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In the last ten years we can observe an upsurge in interest in metonymy in the field of cognitive linguistics. Beforehand, metonymy was mainly discussed in relation to metaphor, and treated as peripheral to it. Nowadays, it is widely recognised as fundamental to cognition and widespread in everyday usage. Nevertheless, it has so far received little attention from metalexicographers, whereas the treatment of metaphor in dictionaries is a more frequent subject of research.

The assumption made in the paper is that conventionalised metonymic senses deserve to be covered in pedagogical lexicography in the same way as institutionalised, dead metaphors. The paper attempts to study the representation of metonymic lexical items in five English monolingual learners’ dictionaries: Cambridge advanced learner’s dictionary (CALD2, 2005), Collins COBUILD advanced learner’s English dictionary (COBUILD4, 2003), Longman dictionary of contemporary English (LDOCE4, 2003), Macmillan English dictionary for advanced learners, (MEDAL, 2002), and Oxford advanced learner’s dictionary of current English (OALDCE7, 2005). The conventionalised metonymies subjected to scrutiny belong to two most productive types of metonymic mappings, WHOLE FOR PART and PART FOR WHOLE. In the former group, the subtypes distinguished are, e.g., TREE FOR WOOD, ANIMAL FOR FUR, and CONTAINER FOR CONTENTS, in the latter, e.g., BODY PART FOR PERSON, MATERIAL FOR OBJECT, and LIQUID FOR CONTAINER.

The paper discusses representation problems occurring in the investigated dictionaries, among them: discrepancies among the dictionaries and within an individual dictionary, the ordering of the source and target senses of a metonymic lexeme, as well as the omission of the source or the target meaning. The main focus is placed on studying the lexicographic coverage of such cases of metonymic meaning extension which may create difficulties for potential users of monolingual learners’ dictionaries. In this respect, two problem areas have been recognised. The first one deals with the representation of metonyms, where the source and the target meanings differ with regard to noun countability. The lexeme coffee, classified as the LIQUID FOR CONTAINER mapping, may serve as an example. The source sense of coffee, as in the sentence He drinks a lot of coffee, is an uncountable noun, whereas the target of metonymy, illustrated by the utterance Two coffees, please, is a countable noun. The other problematic issue concerns the coverage of lexical items with two or more metonymic senses. The lexeme silver, for instance, has a few metonymic meanings: “utensils/objects”, “coins”, and “a medal”, all of them exemplifying the MATERIAL FOR OBJECT metonymy.

Suggestions as to preferable ways of metonymy representation are made in line with the cognitive approach. It is accepted that the link between the source and the target senses should be visible, with the former meaning preceding the latter in the microstructure of a lexical entry.
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