Sign Languages and Linguistics Convergence Research
Vol. 1. No. 1 (2024) pp.087~121

Metonymy in Korean Copular Constructions

Park, Chongwon
(University of Minnesota Duluth)

Park, Chongwon. 2024. Metonymy in Korean Copular Constructions. ***Sign Languages and Linguistics Convergence Research****, 1*(1), 87-121. This article develops an analysis of the Korean copular construction from a Cognitive Grammar perspective with emphasis on the metonymic type copula. By pointing out that metonymy does not occur untethered, I draw attention to the importance of defining metonymy in a verifiable way. I attempt to identify the locus of metonymy based on the definitive properties laid out in Panther & Thornburg (2007) [Panther, Klaus-Uwe & Linda L. Thornburg. 2007. Metonymy. In Dirk Geeraerts & Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp.236–263)]. I then argue that information structure plays a vital role in the rise of the metonymic meaning; given information tends to induce metonymy more easily than new information because of its relative conceptual salience. It is demonstrated that the metonymic link between the source and the target content is strengthened when the source gives rise to given information, thereby narrowing the conceptual distance between the two content. This narrowed conceptual distance makes the target more accessible from the source; therefore, the locus of metonymy tends to be associated with given information. After illustrating some variations of the metonymic copular construction, I extend my discussion to the specificational pseudo-cleft construction, where the topical subject nominal also tends to undergo a metonymic shift.

Key words: Conceptual Saliency, Copular Sonstruction, Information Structure, Metonymy, Pseudo-cleft Construction

1. Introduction

This article is a modest attempt to develop an analysis of the Korean copular construction from a Cognitive Grammar (CG) perspective. The copula,-ita, is the 8th most frequently used verb in the written genres, and its frequency is ranked 3rd in spoken Korean (Yu & Nam, 2016). Thus, it is not surprising that we find ample research on this verb from various theoretical perspectives. Influenced by the research on the English copula (Higgins 1979, Partee 1987, Heycock & Kroch 2002, among others), scholars have attempted to account for this construction within various formal syntactic and semantic frameworks. Representative research of these approaches includes but is not limited to Choi (2011), Jhang (1995), Kim (2016), Kim & Sells (2007), Sohn (2004), and Yoon (2008), among others. This type of research aims to tease out the formal properties of the construction, and these scholars generally categorize the Korean copula into three types, as illustrated in (1).[1]

(1) a. Equative
Chelswu-ka Tongswu-i-ta!
C-Nom T-Cop-Dcl
'Chelswu is Tongswu!'

b. Predicational
Chelswu-ka haksayng-i-ta.
C-Nomstudent-Cop-Dcl
'Chelswu is a student.'

c. Specificational
ku chayk-uy ceca-nun Chelswu-i-ta.
that book-Gen author-TopC-Cop-Dcl
'The author of that book is Chelswu.'

[1] The abbreviations used in this article are as follows Acc: Accusative; Adn: Adnominalizer; Comp: Complementizer; Conj: Conjunction; Conn: Connective; Cop: Copula; Dcl: Declarative; End: Sentence Ender; DP: Discontinued Past; Gen: Genitive; Hon: Honorific; KES: the schematic nominal kes; Neg: Negation; Nom: Nominative; Pol: Polite; Prs: Present; Pst: Past; Q: Question; Top: Topic.

The other group of researchers, who work within the Kwukehak tradition, tend to provide a finer-grained categorization. For example, Nam's (2004) corpus-based study identifies at least six types of copular constructions, as shown in (2).

(2) a. sayspyel-i kumseng-i-ta.
morning.star-Nom Venus-Cop-Dcl
'The morning star is Venus.'

b. Yengho-ka simphan-i-ta.
Y-Nom umpire-Cop-Dcl
'Yengho is an umpire.'

c. Chelswu-nun sachwunki-i-ta.
C-Top adolescent.period-Cop-Dcl
Lit: 'Chelswu is the adolescent period.'
Intended: 'Chelswu is going through the adolescent period.'

d. kongsa-ka acik kkuthna-ci anh-un moyang-i-ta.
construction-Nom yet finish-Conn Neg-Adn shape(seem)-Cop-Dcl
Lit: 'The construction is the shape of unfinished.'
Intended: 'The construction does not seem over yet.'

f. na-n khephi-i-ta.
I-Top coffee-Cop-Dcl
'I am coffee.'

g. wuli-ka cheum manna-n kes-un Busan-eyse-i-ess-ta
we-Nom first meet-Adn KES-Adn Busan-in-Cop-Pst-Dcl
Lit: 'What we met first was in Busan.'
Intended: 'It was in Busan that we met first.'

While Kwukehak scholars provide robust observations of the data, they tend to pay relatively little attention to the relevance of their observations/analyses to

contemporary linguistic theories.[2] Interestingly, examples like (3) haven't drawn much attention from either group. For this reason, I consider Choi (2017) and Kim (2015) rare exceptions. Kim (2015) analyzes the copula with emphasis on the type given in (3a), adopting the notion of meaning transfer proposed by Nunberg (1978, 1979, 1993, 1995, 2002). Working within a cognitive linguistic framework, Choi (2017) argues that metonymy plays a central role in the interpretation of copular sentences.

(3) a. na-nun haympeke-i-ta.
I-Top hamburger-Cop-Dcl
'As for me, I am a hamburger.'
b. nay-ka haympeke-i-ta.
I-Nom hamburger-Cop-Dcl
'I am a hamburger.'
c. appa-nun tto ku soli-i-ya?
dad-Top again that sound-Cop-Q
Literal: 'Is Dad that sound again?'
Intended: 'Is Dad repeating the same story again?'
(Choi, 2017, p.87)

I aim to refine Choi's (2017) proposal in this article. While Choi is on the right track in adopting the notion of metonymy for the analysis of the Korean copula, his analysis is overextended to encompass non-metonymic copular constructions. For example, Choi suggests that (1b) is metonymic in that Chelswu undergoes a metonymic shift from Chelswu (person) to his identity/occupation. Unlike Choi (2017), I demonstrate that examples like (1b) are not metonymic.

This article focuses on metonymic copular constructions presented in (3). The key nature of my proposal is as follows: First, I demonstrate that given information is more susceptible to metonymic interpretation. For example, (3a) is

[2] Representative research conducted in the Kwukehak tradition includes Yang (2001), Kim (2002), Im (2006), Nam (2004), Lim (2005), Seo & Jeong (2018), Kim (2019), among many others.

the most natural response to a question like (4).

(4) ne-nun mwues-ul cwumwun-ha-yss-e?
you-Top what-Acc order-do-Pst-Q
'What did you order?'

In (3a), na 'I' exhibits a high degree of topicality; the sentence is about na. Under context (4), 'I ordered something' becomes given information. Though the conceptual link between 'a person' and 'something the person ordered at a restaurant' is usually weak, it is strengthened because the target concept becomes readily accessible from the source in (3a). The conceptual distance between the source and the target is narrowed owing to the saliency of the source and the explicit mention of the target in the context.

Second, I argue that the pseudo-cleft construction, as in (5), is metonymic. In (5), the first NP undergoes a metonymic shift from action to place. A curious fact is that a locative expression is permitted in the NP2 position in (5). I demonstrate that this is an expected outcome of the property type of the copular construction, which needs to be distinguished from (1).

(5) nay-ka Chelswu-lul manna-n kes-un Seoul-eyse-i-ess-ta.
I-Nom C-Acc meet-Adn KES-Adn Seoul-in-Cop-Pst-Dcl
Intended: 'The place I met Chelswu was in Seoul.'

The organization of this article is as follows: In section two, I summarize terms related to metonymy and provide the definition of metonymy I subscribe to. Section 3 discusses that metonymy does not occur untethered; it has various constraints. In Section 4, I demonstrate that one such constraint is information structure. That is, given information is more susceptible to the metonymic shift than new information, owing to its conceptual salience. Section 5 analyzes the pseudo-cleft construction with emphasis on the specificational type. Section 6 summarizes this article by discussing some implications and limitations of my

research.

2. Meaning transfer, metonymy, zone activation, and reference point

Scholars use the term metonymy differently, and we need to define it clearly to avoid confusion. Researchers like Lee (2023) differentiate metonymy from meaning/reference transfer. Adopting Nunberg's (1979) terminology, Lee states that examples in (6) illustrate metonymy, while those in (7) depict cases of meaning shift. In (6), no referential shift is observed, as evidenced by the acceptability of anaphora and copredication, shown in (6a) and (6b), respectively. The nominal, the pot, may refer to the pot's contents or the pot itself.

(6) a. The pot is boiling. It is made of metal.
b. The pot, which is boiling, is made of metal.
(Lee, 2023, p.177)

(7) contrasts with (6) in that the ham sandwich only refers to a person.

(7) a. The ham sandwich left in a hurry. * It was too salty.
b. * The ham sandwich, who left in a hurry, was too salty.
c. The ham sandwich left in a hurry. He left no tip.
(Lee, 2023, p.177)

Other scholars, like Zhang (2020), identify the pot in (6) as a typical example of metonymy, opposing Langacker's (1999, 2009) treatment of it as a zone activation phenomenon. While some linguists treat examples like (6) as a different phenomenon from a typical metonymy, most Cognitively-oriented researchers view the ham sandwich in (7) as a metonymy. Most metonymy scholars also agree that typical metonymies induce a shift in reference, though grammatical[3] (non-referential) metonymies have been identified in the literature.[4]

What is metonymy, then? A widely accepted definition of metonymy is from

Radden and Kövecses (1999, p.21): "Metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, target, within the same cognitive model." Panther & Thornburg (2007, p.242) elaborate on the definition and propose that an adequate definition of conceptual metonymy should contain at least the following components.

(8) a. Conceptual metonymy is a cognitive process where source content provides access to target content within one cognitive domain.
b. The relation between source content and target content is contingent (conceptually non-necessary), i.e., in principle defeasible.
c. The target content is foregrounded, and the source content is backgrounded.
d. The strength of the metonymic link between source and target content may vary depending, among other things, on the conceptual distance between source and target and the salience of the metonymic source.

Following Panther & Thornburg (2007), I also adopt (8a–d) as defining characteristics of metonymy. In (8a), 'domain' refers to "a semantic structure that functions as the base for at least one concept profile.[5]" This definition is proposed by Croft (1993, p.339) based on Langacker's (1987) explicit treatment

[3] Scholars use non-referential metonymy and grammatical metonymy interchangeably. However, I avoid the term referential because I reserve the term referential to refer to a nominal's referentiality in a copula sentence.

[4] Radden & Kövecses (1999) and Ruiz de Mendoza & Pérez (2001) treat examples like She is (just) a pretty face as grammatical metonymy, which involves a predicative use of (nominal) metonymy. Sweep (2009) criticizes this view by arguing that the example above is idiomatic and can be interpreted as referential metonymy. Panther & Thornburg (2007) classify metonymies into four types based on pragmatic functions: (1) referential metonymy, (2) predicational metonymy, (3) propositional metonymy, and (4) illocutionary metonymy. Discussing the properties of these metonymies is beyond the scope of this article. It just needs to be stressed that a referential shift is not required for metonymy.

[5] Profiling means designating a conceptualization by means of a linguistic expression. A profiled relationship refers to a linguistically encoded relationship between two or more participants in a given scene

of the until-then implicitly understood notion. For example, an arc presupposes the concept of a circle for its definition. Here, a circle serves as the base (or the background) against which we understand what arc is; then, a circle is a domain. Note that many concepts presuppose several different domains. The combination of domains simultaneously presupposed by a concept is called a domain matrix. According to Croft's (1993) analysis, metonymy involves mapping within a domain matrix, dubbed "domain highlighting." By defining metonymy in terms of the highlighting, a referential shift is no longer a definitional property of metonymy.[6]

Defeasibility in (8b) means that metonymic links do not exist by necessity (Panther & Thornburg, 2003). For example, in a restaurant context where one server says to another, *The hamburger at table 6 is irritating,* the link between *the hamburger at table 6* and *the customer who is eating (or ordering) a hamburger* is contingent; it is not conceptually necessary that the hamburger is consumed by the customer.

Foregrounding and backgrounding addressed in (8c) can be explained with the example *Mary built a new garage last year* (Panther & Thornburg, 2007, p.242). While *Mary did not build the garage herself, Mary* is not a good example of metonymy because the utterance is about *Mary*; therefore, *Mary* is foregrounded, not her workmen. Since *Mary* is foregrounded, (9a), where Mary is referred to by the pronoun *she*, is felicitous. By contrast, (9b) is awkward because *they* refers to the backgrounded entity—Mary's workmen.

(9) a. Mary built a new garage last year, and this year she went on a long vacation.
b. # Mary built a new garage last year, and then they (the workmen) did some work on the house.
(Panther & Thornburg, 2007, p.242)

(8d) is to explain why *redhead* is more likely to designate a person than

[6] Though Croft's treatment of metonymy is based on Langacker (1993), Langacker considers shifting reference a crucial element in the definition of metonymy. According to Langacker (1993, p.30), metonymy induces "changes in reference."

toenail. According to Panther & Thornburg (2007, p.242), it is because *redhead* is more salient and conceptually closer to the concept person than *toenail*.

Earlier, I briefly mentioned zone activation, which is distinct from metonymy. A well-known example of zone activation is given in (10). In (10), we observe a profile/active-zone discrepancy because the profiled portion of *your dog* is actually *your dog's teeth.* Instead of *your dog's teeth*, however, *your dog* (active zone) plays the trajector role in the relationship, leading to a discrepancy between the two; *your dog's teeth* is cognitively activated by virtue of linguistic context.[7]

(10) Your dog bit my cat.
(Langacker, 1984, p.177)

Geeraerts and Peirsman (2011) argue that zone activation is a completely different phenomenon than metonymy based on the observation that there is a lack of necessity of the reference shift in zone activation, while this is required for typical metonymy, such as (11). Additionally, in zone activation, the profiled portion and its active zone may not be interchangeable in a certain grammatical context, while a metonymically shifted expression is almost always interchangeable with its original expression. As shown in (12), the profiled thing, *your dog's teeth*, is incompatible with the verb bite, because it requires a volitional subject. The predicate *bit the cat* is only compatible with the active zone, your dog. By contrast, (11) and (13) show that both *the red shirts* and *the players wearing the red shirts* are compatible with the same predicate.

(11) The red shirts won the match.
(Geeraerts & Peirsman, 2011, p.94)

(12) * Your dog's teeth bit my cat.
(Barcelona, 2011, p.32)

[7] Trajector refers to a primary participant in a profiled relationship, which is usually being located, evaluated, or otherwise described (Langacker, 2008, p.113).

(13) The players wearing the red shirts won the match.

Another related phenomenon to metonymy is reference point. Human beings have the basic cognitive ability to invoke the conception of one entity in order to make mental contact with another. The readily accessible entity with which the conceptualizer makes initial contact is called a reference point, and the less accessible one contacted via the reference point is called a target. The notion of reference point relationship can be utilized either syntagmatically or paradigmatically. The possessives shown in (14a) illustrate a grammatical (syntagmatic) reference point relationship, where the possessor functions as a reference point, and the possessed as its target. A reference point relationship is also observed in the paradigmatic plane, as illustrated in (14b), where the authors serve as a reference point with respect to the target—the product of the authors.[8]

(14) a. the student's glasses, John's cousin, etc.
b. John bought Lakoff and Johnson at a used bookstore.

Langacker (1993, p.30) states that "various kinds of factors can make an entity sufficiently salient to serve as a metonymic reference point." He proposes the general cognitive principles of relative salience, as in (15).

(15) (Other things being equal) human > non-human, whole > part, concrete > abstract, visible > non-visible, etc.
(Langacker, 1993, p.30)

Armed with these definitions, I demonstrate that examples in (3) and (5) involve a paradigmatic reference point relationship. In addition to the cognitive principles provided in (15), I propose that given information exhibits a higher

[8] Most research on metonymy has been conducted within the cognitive linguistics enterprise. However, a CG approach to metonymy is rare. By incorporating the notions discussed here, such as reference point and active zone, Broccias (2022) analyzes metonymy. Ultimately, he argues that a CG approach may resolve some of the potentially problematic issues visible in recent cognitive research on metonymy.

degree of saliency than new information; therefore, it tends to serve as a metonymic reference point more easily.

3. Where does metonymy stop?

Im (2006, p.317) posits an invisible subject for the predicational copula type in dealing with Korean copular constructions, shown in (16).[9] The "underlying" sentences for (16a–b) are provided in (17).

(16) a. Yengswu-ka haksayng-i-ta.
Y-Nom student-Cop-Dcl
'Yengswu is a student.'
b. ku-ka Chelswu-i-ta.
he-Nom C-Cop-Dcl
'He is Chelswu.'

(17) a. Yengswu-ka sinpwun-i haksayng-i-ta.
Y-Nom identity-Nom student-Cop-Dcl
'As for Yengswu, his identity is a student.'
b. ku-ka ilum-i Chelswu-i-ta.
he-Nom name-NomC-Cop-Dcl
'As for him, his name is Chelswu.'

Im's analysis assumes that sentences in (16) are underlyingly a double-subject construction, and the subject is not overtly realized.[10] However, not all double-subject constructions permit the "omission" of the subject. While (16a) and (16b) may be paraphrased as (17a) and (17b), respectively, (18a) and (18b) are not identical.

[9] Note that both (16a) and (16b) can be interpreted equatively. However, the intended meanings of the examples in (16) are predicational in that the second NP denotes a property of the first NP; the intended meaning of (16b) is 'he has the property of the person named Chelswu.'

[10] Following Park & Yeon (2023a, 2023b), I assume that Yengswu and ku 'he' in (17a) and (17b) are sentential topics.

(18) a. Chelswu-ka pwuca-i-ta.
C-Nomrich-Cop-Dcl
'Chelswu is rich.'
b. Chelswu-ka apeci-ka pwuca-i-ta.
C-Nomfather-Nom rich-Cop-Dcl
'As for Chelswu, his father is rich.'

Furthermore, in Im's analysis, it is difficult to pinpoint what kinds of relationships between the topical and the subject nominals warrant the omission of the subject.

Choi (2017) provides an alternative analysis by pointing out general issues concerning the subject omission approach. Choi claims that both (16a) and (16b) involve metonymy; *Yengswu* stands for *Yengswu*'s identity in (16a), and ku 'he' stands for his name in (16b). In other words, Choi argues that *Yengswu* and ku induce a shift in reference. While metonymy has been traditionally regarded as a *stand for* relation, this view is too simplistic because, as Panther & Radden (2005, p.1) and Radden & Kövecses (1999, p.18) argue, metonymy is more than just a matter of substitution. For this reason, I provided elaborated definitional properties for metonymy adopted from Panther & Thornburg (2007) in Section 2. Let us now evaluate Choi's claim based on the properties identified in (8). The source content *Yengswu* provides access to its target content *Yengswu*'s identity within one cognitive domain or domain matrix.[11] So, the criterion in (8a) is met. As a person, the source content is conceptually salient, and the link between the source and the target is strong because they are conceptually close. This suggests that the fourth criterion in (8d) is also satisfied. Now, let us consider the other two criteria—(8b) and (8c). It seems that the relation between source content and target content is not defeasible because the relation between a person and her/his/their identity is conceptually necessary; every human being has an identity. As for (8c), we cannot say the target content is foregrounded, and the source content is backgrounded in (16). If the target concept—*Yengswu*'s

[11] In this case, the domain matrix combines several domains, such as physical objects, living things, and volitional agents.

identity—is foregrounded in (16a), we expect that (19a) is fully acceptable, where the predicate *hwaksil-hay* 'certain/verifiable' is compatible with the target content. However, (19a) is awkward with the intended meaning. The same applies to (16b); while the target content—his name—is compatible with the predicate *hunhay* 'common,' (19b) is not felicitous.

(19) a. # Yengswu-ka haksayng-i-ko hwaksil-hay
Y-Nom student-Cop-Conj certain-do
Intended: 'Yengswu is a student, and (his identity) is verifiable.'
b. # ku-ka Chelswu-ko hun-hay.
he-Nom C-Conj common-do
'He is Chelswu, and (his name is) common.'

Based on the abovementioned observations, we can conclude that sentences in (16) are not metonymic.

How about (20)? This type of example is widely discussed in English, as shown in (21).

(20) Kim-kyoswu-nim-un haympeke-i-ya.
K-professor-Hon-Top hamburger-Cop-Dcl
'Professor Kim is a hamburger.'
(21) John was a hamburger.

Liebesman & Magidor (2018) argue that the second NP is interpreted metonymically in English, based on the tests, as in (22).

(22) a. # Bill was a ham sandwich, and it was delicious.
b. Bill, who wore a green shirt, was a ham sandwich.
c. # Bill, which was toasted, was a ham sandwich.
(Liebesman & Magidor, 2018 [Electronic version])

(22a) shows that the target meaning cannot be referred to by the pronoun it. While *Bill* (the person) can be modified by the animate non-restrictive relative

clause, as in (22b), *Bill* cannot be modified by the non-animate relative clause, as in (22c). These examples illustrate that the metonymic shift occurred in *a ham sandwich*, not in Bill. Be that as it may, I believe that (22a) can be rescued with proper context. For example, if (22a) is an answer to the question in (23a), it becomes acceptable. (23b) is a lightly modified version of (22a) to show the increased naturalness of the answer.

(23) a. What did Bill order? Did he order something awful and yucky again?
b. No, Bill was a ham sandwich this time, and (it) was really delicious. I tried some of his.

By contrast, even when the same context is given, (22c) cannot be rescued. Is this strong evidence that the locus of metonymy is *ham sandwich*? To me, the unacceptability of (22c) is independently motivated. Let us consider (24), where *Obama* has a metonymic meaning; *Obama* refers to the time period during which he was the US President. Nevertheless, the relative clause can modify the source meaning of *Obama*, as in (24b). Modifying the target meaning, as in (24a), is somewhat awkward. Proper nouns seem to maintain their source meanings, even after a metonymic shift.

(24) a. # We were happier during Obama, which lasted only 8 years.
b. We were happier during Obama, who was politically savvy and effective.

Moreover, (25) is equally odd under the context in (23a). If *ham sandwich* underwent a metonymic shift, (25) is expected to be acceptable.

(25) # Bill was the ham sandwich who was wearing a green shirt.

If a different context is given, such as (26), the degree of acceptability of (25) increases. Because of the newly established context, *ham sandwich* becomes given information in (25), and Bill gains the new information status. What I

demonstrate here is that the task of identifying the locus of metonymy should not be carried out in isolation of a context. A context provides specific information concerning information structure, and different alignments of information structure induce different types of metonymic shifts.

(26) (At a restaurant, server A talks to server B. They had a big group of high schoolers as customers yesterday.) Who ordered a ham sandwich yesterday? I don't remember thing. I was crazy busy.

For Korean examples like (20), Kim (2015) proposes that the second NP undergoes a metonymic shift. By contrast, Choi (2017) states that it is the first NP that undergoes a metonymic shift. Though not relying on metonymy, Kim (2002) proposes the underlying structure (27) for (20), which implies that some syntactic operation happens in the first NP.

(27) [CP Kim-kyoswu-nimi-un [IP ([NP proi mek-ko siph-un kes]-i) [haympeke]-i]-ta].
K-professor-Hon-Top eat-Comp want-Adn KES-Nom hamburger-Cop-Dcl
'As for Professor Kim, what he wants to eat is a hamburger.'

I argue that it is the first NP that undergoes a metonymic shift in (20). Let us first consider the context provided in (28).

(28) Context: At a restaurant, people ordered food. They are talking about Professor Kim's recent financial difficulties due to his divorce. One person asks another *Kim-kyoswu-nim-un mwel cwumwun-ha-yss-eyo*? 'What did Professor Kim order?'

As an answer to the question addressed in (28), (29a) sounds natural, but (29b) is somewhat awkward. If the locus of metonymy is the first NP (Professor Kim), we expect (29a) to be acceptable because the conjoined predicate *ssa-n ke-i-ya* '(it is) cheap' is compatible with the target content. By contrast, if the

locus of metonymy is the second NP, (29b) should be felicitous because what is foregrounded is Professor Kim, not what he ordered, and the conjoined predicate *yocum kanan-hay* '(is) poor these days' is fully compatible with the unshifted meaning of Professor Kim.

(29) a. Kim-kyoswu-nim-un haympeke-i-ko ssa-n ke-i-ya.
K-professor-Hon-Top hamburger-Cop-Conj cheap-Adn thing-Cop-Dcl
Lit: 'Professor Kim is a hamburger and (it was) something cheap.'
Intended: 'Professor Kim is a hamburger, and (what he ordered is) cheap.'

b. # Kim-kyoswu-nim-un haympeke-i-ko yocum kanan-hay.
K-professor-Hon-Top
hamburger-Cop-Conjthese.days poor-do
Lit/Intended: 'Professor Kim is a hamburger and poor these days.

We can further demonstrate that the first NP is indeed metonymically interpreted using Panther & Thornburg's criteria. We can access what Professor Kim ordered (target) through Professor Kim (source) within one cognitive domain/domain matrix that includes food, volitional agents, etc. The relation between the source and target concepts is contingent; it is conceptually non-necessary. While the strength of the metonymic link between source and target is weak if (29a) is taken out of context, the distance between source and target is narrowed with the context in (28). This is because 'Professor Kim ordered something' is presupposed and 'what he ordered' becomes readily available as a target content.

4. The role of information structure in copular constructions

This section examines the role of information structure in copular

constructions in connection to metonymy. I demonstrate that a metonymic shift is more frequently observed in a topical nominal (or given information) than a focus nominal.

4.1 Given vs. new information

Let us consider (30a), which contrasts with (30b). While the case marker, -ka, is attached to the first nominal in (30a), the topic marker, -nun, is attached to the first nominal in (30b). (30b) exhibits the same pattern as (20), and I proposed that the first nominal undergoes a metonymic shift in (20). The same is true for (30b). The two sentences in (30) have different interpretations, and the locus of the difference resides in which nominal is construed metonymicall y.[12]

(30) a. nay-ka haympeke-i-eyyo.
I-Nom hamburger-Cop-Dcl.Pol
'I am a hamburger.'
b. na-nunhaympeke-i-eyyo.
I-Top hamburger-Cop-Dcl.Pol
'(As for me,) I am a hamburger.'

The utterance contexts for the two sentences in (30) are noticeably different. Unlike the context provided in (28), (30a) can most naturally be uttered in the situation described in (31).

(31) Context: A server at a restaurant brought the food the customers ordered. She asks *nwu-ka haympeke sikhisi-ess-cyo*? 'Who ordered a hamburger?' I answer her with (30a).

In the answer given in (30a), *nay* 'I' gives rise to a focus (new

[12] Very little attention has been paid to the interpretational difference between (30a) and (30b) in the literature. Choi (2017) briefly discusses the difference based on the locus of a metonymic shift, but he does not answer why the two sentences in (29) have different metonymic loci.

information), while *haympeke* 'hamburger' is old/given information. Which nominal undergoes a metonymic shift in (30a), then? I argue that the second NP induces a metonymic shift, which differs from (30b). One piece of evidence comes from the coordination test, given in (32). If the locus of the metonymy is the first NP, we expect (32b) to be acceptable because the putative target concept 'what I ordered' must be highlighted instead of the source concept *nay* 'I'. However, (32b) is either unacceptable or very awkward. When a coordinated predicate is compatible with the non-metonymic meaning of *nay* 'I', as in (32a), the result is fully acceptable. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that *haympeke* 'hamburger' underwent a metonymic shift from food to the person who ordered it in (32).

(32) a. nay-ka haympeke-i-ko cikum acwu paykoph-ayo.
I-Nom hamburger-Cop-Conj now very hungry-End
'I am a hamburger and very hungry now.'

b. # nay-ka haympeke-i-ko acwu masiss-eyo.
I-Nom hamburger-Cop-Conj very delicious-End
'I am a hamburger and very delicious.'

The difference between (30a) and (30b) lies in the alignment of given and new information. While nay 'I' is new information in (30a), the first nominal is construed as given information in (30b).

There is no denying that given information is conceptually more salient than new information. It is therefore expected that given information serves as a metonymic source more easily than new information. As I briefly mentioned earlier, the conceptual distance between the source (*hamburger*) and the target (the person who ordered it) is usually big because we can conceptualize hamburger without invoking the person who ordered it. Under the given situation, however, the target content becomes more accessible to the source content. The increased accessibility facilitates the metonymic shift in *hamburger*.

4.2 Non-topical metonymy

It needs to be stressed that a topic does not always induce metonymy. While *appa* 'dad' is topic-marked in (33), it does not seem metonymic. In (33b), *appa* 'father' is foregrounded and compatible with the predicate *phikon-hay ha-si-n-ta* 'looks tired.' If *appa* 'father' underwent a metonymic shift and the target meaning—the sound (my) father produces—were foregrounded, (33c) is predicted to be acceptable. However, (33c) is somewhat awkward, at least to me.

(33) a. appa-nun tto ku soli-i-ya?
dad-TOP again that sound-Cop-Q
Literal: 'Is Dad that sound again?'
Intended: 'Is Dad repeating the same story again?'
(Choi, 2017, p.87)

b. appa-nun tto kathun soli-i-ko cacwu phikonhay ha-si-n-ta.
dad-Top again same sound-Cop-Conj frequently tired do-Hon-Prs-Dcl
Literal: 'Dad is the same sound again and feels tired frequently.'

c. # appa-nun tto kathun soli-i-ko kwi-ey cala n tule-o-n-ta.
dad-Top again same sound-Cop-Conj
ear-ineasily Neg enter-come-Prs-Dcl
Literal: 'Dad is the same sound again and does not come in my ears easily.'

If so, it seems that a reasonable analysis of (33a) is to propose that metonymy occurred in the second NP—*soli* 'sound.' The nominal soli 'sound' has properties different from those of others we have discussed thus far. It has a mass-like property; it is unbounded. Unbounded nouns in Korean often behave like adjectives in the sense that they denote properties/situations/states when they appear in a stative context. The adjectival meanings of these nouns arise through

metonymy. Unlike other metonymies we have discussed, this type of metonymy is more or less conventionalized. In other words, it is more tightly linked to lexical items, accompanied by a stative context. Conventionalized metonymies are nothing unusual. In (34a), the composite expression *flock of geese* is expected to profile the bounded unit *flock*. Alternatively, the mass of geese delimited can be profiled. The alternative construal arises through metonymy; the mass of geese is foregrounded, and the unit is backgrounded. This type of metonymy is sometimes obligatory, as shown in (34b).

(34) a. I saw a flock of geese. It/They were clearly visible against the blue sky.
(Langacker, 2008, p.344)
b. I saw a lot of geese. *It/They were clearly visible against the blue sky.

Mass-like nouns in Korean do not require a metonymic shift, but they tend to exhibit both metonymic and non-metonymic construals. Due to this conventionalized metonymic construal, the metonymic meaning of *soli* 'sound' is always available in (33a).

Choi (2017) provides more examples similar to (33a), as illustrated in (35). Here, both *kocang* 'out of order' and *yatan* 'clamor' exhibit a similar property to *soli* 'sound' in that they are construed as situations or states. For example, as the translation indicates, (35a) means 'The car is in a broken state.'

(35) a. catongcha-ka kocang-i-ta.
car-Nom breakdown-Cop-Dcl
Literal: 'The car is a breakdown.'
b. aitul-i iliceli nalttwimye yatan-i-ta
children-Nom back.and.forth running.wild commotion-Cop-Dcl
Literal: 'The children are a commotion, running wild back and forth.'
(Choi, 2017, p.87)

The examples illustrated in (33) and (35) are rather straightforwardly explained in CG. CG (Langacker, 2008, pp.396–398) assumes there are two types of copular constructions; one is the adjectival construction, as in (36a), and the other is the predicative nominative, shown in (36b) and (36c).[13] The difference between (36b) and (36c) is explained by the notion of virtuality; while my cousin is an actual entity in (36b), a doctor in (36c) is "a virtual instance of a type—an instance conjured up just in order to characterize it" (Langacker, 2008, p. 397). Besides this difference, both (36b) and (36c) are the equative copular construction. In all three cases, be profiles a schematic imperfective process.[14] However, (36a) needs to be distinguished from the other two in that the adjectival complement sad elaborates the schematic relation evoked by be.[15] By contrast, the related entity is equated with the profile of the nominal complement in (36b) and (36c).

(36) a. John is sad.
b. Jane is my cousin.
c. Jane is a doctor.

The examples in (33a) and (35) behave similarly to the English example in (36a). To demonstrate how this works, let us consider (33a) again. After undergoing a metonymic shift from a sound to a mental state of making the sound, *soli* 'sound' profiles a simplex relationship.[16] The schematic relationship profiled by the copula is then rendered specific by the metonymic interpretation of the nominal, which ascribes a mental state to its trajector. As a result, we interpret (33a) as 'My dad is in the state of saying the same thing over and

13 Langacker (2008) does not include discussions on the specificational copula construction. I assume that it can also be treated as an equative sentence in CG.

14 Imperfective process refers to a complex relationship whose characteristic feature is that it represents an internal portion of some longer process.

15 Elaboration is a CG term that refers to the characterization of a substructure in finer-grained detail.

16 Simplex relationship refers to a configuration fully manifested at a single instant. For example, the spatial relationship profiled by the preposition on is simplex.

over again.'

By arguing that *soli* 'sound' in (33a) undergoes a metonymic shift from sound to the action of making the sound (saying things), Choi (2017) alludes to the possible paraphrase of (33a), as shown in (37).

(37) appa-nun nul kathun soli-lul ha-n-ta. dad-Top alwayssame sound-Acc do-Prs-Dcl
Literal: 'Dad always makes the same sound.'
Intended: 'Dad repeats the same story over and over again.'

However, the unacceptability of (38) tells a different story. If the target content of soli 'sound' is an action, why can it not be modified by *panpok-toy-nun* 'repeated,' an action-denoting adjective?

(38) * appa-nun nul panpok-toy-nun soli-i-ta. dad-Top always repeat-become-Adn sound-Cop-Dcl
Literal: 'Dad is always a repeated sound.'

In my CG-based analysis presented above, unbounded nominals induce metonymy, which helps us construe an unbounded mass as a simplex relationship. The simplex relationship is fully compatible with the adjectival copula construction; both profile imperfect processes conceived as extending through time without intrinsic bounding. Then, the metonymic meaning—the simplex relationship—elaborates the schematic relation evoked by the copula, thereby supplying a specific content to the copula.

5. Metonymy in pseudo-cleft constructions

5.1 Specificational copula

Though specificational copular constructions generally do not involve metonymy, they must be discussed because pseudo-cleft constructions occur in them. In the specificational copula, as in (39a), the first NP, *ku chayk-uy ceca*

'the author of the book,' sets up a variable, and the second NP specifies its value. The first NP in (39a) is non-referential, whereas the second NP is referential. The first NP in the specificational copula construction is always non-referential, but the second NP is not sensitive to its referentiality, as indicated in (39b).[17] As for the virtuality of the nominals, the first NP is always actual, and the second NP may be either actual or virtual. In this regard, the specificational copula may be treated as a variation of the equative construction in CG.[18] A true equative sentence like (40a) requires actuality for both nominals. As for the nominals' referentiality and semantic type, the first and the second NPs must have the same value.[19] A predicational use of the copula arises when the second NP is virtual and non-referential. In the specificational copular construction, the first NP is actual and non-referential, while the second NP is not sensitive to either property.[20]

(39) a. ku chayk-uy ceca-nun Murakami-i-ta.
that book-Gen author-Adn M-Cop-Dcl
'The author of the book is Murakami.'

b. ku chayk-uy ceca-nun haksayng-i-ta.

17 See Mikkelsen (2005, 2011) for a discussion on the referentiality of the specificational copula.

18 Mikkelsen (2005) notes that the subject of the specificational copula behaves differently from that of the predicational one regarding its pronominalization in a tag question. For example, the predicational copula clause, The guest of honor was happy, wasn't she? is felicitous, but the subject in the specificational copula type cannot be referred to by an animate pronoun, as shown in * The director of the movie is Otto Preminger, isn't he? Discussing how this difference is handled in the CG framework is beyond the scope of this article. Nonetheless, I conjecture that it has to do with the subject's referentiality.

19 Semantic type refers to the nominal's (non-)eventivity.

20 There are three different views on the typology of the specificational copula. The first treats it as a variant of the predicate copula clause, which Moro (1997) supports. The second view, supported by Jacobson (1994), treats the specificational copula as equative. In the third view pursued by Higgins (1979), the specificational copula is a distinct type of its own.

that book-Gen author-Adn student-Cop-Dcl
'The author of the book is a student.'

(40) a. Elle is Minju.
b. Elle is an actress.
c. The artist of the painting is Elle/a student.

The specificational copula exhibits a peculiar alignment of the new and given information. Based on Heycock & Kroch's (2002) observation of the English specificational copula, Kim (2016) argues that the Korean specificational copula is identical to that of English concerning the alignment of the given/new information. As an answer for (41a), (41b) is acceptable, but (41c) is not.

(41) a. John-i mwues-i-la-ko?
J-NOM what-Cop-Q-Comp
'What did you say John is?'
b John-i pemin-i-ya.
J-NOM culprit-COP-dcl
'John is the culprit.'
c. * pemin-i John-i-ya.
culprit-NOM J-Cop-Dcl
Intended: 'The culprit is John.'
(Kim, 2016, p.95)

The reason, according to Kim (2016), is that the specificational copula requires given information for the first (subject) NP, and new information for the second NP. I believe Kim's observation is accurate, and I will discuss how this observation is relevant to my analysis of the pseudo-cleft construction in the following subsection.

5.2 Pseudo-cleft constructions

Kim (2016) categorizes the Korean pseudo-cleft construction into three types,

as shown in (42). All of these examples require the copula as well as the bound noun kes. Adopting Park & Yeon (2023c), I assume that kes is a schematic nominal that profiles a thing and has some role in a schematic process. This schematic process corresponds to the more specific process designated by the adnominal clause that modifies *kes*.[21] For example, *kes* in (42a) profiles a thing that indicates its involvement in a schematic process. This process corresponds to the specific process designated by *Chelswu-ka ssu-n* 'Chelswu wrote.' A second correspondence equates the thing profiled by *kes* with the landmark of that process, making kes its object.[22] The *kes* is then equated with the second NP, giving rise to the meaning 'What Chelswu wrote is this book.' The predicational pseudo-cleft example in (42b) can be accounted for similarly. Once again, the only difference resides in the virtual nature of the second NP in (42b). Both (42a) and (42b) are non-metonymic, exhibiting the similar patterns observed in (1a) and (1b).

(42) a. Equative
Chelswu-ka ssu-n kes-un ichayk-i-ta.
C-Nomwrite-Adn KES-Adn thisbook-Cop-Dcl
'What Chelswu wrote is this book.'

b. Predicational
Chelswu-ka sa-n kes-un kacca-i-ta.
C-Nombuy-Adn KES-Adn fake-Cop-Dcl
'What Chelswu bought is a fake.'

c. Specificational
(Chelswu-nun ounl mwuel hay?)
C-Top today what do
Chelswu-ka onul ha-nun k e s - u n

21 Correspondence indicates that two entities represent the same concept.

22 Landmark refers to the secondary participant in a relationship. For example, in the utterance I like Gio, a relationship is profiled by the verb like. In this relationship, I is the primary participant (trajector), and Gio is the secondary participant (landmark).

caki pang-ul
C-Nomtoday do-Adn KES-Top
self room-Acc
chengso-ha-nun kes-i-ya.[23]
clean-do-Adn KES-cop-Dcl
'What Chelswu does today is to clean his room.'

(42c) is different from (42a) and (42b) in that the first NP must be given information, and the second NP must be new information. When the given-new alignment is switched, the result is unacceptable, as in (43).

(43) (nwu-ka onul Chelswu pang-ul
chengso-hay?)
who-Nom today C room-Acc clean-do
'Who cleans Chelswu's room today?'
?? Chelswu-ka onul ha-nun kes-i/un caki pang-ul
C-Nom today do-Top KES-Nom/Top self
room-Acc chengso-ha-nun kes-i-ya.
clean-do-Adn KES-Cop-Dcl
'What Chelswu does today is cleaning his room.'

The other difference concerns metonymy. Unlike (42a) and (42b), the first NP in (42c) is construed metonymically. Though grammatically a nominal, the *kes*-clauses in (42c) do not denote a thing. Rather, they denote an action the hearer performs. Therefore, *kes* cannot correspond to the landmark (thing) of the processes profiled by the adnominal clauses. In this case, the complex event of *Chelswu*'s doing (various things) is metonymically construed as one specific event: whole event for sub-event metonymy. After the metonymic shift, the target meaning is equated with the second NP. Note that both NPs are nominals because of the profile determinants' (head nouns) nominal profiles, making (42c) a variant of equative. It is semantically distinct from (42a) and (42b), owing to the lack of direct correspondence between kes and the putative landmark

[23] I assume that the function of the second kes is identical to that of the first.

nominals of the profiled processes. Nonetheless, only the first NP is construed metonymically in (42c). Since it is given information, this is naturally expected in my analysis.

It is worth mentioning that kes plays a role in the metonymic construal of (42c). Though the first NP is nominalized with *-(u)m*, (44) is not acceptable. Based on a similar observation, Park & Yeon (2023c) suggest that a metonymic shift occurs mediated by *kes* in the Korean IHRC (Internally-Headed Relative Clause) construction. Put differently, kes has two functions in the IHRC construction. First, it induces metonymy, and second, it ensures the nominal profile of the adnominal clause in the Korean IHRC. While Park & Yeon (2023c) do not treat pseudo-cleft constructions as metonymy, we can encompass examples like (42c) as a metonymy phenomenon. Á la Park & Yeon (2023c), we might argue that the unacceptability of (44) is due to the lack of *kes*' presence. Without *kes*, the metonymic shift of the first NP is blocked; therefore, the complex event designated by the first NP is equated with a specific event designated by the second NP. However, these two NPs cannot be equated due to a semantic type clash.

(44) *Chelswu-ka onul ha-(u)m-un caki pang-ul chengso-ha-nun kes-i-ya.
C-Nom today do-Nml-Adn self room-Acc clean-do-Adn KES-cop-Dcl
Intended: 'What Chelswu does today is to clean his room.'

Before I conclude this article, I would like to discuss a peculiar case of the specificational pseudo-cleft mentioned in (5). For convenience, I reintroduce the same example with the new number. In (45), the second NP is a locative expression.

(45) nay-ka Chelswu-lul manna-n kes-un Seoul-eyse-i-ess-ta.
I-Nom C-Acc meet-And KES-Adn Seoul-in-Cop-Pst-Dcl
'The place I met Chelswu was in Seoul.'

(45) does not pose a challenge in my analysis. The first NP undergoes a metonymic shift from action/event to place. Then, the place is equated with the location denoted by *Seoul-eyse* 'in Seoul.' Kim (2016) argues that an example like (45) cannot be an equative sentence because the first and the second NPs do not refer to the same semantic type. Be that as it may, it is not easy to justify the claim that the place denoted by the first NP is semantically different from the location designated by the second NP.

We might accept Kim's position and propose that the specificational pseudo-cleft introduced in (45) differs from the one in (42c). Even then, the difference might come from the fact that pseudo-cleft sentences can be sanctioned in two different copular constructions. What I suggest is (42c) occurs in the copular construction that equates two nominals. Unlike (42c), (45) is sanctioned by the adjectival copular construction, which was introduced in (33a). In CG, this copula profiles a schematic imperfect process; therefore, it designates a simplex relationship. The locative expression in (45)—*Seoul-eyse*—is then compatible with the copula because it also designates a simplex relationship.

One welcome consequence of the alternative analysis is the capability of explaining the acceptability of (46).

(46) (Chelswu-wa Yengswu-ka ettehkey wa-ss-ess-tako?)
C-Conj Y-Nom how come-Pst-DP-Q
'How did Chelswu and Yengswu arrive (fast or slow)?'
Chelswu-nun cencenhi kuliko Yengswu-nun hekepcikep-i-ess-e.
C-Top slowly and Y-Top in.a.hurry-Cop-Pst-Dcl
Literal: 'Chelswu was slowly, and Yengswu was hurriedly.'

Kim (2016) treats examples like (46) as unacceptable. However, at least to

me, it is fully acceptable under the given context. Furthermore, Kim states that the second NP must refer to a (temporal) location in the specificational pseudo-cleft, where it is not a nominal expression. In my analysis, the acceptability of (46) is expected. CG groups together the three grammatical categories: adjectives, adverbs, and prepositions. The common property of these three is that they all profile a simplex relationship, though the properties of their trajectors and landmarks are different. Since adverbs profile a simplex relationship, they may occur in the second NP position in the specificational pseudo-cleft, which is sanctioned in the adjectival copular construction.

6. Conclusion

In this article, I developed an analysis of Korean copular constructions from a Cognitive Grammar perspective. While I touched on various types of copulas, my main focus was on the metonymic type. I pointed out that metonymy does not occur untethered, and various constraints make the target meaning of metonymy more accessible to the speaker. I discussed the role of information structure in the rise of metonymic meanings.

One challenge I encountered was identifying the locus of metonymy. In English, the commonly adopted tests, such as anaphora and copredication, are relatively solid; most researchers seem to agree on the judgment of the test results. Unfortunately, the same is not true for Korean. The meaning differences I illustrated tend to be subtle, and I admit that not all researchers will accept my judgments. This might be due to the general observation that Korean is more discourse-oriented than English. There are many phenomena in Korean susceptible to the rich interplay of formal and functional-discoursal factors. If so, we need to find a way to more robustly identify the locus of metonymy. I will leave this for my future research.

References

Barcelona, A. (2011). Reviewing the properties and prototype structure of metonymy. In R. Benczes, A. Barcelona, & F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (Eds.), *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view,* (pp.7−57). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company,

Broccias, C. (2022). A cognitive approach to 'metonymy.' In Mario Brdar & Rita Brdar-Sxabó (Eds.), *Figurative thought and language in action,* (pp.37−58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Choi, D. (2017). 'Ita' kwumwun-ey tayhan inci-cek cepkun [A cognitive approach to the copula construction of Korean]. *Eoneohag: Journal of the linguistic society of Korea,* 77, 75−97.

Choi, K. Y. (2011). K*es* in the Korean cleft construction: kes filling in an empty NP. *Studies in generative grammar, 21*(1), 21−47.

Croft, W. 1993. The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. *Cognitive Linguistics, 4*(4), 335−370.

Geeraerts, D. & Peirsman, Y. (2011). Zones, facets, and prototype-based metonymy. In R. Benczes, A. Barcelona, & F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (Eds.), *Defining metonymy in cognitive linguistics: Towards a consensus view,* (pp.89−102). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Heycock, C. & Kroch, A. (2002). Topic, focus, and syntactic representations. In L. Mikkelsen & C. Potts (Eds.), *Proceedings of the* 21st *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 21),* (pp.101−125). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Higgins, F. R. (1979). *The Pseudo-cleft construction in English*. New York & London: Garland.

Jhang, S.-E. (1995). *Headed nominalizations in Korean: Relative clauses, clefts, and comparatives.* Seoul: Hankwuk Publishers.

Kim, J.-B. (2016). Copular constructions and asymmetries in the specificational pseudocleft constructions in Korean. *Language and Linguistics, 17*(1), 89−

112.

Kim, J.-B. & Sells, P. (2007). Some remarks on Korean nominalizer kes and information structure. *Studies in Modern Grammar 64,* 45-72.

Kim, J. (2019). Hankwuke myengsakwu-wa kyeysamwun-uy uymilon [semantics of noun phrases and copular sentences in Korean: Contrastive analysis with Japanese]. *Kwukehak, 92,* 91-132.

Kim, J.-u. (2015). 'Ita' kwumwun-uy hwayong-cek yongpep-ey kwan-ha-n soko [The pragmatics of the 'ita'construction]. *Pankyoemwunyenkwu, 41,* 263-283.

Kim, U. S. (2002). Hyengsiktongsa 'ita'-uy mwunpep [The syntax of the dummy verb 'ita' in Korean]. *Language Research, 38*(3), 879-905.

Im, H.-P. (2006). Cengchey palkhim-uy hyengyongsa 'ita' mwuncey-wa yene [The issues with the indentificational 'ita' and its collocations]. In K. Kim et al. (Eds.), Emwunhan yenkwuuy nelpiwa kiphi [*The width and depth in language and literature research*], (pp.287-376). Seoul: Yeklak Publishing.

Jacobson, P. (1994). Binding connectivity in copular sentences. In M. Harvey & L. Santelmann (Eds.), *Proceedings of SALT IV,* Ithaca: Cornell University.

Langacker, R. W. (1984). Active zones. In Claudia Brugman & Monica Macaulay (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 10*, 172-188.

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

Langacker, R. W. (1999). *Grammar and conceptualization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2009). *Investigations in cognitive grammar.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lee, E. (2023). *An introduction to lexical semantics.* London & New York: Routledge.

Liebesman, D. & Magidor, O. (2018). Meaning transfer revisited. *Philosophical Perspectives, 32*(1), 254-297.

Lim, D.-H. (2005). 'Ita' kwumwun-uy ceysimwun-cek sengkyek [The theticity of Korean 'ita' constructions. *Kwukehak, 45*, 119-144.

Mikkelson, L. (2005). *Copular clauses: Specification, predication and equation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mikkelson, L. (2011). Copular clauses. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger, & Paul Portner (Eds.), *Semantics* (pp.1805-1829). Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Moro, A. (1997). *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nam, K. (2004). Hyentaykwuke 'ita'-uy kwumwun yenkwu [*A study on the 'ita' construction in modern Korean*]. Seoul: Hankwuk Publishing.

Nunberg, G. (1978). *The pragmatics of reference*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Nunberg, G. (1979). The non-uniqueness of semantic solutions: Polysemy. *Linguistics and Philosophy, 3,* 143-184.

Nunberg, G. (1993). Indexicality and deixis. *Linguistics and Philosophy, 16*, 1-43.

Nunberg, G. (1995). Transfer of meaning. *Journal of Semantics, 12*, 109-132.

Nunberg, G. (2002). The pragmatics of deferred interpretation. In Laurence R. Horn & Gregory Ward (Eds.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Panther, K.-U & Thornburg, L. L. (2002). The role of metaphor and metonymy in English -er nominals. In René Dirven & Ralf Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast,* (pp.279-319). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Panther, K.-U. & Radden, G. (2005). Metonymy. In Jef Verschueren & Jan-Ola Östman (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics,* (pp.1-14). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Panther, K.-U. & Thornburg, L. L. (2003). Introduction: On the nature of conceptual metonymy. In Klaus-Uwe Panther & Linda L. Thornburg (Eds.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing,* (pp.1-20). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Panther, K.-U. & Thornburg, L. L. (2007). Metonymy. In Dirk Geeraerts &

Hubert Cuyckens (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics,* (pp.236–263). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Park, C. & Yeon, J. (2023a). Information structure in Korean: What's new and what's old. *Journal of Pragmatics, 205*, 16–32.

Park, C. & Yeon, J. (2023b). Notes on word order variation in Korean. *Pragmatics, 34*(4), 588-614.

Park, C. & Yeon, J. (2023c). The factive, IHRC, and cleft constructions in Korean. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics, 21*(1), 140–177.

Partee, H. B. (1987). Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. In Jeroen Groenendijk, Dick de Jongh, & Martin M. B. Stokhof (Eds.), *Studies in Discourse Representation Theory and the Theory of Generalized Quantifiers,* (pp.115–143). Dordrecht: Foris.

Radden, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In Klaus-Uwe Panther & Günter Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought,* (pp.17–59). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. J. (2001). Metonymy and grammar: Motivation, constraints, and interaction. *Language & Communication, 21*(4), 321–357.

Seo, K. & Jeong, H. (2018). Hankwuke kyeysa 'i'-uy tauyseng-kwa uymicito [Polysemy and a semantic map of -i- copular constructions in Korean]. *Discourse and Cognition, 25*(4), 55–75.

Sohn, K.-W. (2004). Kes-clefts, connectedness effects, and the implications thereof. *Studies in Generative Grammar, 14*(4), 561–571.

Sweep, J. (2009). Metonymy without a referential shift: Adding evidence to the discussion. *Linguistics in the Netherlands, 26(*1), 103–114.

Yang, J. S. (2001). 'Ita'-uy mwunpeppemcwu-wa uymi [The grammatical category of meaning of 'ita']. *Kwukehak, 37*, 337–393.

Yoon, H.-J. (2008). The structure of kes-clefts and the syntactic status of kes in Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar, 18*(3), 459–475.

Yu, H. & Nam, K. (2016). 'Ita'-uy pemcwu-wa mwunpep kiswul [Classification and grammatical description of the Korean copula 'ita']. *Mwunpepkyoyuk, 26*, 253–285.

Zhang, G. (2020). Zone activation is not metonymization. *International Forum of*

Teaching and Studies, 16(2), 61-68.

Park, Chongwon

Professor of Linguistics
Department of English, Linguistics, and Writing Studies
College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
University of Minnesota Duluth
420 Humanities, 1201 Ordean Court
USA
Phone: +1-218-726-7706
Email: cpark2@d.umn.edu

Received on May 21, 2024
Revised version received on June 14, 2024
Accepted on June 28, 2024