoying a good time, happiness and freedom, which cannot be indicated by its non-

metonymic counterpart, "zai gongyuan guang (stroll in the park)". It is possible that the denoted meaning of the above sayings may not be gotten by non-native speakers of Chinese.

6. Conclusion

The paper analyzes the V.+location noun construction in terms of its cognitive mechanism from the perspective of grammatical metonymy. It is found out that Vt.+location noun construction is motivated either by *container for content* metonymy or *location for patient* metonymy or both. In the former, the metonymy realization pattern is that the patient connected to the location noun undergoes metonymy and takes the position of the logic patient of the verb. In the latter, the semantic role of the location noun as location in its non-metonymic counterpart undergoes metonymy and occupies the position of the logic patient, which is also the affected entity of the action ICM.

Besides, it is also found out that there are two cognitive principles for the metonymic conceptualization of the construction. On the one hand, the location noun should be salient enough in the whole ICM; on the other hand, the location noun and the verb should share close, high and conventional correlation in terms of semantic meanings. Only by following the two cognitive principles, can the location noun be able to act as a reference point and provide mental access to the target, the logic patient of the verb, leading to the realization of the metonymy. In addition, social and cultural context also plays a very important role of the construction, which perfectly shows the dynamic and creative nature of language.

With regard to Vi.+location noun construction, the pattern of *action for state* metonymy is realized through promoting the location noun which originally functions as adverbial adjunct to the object position of the verb, leading to its semantic role as patient or affected entity of the verb superficially, but it is important to notice that it is the extra colorful communicative effects achieved by the construction that qualifies and justifies the promotion of the location noun to the patient of the verb. To understand these sayings structured under the Vi.+location noun construction, the culture has to be taken into consideration. As far as I am concerned, it could be difficult for western people to sense the subtle differences between "guang gongyuan (stroll the park)" and "zai gongyuan guang (stroll in the park)".

In conclusion, the present study is just an attempt to analyze the sayings structured by V.+location noun construction and the data are not abundant enough to make a corpus-based one. Future research may wish to carry out a quantitative study on the topic. Besides, future study may also wish to investigate the topic in other languages and make a comparative study.

References

Barcelona, A. 2002. Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: An update [A]. In: René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast [C], 207-278. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Guo, J.F. 1998. On Features of the Classification of VO Semantic Relations (郭继懋,《谈动宾语义关系分类的性质》). Acta Scientiarum Naturalium Universitatis Nakaiensis (《南开大学学报》) (6).

Langacker, R. W. 1987. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol I: Theorectical Prerequisites [M]. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R.W. 1993. Reference-point constructions [J].Cognitive Linguistics 4:1-38.

Lakoff, J. & M. Johnson. 1980. Metaphors We Live by [M]. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Liu, Z.G & Liu, R.Q. 2003. Non-categorized Explanation of Vi+NP Construction (刘正光 & 刘润清.《Vi +NP 的非范畴化解释》). Foreign Language Teaching and Research. (《外语教学与研究》), (1).

Pérez Hernández, L. 2013. A Pragmatic-Cognitive Approach to Brand Names: A Case Study of Rioja Wine Brands. *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* 61/1: 33–46.

Radden, G. & Kövecses, Z. 1999. Towards a Theory of Metonymy [A]. Panther, K. & Radden, G. (eds.). Metonymy in Language and Thought [C]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Saeed, J.I. 2000. Semantics [M]. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Panther, K. and Radden, G. (eds.). 1999. Metonymy in Language and Thought [C]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Panther, K. & Thornburg. L. 2000. The *effect for cause* metonymy in English Grammar [A]. In: Antonio Barcelona (ed.). Metaphor and Metonymy at the Creossroads – A Cognitive Perspective[C], 215-232. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ren, Y. 2000. "Chi Shi Tang" (Eat at the Dining-room)and Grammatical transfer of metaphor (任鹰,《"吃食堂"与语法转喻》). Journal of Graduate School of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (《中国社会科学院研究生院学报》) (3).

Ruiz de Mendoza, I.F.J. & Otal, J.L. 2002. Metonymy, Grammar and Communication [M]. Granda:Comares.Colección Estuduis de Lengua Inglesa.

Shen, J.X. 1999. A Metonymic Model of Transferred Designation of "de"-Construction in Mandarin Chinese (沈家煊,《汉语普通话中"的"结构的转喻转指模式》). Contemporary Linguistics (1).

Wang, Z.H. 2000. A Cognitive Study of "Chi Shi Tang" (王占华,《"吃食堂"的认知考察》). Language Teaching and Linguistic Studies (《语言教学与研究》) (2).

Waltereit, R. 1999. Grammatical Constraints on Metonymy [A]. Klaus-Uwe Panther & G. Radden (eds.). Metonymy in Language and Thought [C]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Wu, S.Q. 2011. Grammatical Metonymy：Its Implication, Characteristics and Operational Model (吴淑琼,《语法转喻的含义、特征和运作模式》), Foreign Language and Literature (《外国语文》), 27 (6).

Wu, S.Q. 2012. A Review of the Research on Grammatical Metonymy abroad (吴淑琼,《国外语法转喻研究述评外语研究》). Foreign Language Research (《外国语文》), 27 (6).

Xing, F.Y. 1991. A Study on the Phenomenon of Object-Substitution in Chinese (邢福义,《汉语里宾语代入现象之考察》). Chinese Teaching in the World (《世界汉语教学), (2).

Xu, S.H. 2003. A Study on Stereotypical relation and construction (徐盛桓,《常规关系与句式结构研究》). Foreign languages (《外国语》), (2).

Yang, C.H. 2008. A Cognitive Study of Metonymy in Grammar (杨成虎,《语法转喻的认知研究》). PhD dissertation, Beijing Normal University.

Zhang, Y.Q. 2004. A Study on Modern Chinese Patient Object Clauses (张云秋,《现代汉语受事宾语句研究》) [M]. Shanghai: Xue Ling Press.