

**LEGE ARTIS**

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. I. No 2 2016

**MEANING-MAKING PROCESSES IN DERIVATIVES
FROM PRECEDENT NAMES***Ekaterina Golubkova, Anastasia Zakharova**Corresponding author**

Golubkova, E., Zakharova, A. Meaning-making processes in derivatives from precedent names // *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2016, vol. I (2), December 2016. p. 37-79. DOI: 10.1515/lart-2016-0010 ISSN 2453-8035*

Abstract: The paper addresses the issue of meaning-making in a highly prolific and sprawling segment of English vocabulary – derivatives from precedent names (DPNs). The combination of cognitive linguistics methods applied to analyze the semantics of DPNs (*Robin Hood* cluster, *Cinderella*-based blends and *Dorian Gray effect*) permitted to account for their bias towards polysemy, which seems to be basically grounded in the process of metonymic zoom-in on the selected content in the event frame that describes the precedent name, oftentimes leading to domain extension and indeterminacy.

Keywords: precedent name, derivative, cognitive linguistics, frame semantics, conceptual integration, blend, metaphor, metonymy, windowing of attention, derivative from precedent name (DPN), *Dorian Gray effect*.

1. Introduction

Our paper lies at the crossroads of word formation, cultural studies and cognitive linguistics due to the mixed character of its unit of research, i.e. derivatives from precedent names in English (DPNs). It aims at elaborating on several specific features of DPNs' semantics relying on the methods currently developed in the cognitive linguistic paradigm.

The distinctive feature of today's cognitive linguistics research is the idea that meaning is essentially "made" or constructed in the process of communication. However, it is still a mystery what actually happens in the mind of the language users when they come

face-to-face with a new word or an ambiguous statement. Most prior research in cognitive linguistic paradigm has been focused on working out the methodology of description of meaning formation. Cognitive linguistic enterprise contributed a number of efficient strategies of meaning description, such as Frame semantics, Idealized Cognitive Models, Image schemas, Conceptual metaphor and metonymy theory, Blending theory, and the theory of the windowing of attention (or de-/focusing), which prove to be compatible and complementary in the research of a variety of language units, being especially fruitful if combined with empirical corpus data (Ирисханова 2014; Fauconnier & Turner 1999; Fillmore 1977; Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Langacker 2009; Littlemore 2015; Talmy 1985; 2000).

Among linguistic data that seem to be especially attractive for meaning-making analysis are new words that are derived from precedent names, the process which currently affects some languages, including Russian (*собьянинг, мизулинг, псакинг*), German (*Thatcherismus, Schröderismus, Kohlianer, Schäublianer, Merkelianer, Nicht-Merkelianer, Blairsches Markenzeichen*) and, certainly, English. In the latter, DPNs are coming in scores revealing its high word-building and expressive potential. DPNs in English exhibit a particular bias towards further derivation and polysemization. In the course of our initial research the corpus of around 500 DPNs was collected. It embraced derivatives coined from a variety of precedent names: fiction protagonists (*Dorian Gray, Robin Hood, Cinderella, Sherlock Holmes, Harry Potter, Tom Sawyer, Frankenstein, Peter Pan, Snow-white*), cartoon and film characters (*MacGyver, Mickey Mouse, Hulk, Tom and Jerry, Batman, Spongebob, Pokemon*), celebrities (*Newton, Zidan, Angelina Jolie, Kim Kardashian, Michael Jackson, Michael Jordan, Alfred Hitchcock, Nicholas Cage, Lebron James*), politicians (*Churchill, Obama, Romney, Trump, etc.*) via a number of word-formation means, such as word-composition, conversion, blending, affixation.

Apart from the obvious ubiquity and popularity of the process, there are a number of **reasons**, which contributed to the choice of DPNs as an attractive testing ground for the description of the meaning-making process. Current mass media discourse brims with them as they seem to carry a load of cultural, pragmatic and evaluative information imprinted in their form mostly due to the precedential character of their formant. Thus, they can communicate fairly complex ideas efficiently, which can serve as a laconic form for much longer events and ideas. As long as one part of DPNs is a precedent name, the derivative somehow alludes to this prototypical name and foregrounds some relevant, charismatic knowledge about the character; the process of activation of this knowledge is called exophoric reference. The process looks economical, however, underspecified as to the number and type of features which might be mapped onto the meaning of the DPN.

The other reason for placing DPNs in the focus is their liability to building both derivational sets, such as a massive set (around 90 units) with the suffix *-esque* (*Kafkaesque*, *Jaggeresque*, *Jordanesque*, *Kiplingesque*, *Kennedyesque*, *Lolitaesque*, *Burtonesque*, *Clooneyesque*, *Cinderellaesque*, *Don Quixotesque*, *Draculaesque*, *Picassoesque*, *Schwarzeneggeresque*, *Gogolesque*, *Frodoesque*, *Tarzanesque*, *Yodaesque*, etc.) and derivational clusters producing a score of derivatives based on a variety of patterns (*Harry Potter cluster*: *potterology*, *potterologist-in-chief*, *Potterphernalia*, *the Harry Potter phenomenon*, *Potterloving*, *Potterphiles*, *to be harry-pottered* (2 meanings), *hairy potter*, *Potter-sphere*, etc.). In the paper some attention will be given to both phenomena.

Finally, a number of DPNs demonstrate a clear bias towards polysemy and even ambiguity, for example, *Dorian Gray effect*, whose meanings range from the aging face and wearing off of the medical botox treatment to the abstract meaning of knowledge about time-management. The case of ambiguity is reported in the on-line debate about the hotly disputed derivative *Orwellian*, which has two contradictory

strands of meaning, since it can be both a compliment and an insult. If you call somebody *Orwellian* in character, chances are that this person supports you and that they are reliable and easy to deal with. Besides, it can be applied in all types of circumstances denoting something that you like or approve of. The negative strand of meaning manifests itself remarkably in a great number of contexts ranging from *Orwellian nightmare* and *Orwellian political language* to an *Orwellian dystopia* and *near-Orwellian economy*. It is noteworthy that New York Times declared *Orwellian* the most widely used derivative from a modern writer, it has overshadowed even the well-known *Macchiavellian*, *Kafkaesque* and others ("Do you really know what 'Orwellian' means?", *s.a.*)

Background

Prior research of the DPNs stayed largely within the framework of the study of anthroponyms scattered around in the papers devoted to the process of making new words: word composition (Коннова 2015), blending (Лаврова 2013), affixation (Шокина 2006). Over the last three decades anthroponyms were given special attention in research works on secondary designation and their extralinguistic potential (Ермолович 2005; Никитина 1997; Чернобров 1995). Stylistically, anthroponyms were studied in terms of allusion (Каграманов 2007; Шеремет 1984) and discursive back-up (Гайдук 2001).

Anthroponymic elements have recently become the cornerstone of research into the modeling capacity of phraseological patterns that serve as prototypical scaffolding for the newly derived phraseological units: *to out-Herod Herod* (to surpass Herod in cruelty and wickedness), *to out-Zola Zola* (to surpass Zola in naturalism), *to out-Joseph Joseph* (to surpass *Joseph* in modesty and chastity) (Дьячкова 2014).

DPNs as well as anthroponyms were also mentioned in recent cross-cultural studies, which place the accent on their precedent nature (Ирисханова 2014; Караулов 2010,

Моисеенко 2015). The study of proper names and common names, created by the former including the comparative aspect, is of practical interest particularly for the purposes of socio-political translation, as well as from the point of cultural linguistics since such lexical units express the specificity of the cultural background of the speaker. In some papers, the process was called 'deonymization' (Чигашева 2015). Its study, in the comparative aspect, becomes extraordinary relevant especially today due to the process of globalisation when intercultural contacts gain special importance.

Though the DPNs have been in the focus of a number of linguistic studies, they have not yet been analysed from the cognitive point of view, which could account for their meaning-making process, polysemy, and ambiguity. Equipped with the tools of cognitive linguistic analysis, namely frame semantics, conceptual metaphor and metonymy theory, conceptual blending theory, and windowing of attention, we make an attempt below to shed some light on the process of their meaning creation, diversity and usability.

Besides, in the current paper the scope of units is not reduced to anthroponyms, but rather includes a wider range of names from derivatives to phraseologisms. The aim of the research is to reveal and describe the cognitive mechanisms underlying the process of derivation from precedent names.

2. Material, methods, and tasks

2.1 General characteristics of DPNs

As mentioned above, the reason for DPNs' spread could be attributed to the process of globalization in culture, economy, media, and entertainment that led to the sprawl of the precedent characters all over the globe. The term 'infotainment' (fusion of *information* and *entertainment*) understood as a mass media principle stimulating game as a form of communication, found its clear manifestation in DPNs. Some of the luckier DPNs even made their way into dictionaries. The word *MacGyver*, for one, is now in

the Oxford Dictionary. There are few action-adventure TV dramas that get into the dictionary, but *MacGyver* was not like other shows. It starred Richard Dean Anderson as the eponymous hero who escaped life-threatening situations by eschewing firearms in favour of improvised engineering skills and cobbled-together ingenuity. For instance, he might use a pair of binoculars to deflect a laser beam or fashion a smokescreen from baking soda and vinegar (the *MacGyver Wiki* lists all the problems he solved in exhaustive detail).

A robot capable of creating tools was christened the *MacGyver Bot*. A competition to celebrate the ingenuity of female engineers was called *The Next MacGyver*. The top definition for *MacGyver* on Urban Dictionary, originally posted in 2003, runs thus: *Someone who can jump-start a truck with a cactus*.

The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary of New Words states that *to MacGyver* is to make or repair something *in an improvised or inventive way, making use of whatever items are at hand*, as in *he MacGyvered a makeshift jack with a log*. Danielle George, professor of radio frequency engineering at the University of Manchester, who delivered a 2014 Royal Institution Christmas lecture urging people to make things with common household objects, thinks it's unnecessary: the verb *to tinker* already describes attempting to improve something in a casual way, she says. But she believes the addition is a sign that "the public are repairing or repurposing objects in an inventive way, which is fantastic and is a positive statement in an apparently disposable society" ("How 'MacGyver' became a verb", *s.a.*).

Thus, the initial observations show that DPNs are expressive, clear-cut, eye-catching, analogically-grounded, and laconic units of language. These characteristics make them unique material for cognitive research, which **aims** at uncovering the cognitive mechanisms underlying the process of derivation from precedent names and accounts for the linguistic creative capacity of the English language speakers.

2.2 Specific tasks of the paper

In the following sections we will try to solve the following more specific tasks:

1. to build a corpus of the most frequent DPN clusters, on the one hand, and analogical derivational sets, on the other;
2. to apply current cognitive methodologies, such as frame semantics, conceptual metaphor and metonymy theories, and Leonard Talmy's windowing of attention (or de-/focusing in terms of Olga Iriskhanova) to describe the cognitive mechanisms responsible for the meaning-making in DPNs;
3. to carry out a case study of a DPN cluster *Robin Hood* to illustrate activation of knowledge in the process of exophoric reference;
4. to illustrate the working of Conceptual integration in DPNs created through blending (contamination);
5. to illustrate and account for the cases of polysemy in DPNs *Dorian Grey effect*.

Since current fragment of research is only initial stage of a more comprehensive and in-depth study of DPNs, some aspects of their functioning and composition will be left out. Thus, we will not yet case-study conversive pairs, cases of affixation and phraseological units, or comment on the pragmatic functions of the DPNs in discourse or factors determining the choice of DPNs in communication as compared to their neutral synonyms.

In all types of derivation two basic laws seem to dominate – the law of analogy which is manifested in derivational sets (e.g., *Dorian Gray effect*, *Pygmalion Effect*, *Salman Khan effect*, *Sarah Palin effect*, *Al Gore effect*; *Michael Jackson-like*, *Harry Potter-like*, *Cinderella-like*; *frankenstorm*, *frankenfood*, *frankenweenie*, *frankenfish*, *frankenfool*) and the law of economy reflected in derivational potential of blends and clusters (*to da Vinci*, *Romnesia*, *bridezilla*, *batverse*, *Cubama*, *to burtonify*, *to be jacksonized*, *Hulk up*, *hulky*, *hulk moment*, *hulk up technique*), we **hypothesized** that to a certain extent DPNs' semantics could be modelled according to some most general

analogical patterns and further on described with the inventory of cognitive techniques. Among the **methods** applied in the paper the most effective seems Frame semantics, a theory, which links the meaning of a word with a frame underlying this meaning. A frame is understood as a structure of closely related concepts that is evoked by a word. A frame normally consists of slots, which contain characteristic and stereotypical features of a given situation; the slots are filled with the relevant semantic knowledge, without which we cannot fully understand the meaning of a given word. Besides, the Theory of Conceptual Integration coupled with the attentional shift, metonymic inferencing, and backed up by the context analysis, based on examples from corpora, might account for the complex processes of meaning construction in DPNs.

3. Corpus of the most frequent DPN clusters and analogical derivational sets

The process of finding DPNs was basically carried out 'manually' by browsing through the following sites: www.bbc.co.uk, www.huffingtonpost.com, www.goodreads.com, www.economist.com. However, to see how the selected DPNs function in discourse or, as Littlemore puts it, 'in real-world data' we resorted to corpus query (COCA, NOW Corpus and Corpus of American Soap Operas).

Preliminary estimates enable us to single out the following extensive DPN clusters: *smurf, Hulk, Robin Hood, Harry Potter, Mickey Mouse, Romney, Obama, Cinderella*. Thus, *Cinderella* cluster includes the following DPNs: *cinderella disease, Cinderella Effect, Cinderella Exit, Cinderella Fat, cinderella license, Cinderella Man, Cinderella night, Cinderella Party, cinderella rules, Cinderella schlipper, Cinderella Story, Cinderella Style, Cinderella time, cinderelling, cinderellosis, cinderfella, Cinderelly, Cinder Hella, Cindersmella, Cinderella'd*, to name just a few.

Among the derivational sets statistically the most representative are affixed formations, compounds, blends and conversives. As for affixation, the most numerous are the following derivational sets:

Adjectival sets:

- ending in -esque: *Hemingwayesque, Norbitesque, Zorroesque, etc.*;
- ending in -an: *Herculean* (opposed to *non-Herculean*), *Kafkaian, Schwarzeneggerian, Anaximanderian, Spongebobian, etc.*
- ending in -ish: *Bieberish, Voldemortish, Lambertish, Babelish, Disraelitish, etc.*;
- ending in -style: *Rihanna-style, Michael Jordan-style, Mel Gibson-style.*

Verbal sets:

- ending in -ify: *Tim Burtonify, Adele-ify, Kim Jong un-ify, Zorrify, etc.*;
- ending in -ize: *Jacksonize, Burtonize, Cinderellize, etc.*;
- zero derivation/conversion: *to Martha Stewart, to Michael Jordan, to Pokemon, to Newton, to Harry Potter, to Macaulay Culkin.*

Nominal sets:

- ending in -ism: *Chavism, MacGyverism, Trumpism, Supermanism;*
- ending in -a: *Hitchcockiana, Bondiana, Fordiana, etc.*;
- ending in -tion: *Batmanification, Obamafication, Britneyfication, Oprahization;*
- ending in -itis: *Peterpanitis, Lambertitis, Britneyitis, etc.*

Structurally we can single out DPNs-composites with constant and variable components. Constant components are normally found in the final position: *Batman complex, Cinderella complex; Dorian Gray effect, Voldemort Effect, Alice in Wonderland Effect, The James Bond Effect; Peter Pan syndrome, Nicholas Cage syndrome, Alice in Wonderland syndrome.* However, a few cases reveal constant components in the initial position (*Frankenfood, Frankenteen, Frankenfish*). Variable components as a rule appear in the initial position: *Robin Hood complex, Snow white complex, Peter Pan complex, Batman complex, Cinderella complex; Dorian Gray effect, The Dr. House Effect, The Britney Effect; Schwarzenegger syndrome, Nicholas Cage syndrome, Lebron James syndrome.*

Some DPNs were based on a play on words (pun) containing allusion to different precedent names, distorted morphologically:

Robin Zone, Flip Flopney (alluding to Mitt Romney), Did you rugret it? (alluding to the series Rugrats), Donald Drumpf (Trump), Donald Rumsfailed.

5. Semantics of derived precedent names

5.1 Precedent names as representatives of events. Robin Hood cluster: Robin Hood tax, Robin hoodlum, Robin hooder, Robin Hood Complex

*...definitely they take from the poor and give to
the rich..... the anti Robin Hood...
("Obama's misplaced Robin Hood complex")*

Due to the fact that precedent names are cognitively, culturally, and pragmatically loaded units, as was stated in a number of papers (Жараулов 2010; Моисеенко 2015), they tend to function as triggers of more extended precedent situations or scenarios which can be described in terms of event frames (Голубкова, Братцева 2015). Robin Hood is a heroic outlaw in English folklore who, according to legend, was a highly skilled archer and swordsman. Traditionally depicted as being dressed in Lincoln green, he is often portrayed as "robbing from the rich and giving to the poor" alongside his band of Merry Men.

Thus, the precedent name *Robin Hood* can also be represented as an event frame with a number of prototypical slots: Agent, Collaborator, Patient, Goal, Manner, Benefactor and Time. It is important to mention in passing that the name itself is suggestive of a play on words: *robin* can be treated as the name of the bird or the collocation *rob in hood*. The prototypical content of the above mentioned slots looks like this: Agent – *Robin Hood* (a noble brave robber), Patient – rich people, Collaborator – merry men, Benefactor – poor people, Goal – noble (give riches to the poor), Manner – robbing,

Place – Sherwood forest, Time – Middle Ages. This prototypical event frame is illustrated by a score of corpus examples:

*The hardships of your early life in Harlem led you to a phase in your life you refer to as the "**Robin Hood**" days, when you and your crew stole from trains and brought the goods back to the community. Do you think the ends justified the means in those days?*
(COCA)

When this precedent name undergoes three types of derivational processes: word composition (*Robin Hood tax, Robin Hood Complex*), blending (*Robin hoodlum, Robin Hoodwinking*) and suffixation (*Robin Hooder*), the content of some slots changes and the event structure is reinterpreted.

The *Robin Hood tax* comes from a term coined by economist Hunter Logan in 1998 and commonly refers to a package of financial transaction taxes, proposed by a campaigning group of civil society. Its aim is to support American schools, local government, hospitals and medical coverage through a 0,5% taxation of all Wall street transactions which will yield 250 billion dollars per year ("What is a 'Robin Hood tax'?", *s.a.*). The major modifications of the frame affect 5 slots Agent – the state, Collaborator – supporters all over the world, Time – the 21st century, Place – the USA, Europe, Brazil, etc., Manner – legal taxation. Though the modified slots' content actually disagrees with the initial prototypical frame, it does not impede correct interpretation of the event frame due to the fact that these slots are placed out of focus, while the prototypical slots – Goal (noble – give riches to the poor), Patient (rich people), and Benefactor (poor people) are foregrounded and contribute to the holistic character of this designation. Despite the fact that the whole frame undergoes a metaphorical reinterpretation, the metonymic windowing of attention ensures the necessary level of flexibility of the conceptual structure.

*Instead of the "deep, rapid cuts" to public spending, the TUC wants the government to introduce a "**Robin Hood tax**" on banks to finance an economic investment programme (COCA).*

Another direction of frame restructuring is found in the blend *Robin hoodlum*, which displays the case of polysemy: in American animated cartoon (1948) it is a malevolent anti-social fox Robin Hoodlum. He escapes one trap after another until he is lured into an archery contest at the Palace and caught. He escapes, through the efforts of his faithful followers, and they kidnap the Sheriff and the King to act as their servants. Actually all the prototypical slots get here non-prototypical content: Agent is a troublemaking fox, Goal is to annoy everyone, Manner is to intimidate everyone; the other slots are moved out of focus. The revision of the event structure is backed up by the process of blending *Robin + Hoodlum (hooligan, bully)*, in which two elements *hood* and *hoodlum* overlap entailing the process of reconceptualization of the frame.

In its second meaning *Robin hoodlum* is the nickname of a 12-year old mulatto teenage girl in the book "Shadows of Sherwood: A Robyn Hoodlum Adventure" by Kekla Magoon, who struggles for justice ("The Robin Hood Within by Kekla Magoon" 2015). She is a brave girl who, looking for her parents, performs different tricks, helps the poor and participates in races – all in the spirit of the old good Robin Hood. Thus the writer 'resets' the familiar image of the precedent character offering a new content for nearly all the slots of the event frame: Agent is dramatically modified – it is a young mulatto female, caring and friendly, sharing only one feature with her prototype – she is a rebel, too, the idea backed up by the 'hoodlum' element, Manner is peaceful methods, Patient is the world of adults, Collaborator is Marian and minister Tacker, Time is the 21st century. The slots "faithful" to the prototypical frame are Place (Britain), Benefactor (the poor), Goal (the struggle with the evil). Thus, this interpretation of the DPN calls for an attentional shift from the prototypical Robin Hood features (masculinity and power) to the fact that the agentive slot can be filled in

with unorthodox content, which leads to the inference that any individual irrespective of their age, gender and race can become a noble Robin Hood.

Another case of DPN-blend *Robin Hoodwinking*, discovered in COCA, is a contamination of *Robin Hood* and *hoodwinking*, defined as *cheating, deceiving, going back on one's decision*. *Robin Hoodwinked* is also a one reel animated *Tom and Jerry* short released in 1958, in which the merry crowd of cartoon characters liberate the real Robin Hood imprisoned in the castle performing all sorts of tricks and deceptions. Despite the fact that the nobility of the characters' actions can be questioned, they still are guided by the noble Goal – liberating their hero, which agrees with the prototypical content of the event frame.

However, in another example an actor (Bob Crane) is described as a leader of a 'merry band', an outgoing and witty guy, the features mapped from the prototypical character but, in the DPN *Robin Hoodwinking* this slot content is mixed with the input from *hoodwinking* (*concealing one's true motives from esp. by elaborately feigning good intentions so as to gain an end*), which leads to the clash of information in the resulting frame. The further context clarifies that the initial frame of a positively motivated hero (with the noble Goal) is replaced by antagonistic Goal content (selfish interests) affecting the content of Manner, too (concealing the real intentions). Thus, *Robin Hoodwinking* was coined to describe in this unorthodox way *a darker side to the man*. Thus, different pragmatic context accounts for these two meanings of DPN.

*... actor Bob Crane will always be Col. Robert Hogan, the rakishly handsome, **Robin Hoodwinking** leader of a merry band of World War II Allied airmen in a German POW camp. <...> Bob was a very gregarious, outgoing person with a great sense of humor," says Klemperer. But there was a darker side to the man, and ultimately it may have cost him his life... (COCA).*

The next DPN *Robin Hooder* started out as a nickname of Thai season workers who regularly migrate to earn money outside their native country and send the earned money home. Gradually this DPN extended its meaning and started to euphemistically define any 'Gastarbeiter' who works abroad trying to provide for their family. The slots of Patient (a foreign state), Benefactor (the family), Place (a foreign country) and Time (now) get a new content, while Manner ('stealing') and Goal (noble) match the prototypical pattern. Collaborator and Time are placed out of focus. The focus on the Agent is enhanced by the suffix *-er* which due to its agentive character contributes to the conceptualization of the derivative as *someone who adopted the typical characteristics of the famous epic precedent hero*. Besides, the *hooder* element might metonymically reflect a frequent outfit of the season workers, contributing to the so-called conceptual convergence when the meaning of the novel designation gets enhanced motivation.

By analogy, another DPN has appeared *Romney Hood* to describe Robin Hood in reverse: taking from the poor and giving to the rich. Romney Hood will protect the rich from picking-up the debt tab. Romney Hood raised taxes on the middle class while giving the top 1% a tax cut. It alludes to the foul practices of American presidential candidate Mitt Romney (Urban dictionary, *s.a.*). The substitution of the precedent name leads to the restructuring of the event frame, namely, to a dramatic change in the Goal and Manner slots: the goal is no longer noble, as the poor are deprived of their money in favour of the rich, and the manner of doing this looks like a number of financial shenanigans. However, the precedential character of this designation preserved its allusion to Robin Hood due to the Hood part and identical phonetic shape of the name *Ro-*.

The documentary, produced by *Shoostering Films*, is entitled *Robin Hood Complex*, which seems to be a pitch at good people doing bad things in the name of good. In the caption the article about this film has "Robin Hood, riding through Iraq. Suit up. Boot

up. You are fighting ISIS, unpaid!" This new documentary follows various foreign fighters taking up arms against ISIS forces in the Middle East. The project attempts to gain insight into why these individuals would leave their relatively safe lives and venture into one of the most violent corners of the earth just to be outnumbered and outgunned by a savage enemy. Thus, the input *Complex* in this DPN contributes the focus on the psychological motivation of the noble character and highlights the optional slot of the Reason, seeking explanation why Robin Hood pursued his noble quest ("Robin Hood complex: foreigners fighting Daesh", *s.a.*).

In the corpus example below the word *complex* refers to the abnormal motivation for illegal actions, such as theft, used by some thieves. In the resulting frame Robin Hood's characteristic 'robber, thief' is metonymically mapped onto the Agentive slot in the emerging structure and enhanced by input 2 – the disease, making us infer that this way of rationalizing a crime is wrong and cannot be justified.

*Motivation for a life of crime is often difficult to pin down. Some thieves feel short-changed by society and consider others' possessions to be rightfully theirs. Others rationalize their crimes under the guise of righting some real or perceived wrong. This is known as the **Robin Hood Complex** (Corpus of American Soap Operas, *s.a.*).*

The other meaning of *Robin Hood complex* is found in the article headlined *Obama's Misplaced Robin Hood Complex*. In the process of accessing Obama's wish to *spread the wealth around*, the author notes that *Robin Hood is a beloved story told to many children and has admittedly undergone many tweaks and changes over time*. The protagonist's actions did not simply boil down to the fact that he "*stole from the rich and dispersed those spoils to the poor*. Rather, those that Robin Hood fought against were the bureaucrats and the corrupt that kept the people under the heel of their boot. He fought against what was, at the time, excessive government and those that controlled the reins of power and the feudal order of the time" ("Obama's misplaced Robin Hood complex", *s.a.*). In this event frame, the scope of both slots, the Benefactor

and the Patient is specified, if not modified: Robin Hood fought against oppressive government and corrupt public officials and even church officials on behalf of the citizenry. Not just the poor, but all the citizenry. Thus, Obama's idea "to steal from the rich to give to the poor" looks dysfunctional and even unhealthy (hence, the word *complex*).

Thus, frame analysis of DPNs of the *Robin Hood cluster* shows that the flexibility of their semantics described in terms of event frames, relies heavily on variations of the slots' content as well as on the process of de-/focusing of some of them. The slots that are brought into focus ensure correct holistic reinterpretation of the DPN's semantics, scaffolding the structure and linking it to the prototype frame.

5.2 Semantics of DPN-blends (contaminants) through the prism of conceptual integration

In this section we analyse DPNs-blends *cinderfella*, *tinderella*, *Cinderelephant* within the framework of conceptual integration theory with the aim to clarify the semantics of derivatives and the essence of contamination process. The main strategies of blend emergence will also be defined.

The English language became a good ground for coining numerous contaminants that have entered modern lexicon. We have gathered about 320 blends (Corpus of Contemporary American English, British National Corpus, Corpus of Web-based English, Corpus of American Soap Operas, Urban dictionary, The Rice University Neologisms Database, The International Dictionary of Neologisms, Unwords) so far.

High frequency of blends formed from precedent names might be associated with the rich informational load their constituents carry. To quote the favourite journalistic play with the names of famous couples: *Brangelina* (*Brad Pitt + Angelina Jolie*), *TomKat* (*Tom Cruise + Katie Holmes*), *Vinnifer* (*Vince Vaughn + Jennifer Aniston*), *Spederline*

(*Britney Spears + Kevin Federline*). The mania started in 2002 or 2003, when Ben Affleck and Jennifer Lopez were dating under huge media scrutiny, and at some point *Bennifer* was coined. The blended name reflects the commodity nature of public Hollywood romances, and the blending itself is phonetically pleasing, though some of the alliances fall apart.

Outside the celebrity world, Cinderella in *cinderfella* epitomizes both the character of Charles Perrault's tale – a diligent, kind, pretty, orphan girl who through lucky chance and hard work upgraded to the position of a princess, and the plot of the tale in general with all the events, characters and artefacts (such as a glass slipper) staying in the secondary focus, but retrievable when the necessity comes about (Голубкова, Братцева 2015). Similarly, in *tinderella* the first element *tinder* (*wick, fuse*) stands for an Android app for romantic on-line dating. Hence the emerging blended meaning of *a pleasant female available at the Tinder site*.

A number of papers have confirmed that Conceptual integration theory works well for any linguistic units that consist of at least two elements, be it composite words (Прохорова 2005), phrasal words (Петрович 2004), or even internet memes that bring together two semiotic codes (visual and verbal) (Канашина 2016). All of them are characterized by non-compositionality of meaning which may require some cognitive processing effort to decode it.

Blends or, in other terminology, contaminants based on precedent phenomena seem to be still more confusing at times, as they contain only fragments of words and create an additional tension for their correct recognition.

Besides, due to a variety of interpretative options DPN-blends reveal a bias for polysemy. *Cinderfella*, for one, has at least two meanings: a) a man who must be home by midnight for any one of a variety of reasons or he will face serious consequences

(Urban dictionary, *s.a.*); b) a middle-aged single man with an insatiable hunger for intense emotional and physical intimacy. *Cinderfellas want passion! They want fireworks! They want to feel alive! They want to be rescued from their loneliness wastelands! And they want it all by the second or third date. <...> But Cinderfellas are too broken to maintain intimacy on a long-term basis, so they don't make very good partners, at least not in their current emotionally needy state ("5 signs you may be dating a cinderfella", s.a.).*

Both meanings of this DPN share the same generic space: animate, human; input 1: Cinderella is a young, good-looking, diligent, poor, discriminated girl, who enjoys a very quick rise to greatness, which is reversible (midnight deadline), and input 2: man (as opposed to woman). The blended space, as is known, is not reduced either to the sum-total of the blended spaces, or to one of them. It is rather a fusion of features each time metonymically mapped from both inputs, with some features foregrounded and some downplayed. Thus, in *cinderfella 1* input 2 offers a new content to the agentive slot – *a man*, while other slots remain intact with the foregrounding of the deadline at midnight. *Cinderfella 2* inherits the slots of family discrimination, loneliness, yearning for love and hasty emotional connection (instant affection between the prince and Cinderella), which is foregrounded and modified into a quick and temporary intimacy. Likewise in *cinderfella 1* slot Agent is filled with new content (gender and age change). Interestingly, this meaning develops pejorative connotation of *a middle-aged man incapable of stable and lengthy relationship*.

Corpus example enables to distinguish still another meaning of *Cinderfella* – a guy describes his transformation from a bullied discriminated loser at school to an appreciated happy person:

... school, they wouldn't let me sing that song because they said it's a 'girl's song', but when Ryan heard about that, he wrote it into the show. And now when people hear that song, they think of me. A word I used a lot about what's happened is 'therapeutic'. It's

*very therapeutic. Outside of work, I'm getting the praise and acceptance I've always wanted. And at work, I've got my first set of friends ever. What I am is a true **Cinderfella** story"* (COCA).

In *Cinderfella 3*, the input 1 (*Cinderella*) foregrounds the slot of Manner (transformation was for the better and it was miraculous): it actually gets a detailed specific definition fitting the pragmatic situation the narrator finds himself in. Thus, this meaning is as context dependent as in the two first cases.

We can also see the mechanism of conceptual integration at work in another DPN-blend – *tinderella* which means *an attractive female discovered through the tinder dating application*. Structurally this blend is a 'dvandva-contaminant' or 'semantic coordinatives' type (two notional components take equal part in the meaning construal). The agentive slots of beautiful appearance and attractiveness make a girl called *Tinderella* a paragon of a girl of one's dreams. However, input 2 (Tinder site) suggests that she can be found in virtual reality through the Tinder app. Other slots (diligence, discrimination, deadline, and rise to greatness) are actually defocused.

One more unexpected blend discovered in COCA corpus is *Cinderelephant*: Pa. Nathan: What is big and gray and wears a glass slipper? Pedro: What? Nathan: ***Cinderelephant!***

This is an example of metonymic triggering of Cinderella's scenario through the mention of the essential artefact, the *glass slipper*, which is incidentally believed to be made of glass due to translation error (the French word *vair* (*fur*) is misspelled as *verre* (*glass*) and changed the material of the slipper into uncomfortable glass, really hard to wear and easy to lose. It later upgraded to crystal shoe to seem more precious). The blend has two metonymic projections: one induced by the mention of the slipper earlier in the context and the other by two typicalities of an elephant – big and gray.

Thus, DPN-blends exhibit the tendency to become polysemantic, which is ensured by different venues of mapping strategies, de-/focusing effect as well as by filling the event frame slots with non-prototypical content. The emergent meaning is likely to develop connotations resulting from the fusion of the two inputs. Phonological features, some similarity, and recognizability of the fragments of the blend cannot be ruled out as an additional motivating factor behind their choice.

5.3 Metonymy as a meaning-making mechanism: case study of polysemy in DPN Dorian Gray Effect

"... metonymy works just as hard as metaphor and , <...> it does just as many things as metaphor".

(J. Littlemore "Metonymy: hidden shortcuts in language, thought and communication")

In this section we will take a closer look at the compound DPN *Dorian Grey effect* with the aim of accounting for its polysemy.

To describe the process responsible for the emergence of polysemy we will rely on the contemporary cognitive treatment of metaphor and metonymy as two interconnected and interwoven cognitive mechanisms that lead to the development of polysemy. Basically, Falkum described similar cases as instances of systematic polysemy with a metonymic basis, since these metonymies rely upon highly salient properties of their denotations so that thinking of the denotation presupposes thinking of this property (Falkum 2011). In line with this idea, in our analysis, meaning-making processes are complicated by the process of windowing of attention and thus they create the so-called zoom-in effect which provides for feasible motivation of several meanings in one DPN.

By way of a short introduction it must be noted that in current theories of metonymy this particular meaning extension mechanism has been finally given due attention, as by contrast with metaphor it looked rather underresearched (Littlemore 2015; Peirsman & Geeraerts 2006; Radden & Kövecses 1999; Ruiz de Mendoza & Velasco

2002). Metonymy normally serves as a point of access to a particular aspect of a domain and thus provides access to the target concept. Furthermore, each vehicle provides a different route into the relevant conceptual domain. According to Croft (1993), a target is accessed within a domain (Evans & Green 2006). By definition, metonymy is used to highlight some relevant features and leave others in the shade (Langacker 1993), which pretty well agrees with the process of zooming-in or focusing.

One of the reasons why we need metonymy is that it is impossible to include all aspects of our intended meaning in the language that we use. That is to say, language always 'underspecifies' meaning as it cannot possibly express everything that is relevant to its interpretation (Radden et al. 2007), and inferences are needed to work out what is meant (Frisson 2009).

While metaphor is based on comparison and cross-domain mappings, metonymy presupposes that conceptualization of an entity takes place within the boundaries of a single domain, basically displaying three versions of mappings: *pars pro toto*, *toto pro pars*, and *pars pro pars* (Заботкина 2012). Croft and Cruse (2004: 220) also give examples that suggest intermediate possibilities between metaphor and metonymy, while also warning that what may appear to be intermediacy may be the result of combining distinctly different processes. Thus, in principle, an expression can never be said to be metaphorical or metonymic in any absolute sense, but only for a given user in a given context. What Littlemore calls the 'slipperiness' of the metaphor/metonymy distinction, has been studied in depth by Barnden (2010). The authors look at the two main grounds for differentiation: the idea that metaphor involves similarity while metonymy involves contiguity, and the idea that in metonymy links to the source domain are preserved while in metaphor they are not.

Barnden analyses cases of metaphor and metonymy where these 'rules' seem to be broken. He begins by challenging the notion that metaphor relies solely on similarity,

pointing out how many 'primary metaphors', such as knowing is seeing or more is up (Grady 1997) are in fact based on real-life experiential correlations which are essentially contiguous in nature. In other words, when we are first learning native language and its metaphors, *knowing* regularly involves *seeing*, and more regularly involves an 'upward increase'. The relationship between the source and target domain therefore involves contiguity rather than comparison and is perhaps better described as 'metonymy'. Primary metaphors are thought to underlie a great number of conceptual metaphors, so if they are essentially metonymic in nature then this also applies to the conceptual metaphors that they underlie. Barnden points out further that when someone is feeling down, they may not actually be bent over or drooping but that we could perhaps imagine them to be in this state and this hypothetical reasoning could form part of our understanding of the metaphor (Littlemore 2015).

Thus we have to acknowledge that some metonymic processing is at least potentially involved in the comprehension of metaphors such as these. As Barnden puts it, '**contiguity is in the eye of the beholder**' (Barnden 2010: 10). After demonstrating how some metaphors can involve contiguity Barnden also shows how some 'metonymies' can paradoxically involve some degree of similarity. An example that he uses is the name of a country, such as the USA that stands metonymically for a sports team that is representing the USA. He points out that the similarity derives from the fact that they only make sense within the context of a sports competition, in which different teams play one another. There is therefore a one-to-one correspondence between the country and its team. The structural analogy is set up within, which competitive relationships between the teams correspond to competitive relationships between the countries. He argues that when analysed in context, many metonymies in fact involve structural similarities between the source and target domain and can thus be viewed as metaphor (Littlemore 2015).

Barnden (2010) concludes that rather than asking whether a particular expression is intrinsically metaphorical or metonymic, it is more useful to study the type of contiguity or similarity involved. This approach to the study of metaphor and metonymy is much more refined than previous approaches, and provides a promising line of investigation.

According to Littlemore (2015), it could be further refined if two more factors were considered. These are the nature of metonymy as a radial category and the fact that, in language at least, there are clues in the text or intonation that often indicate whether or not a particular expression should be understood as metaphor or metonymy. Goossens (1990; 2003) has identified four main ways, in which metaphor and metonymy interact, and refers to the overall process as 'metaphtonymy'. As Littlemore indicates, researchers working with Goossens' model have since revealed still greater complexity (Wojciechowska & Szczepaniak 2013).

Thus, in recent years there has been a move towards more flexible, context-based approaches to metonymy. Rather than viewing metonymy simply as a 'domain transfer' or 'domain highlighting' process, there has also been much more of a focus on the role of context in metonymy interpretation and production. Individual metonymies cannot be seen as independent of a specific context and pragmatic situation. This has led some researchers to view metonymy as a much more fluid and variable and unpredictable phenomenon.

If metonymy is considered as a reference point phenomenon as in Langacker's works, then in a film every camera angle is a metonymy of one kind or another. The problem is that it is impossible to film something without having a camera angle, which makes metonymy synonymous with perspective (Littlemore 2015).

A possible way to get round these problems was suggested by Radden and Kövecses (1999) who focus on creative or marked forms of metonymy in other forms of expression, insofar as this is possible. The so-called vehicle selection follows four of the criteria: typical over non-typical; central over peripheral; basic over non-basic and important over less important. This idea can be coupled with the recent study from Peirsman and Geeraerts, that metonymy is a phenomenon which exists within a radial (or prototypical) category like the majority of language categories (a fundamental tenet of cognitive linguistics). Peirsman and Geeraerts (2006) see concrete metonymies occupy the centre of the category and more abstract metonymies are placed in the periphery, so for example the following would be seen as more prototypical: *Fancy a new set of wheels?* (BofE) than *Jay and Denise are expected to walk up the aisle in the summer.* (BofE), which is in the periphery, as it involves more temporal or abstract entities (from Littlemore 2015).

To sum up, according to Peirsman and Geeraerts (2006), metonymy types radiate out from prototypical instantiations in three different ways: they gradually become less contiguous, less bounded and less concrete. This model is useful as it shows that metonymies can differ from one another in more than one way. However, as Littlemore stresses, one problem with the model is that, when faced with metonymies from "real-world data" (corpus data), it is sometimes difficult to see which category they fit into (Littlemore 2015: 52).

In our analysis below we look at examples of metonymy in real-world data and take contextual and pragmatic meanings into account, trying to illustrate how metonymic mapping emerges in compound nouns derived from precedent names. In doing so we go by the principles of the so-called vehicle selection outlined by Radden and Kövecses (1999). Basically, vehicle selection depends on three broad categories: human experience, perceptual selectivity, cultural preferences. They seem to come into play in the process of making DPNs.

Dorian Gray effect turns to be one of the most polysemantic units among DPNs scoring as many as five meanings with more yet unregistered but possible. The synopsis of the novel is given below.

The novel "The Picture of Dorian Gray" (1890) by Oscar Wilde features a narcissistic young man Dorian Gray who gives his soul to remain young while the painting of him grows old. Despite a life of dissipation and worse, Gray stays youthful in appearance. Instead, his portrait records his dissolute deeds, becoming a hideous mask. When Gray destroys the painting, his face turns into a replica of the portrait.

With Lord Henry's encouragement, Dorian has become self-absorbed and cruel. At first, Dorian may not have been aware of the seriousness of his wish to remain youthful while the portrait aged. By the time that he hides the portrait in the attic, however, he has every reason to know the consequences. He knows that the pact will "breed horrors and yet will never die".

Dorian seems resigned to his fate. As in the Faust legends, the central character seems to feel beyond hope. According to the Faust legend, he could save himself if he would only repent and seek absolution. Dorian does consider turning to Basil, confessing, and seeking a more enlightened path. His ultimate decision, however, is not just based on despair. True to the Faust legend, he truly craves the benefits of the bargain.

Thus, summed up into an event frame Dorian Gray reveals the following slots: Agent (a self-absorbed and narcissistic young man), Collaborator (Lord Henry), Patient (irrelevant here), Goal (staying young), Manner (making a pact with the devil), Benefactor (Dorian), Time (time span is human life). However, the list of slots is not sufficient to track down metonymic mappings to the target domain of the DPN *Dorian Gray Effect*, since the precedent name triggers the whole scenario of the novel focusing on some axiological parameters, and zooming in onto the specifics of the Manner

(staying mysteriously youthful, while the portrait aged and mirrored all the hideous deeds of the man). It is essentially this zoom-in effect that provides for the metonymic projection of selected information in the slots. Moreover, at times there is an urgent need to infer knowledge drawing on a wider context.

The most decodable meaning is that of a revelation of a person of their evil-doing. Thus, an article headlined *Donald Trump defies the Dorian Gray effect. Why?* features a photo of the candidate distorted by an ugly looking wrinkled scary mask made from cardboard and glued over it. To quote the article: "Scratched into an ad on the platform, someone left us a *Dorian Gray* treatment of Donald Trump. Behold the man behind the mask. But that's the thing about Trump. No one seems to care about his deficiencies or his flaws. This departs from the normal practice of American politics. Normally, it goes like this. An outsider appears in American politics. He or she expresses some deeply felt issue. There's a brief period of enthusiasm. Then the reporters go to work. Debates happen. Interviews are given. And eventually we get a *Dorian Gray* revelation of the real man or woman. And hey presto, that's the end of their candidacy. And, like a booster rocket, the candidate falls away even as the issue continues. The candidate has served his or her purpose. But it's not happening this time. Why isn't happening this time?" ("*Donald Trump defies the Dorian Gray effect. Why?*", *s.a.*). Amid the on-going acrimonious election campaign the mutual exposures of the candidates somehow do not affect Trump's image, according to the journalist.

In this meaning, the typical, basic and important feature of the precedential scenario evoked by the name are foregrounded: the ultimate revelation of the true evil nature of the protagonist.

A number of contexts from medical discourse suggest different interpretations of this DPN. One rather predictable meaning of *Dorian Gray effect* is that of a medical term: sudden aging, an abrupt change from seeming youthfulness to the reality and ravages

of age, as can occur naturally or when the effects of plastic surgery and Botox treatments wear off.

In other contexts, the term is commonly used in psychological literature to refer to a phenomenon, in which past experiences leave a mark on one's physical appearance. What makes this effect *Dorian* is that it is not easily detectable: psychologist needs to seek it out from more subtle cues, such as voice, as the face looks '*emotionally neutral*'.

The Dorian Gray Effect has previously been documented in several studies that suggest that the experience of particular lifelong emotions could, for some individuals, influence their 'emotionally neutral' face.

Though facial cues can provide a wealth of insights into a person's attributes, they are not always the best source of information. The voice, for example, can be a better indication of certain characteristics. There has also been little success for facial cue research on criminality and conditions like psychopathy and sociopathy. Currently, no facial cues have been discovered that readily indicate the presence of one of these conditions (NOW Corpus).

This meaning emerges from the metonymic mapping of one essential feature of Dorian – his unchanging beauty and youthfulness, which no one can penetrate.

In the following context the compound *Dorian Gray effect* is used to illustrate its reverse course: despite hard work and sacrifice, which are the true source of the athlete's excellent physical shape, their perfection soon is frustratingly useless, unwanted, and they end up in a physically ruined state.

*It's the great penalty of athletic prowess, this strange reworking of **the Dorian Gray effect**: you give your all to be a flawless physical specimen, and you deploy your gifts*

in arenas that make typical workplaces seem humdrum beyond words, and then, one day, your perfection is no use to you anymore. And what if the bits that are left are withered beyond... (NOW Corpus).

The Manner slot is filled with a new content, contradicting the prototypical one: athletes create their beauty and fitness themselves, abusing their health at times and ending up (Goal) unhealthy and incapacitated which is not fair and needs to be repaired. A more distant non-prototypical case of metonymic mapping is found in the title of the article:

The Dorian Gray Effect

*Those people have learned that **the time** they have available is the result of the choices and commitments they make. They have examined these choices closely and have identified what are the most important reasons for their success. As a result, they have decided to behave differently and it has changed their lives.*

We all have exactly the same amount of time, but some people seem to have more of it than others. This isn't because they have a Dorian Gray picture in their attic where they can off-load the stress and tension of the day. It is because they have changed their relationship with time.

These people are able to take control of their time because they have decided to change their life choices about what time commitments they will agree to take on each day. As a result, these business people appear to the outside world to have more time than anyone else. The real triumph, though, is the internal one the inner satisfaction of knowing that instead of always being "too busy", they always have enough time in their life for the things that they really want to do ("The Dorian Gray effect", *s.a.*).

The 'making' of this meaning is based on metonymic mapping and zoom-in on one inferential feature of the novel: its protagonist strived to take control of the time, which turned into a disaster. The happy businessmen in the article were better off as they did some homework and prioritized their issues, making more space for pleasure. Other essential slots in Dorian Gray's event frame seem to be totally phased out of focus. These cases of metonymic vehicle selection in one DPN allow for several readings beginning with the obvious one (mapping of one prototypical feature) to a more generalized, inferred one (time management), which leads to the so-called domain expansion.

These examples show that when faced with novel metonymies, we need to engage in 'metonymic thinking' in order to understand them. Langacker (2009: 54) illustrates this nicely with his example of a made-up compound: '*elephanttable*'. This could be a table made out of an elephant's foot, a table covered in elephant ornaments, a table shaped like an elephant, and so on. Because the metonymic connection is not fixed we are free to form our own connections and therefore understand the term in different ways.

Metonymy can, therefore, be described as a thinking process that allows us to make sense of utterances by profiling a particular facet of a given phenomenon. Thus, there is always a degree of indeterminacy in case of novel metonymies. In designations derived from precedent names there is still a wider repertoire of interpretations accountable by a variety of metonymic mappings that can be complex and highly context-dependent.

This idea also agrees with Croft's (2002) 'Domain Highlighting Model'. Croft argues that any given entity forms part of a 'domain matrix' and different parts of this 'domain matrix' are highlighted or 'triggered' in different contexts (Littlemore 2015).

6. Conclusion

In the present paper we analysed the meaning-making process in derivatives coined from precedent names (DPN): famous fiction characters, film or cartoon heroes, and celebrities. This layer of English vocabulary is highly neogenic and displays activity both in terms of building derivational sets and derivational clusters, exploiting existing language resources in accordance with today's tendency to make as many shortcuts in communication as possible. Basically four most productive ways of coining DPNs were revealed: affixation, compounding, blending, and conversion.

To account for the semantics of these units we applied a variety of cognitive linguistic methods, which proved to be quite complementary and non-contradictory. Thus, to study the derivational cluster (*Robin Hood*) we appealed to Frame semantics, describing the precedent name in terms of a dynamic event frame with a number of prototypical slots, which may be filled in DPNs with non-prototypical or even modified content restructuring the initial event frame. It was also discovered that the mechanism of windowing of attention is at work in this process. It is responsible for de-/focusing certain slots of the event frame or even for zooming-in onto certain specific features in the slots which might otherwise be called latent.

In the study of DPNs-blends we resorted to Conceptual integration theory in an attempt to show the flexibility of mappings from the two input spaces that contribute information to the emergent space. Analysis also confirmed the crucial role of metonymic mappings in the process of integration, which in many cases paves way to polysemy in blends.

We also paid special attention to the phenomenon of polysemy, typical of the majority of DPNs. The case study of the compound *Dorian Gray effect* showed that the basic cognitive mechanism responsible for an amalgam of its meanings is metonymy. The short survey of the studies of metonymy over the last decade is indicative of a variety

of approaches to its assessment and description. Our data backed up the current approach to metonymy viewing it as a flexible, context-based phenomenon. It has also been shown (in agreement with Peirsman and Geeraerts), that metonymy is a phenomenon, which exists within a radial (or prototypical) category like the majority of language categories. Thus, concrete metonymies are placed at the centre of the category and more abstract metonymies are closer to periphery (the process called domain expansion). The latter tend to foreground less prototypical and more subtle features of the precedent name, which can be discerned via inference and backstage data analysis.

Thus, both in event frames and conceptual integration models metonymy turns out to be massively responsible for the meaning formation in DPNs oftentimes leading to their polysemy. Metonymies in the so called real-world data (corpus data) leave a certain degree of indeterminacy, whose disambiguation calls for an additional cognitive processing effort and makes the newly coined derivatives pragmatically attractive.

References:

'5 signs you may be dating a cinderfella'. Available at:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michelle-martin/dating-a-cinderfella_b_8242154.html

Bank of English. Available at:

<http://www.titania.bham.ac.uk/docs/svenguide.html#Internet%20connection>

Barnden, J. (2010). Metaphor and metonymy: making their connections more slippery. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 21 (1), p. 1-34.

British National Corpus. Available at:

<http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>

Chernobrov, A.A. / Чернобров А.А. (1995). *Лингвострановедческий анализ английских личных имен*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата

филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Университет имени М.В. Ломоносова.

Chigasheva, M.A. / Чигашева М.А. (2015). Деонимизация как способ образования новых терминов в дискурсе СМИ Германии. In *Магия ИИНО: новое в исследовании языка и методике его преподавания: материалы Второй научно-практической конференции (Москва, 24-25 апреля 2015 г.)*. Т. 1. Крячков Д.А. (ред.). Москва: МГИМО – Университет, с. 239-243.

Corpus of American Soap Operas. Available at:

<http://corpus.byu.edu/soap/>

Corpus of Contemporary American English. Available at:

<http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>

Corpus of Web-based English. Available at:

<http://corpus.byu.edu/glowbe/>

Croft, W. (2002). The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 4, p. 335-370.

Croft, W. & Cruse, A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

'Donald Trump defies the Dorian Gray effect. Why?' Available at:

<http://cultureby.com/2015/09/donald-trump-and-the-dorian-gray-effect.html>

'Do you really know what 'Orwellian' means?' Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2014/nov/11/reading-group-orwellian-1984>

Dyachkova, I.E. / Дьячкова И.Е. (2014). Композиционная семантика английских фразеологических единиц с компонентом-антропонимом. *Современная лингвистика: взаимодействие парадигм и школ. Вестник Московского Государственного Лингвистического Университета*, 20 (706). Халеева И.И. (ред.). Москва: Издательство Московского Государственного Лингвистического Университета, с. 155-168.

- Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics. An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Falkum, I.L. (2011). *The semantics and pragmatics of polysemy*. Doctoral thesis. University College London.
- Fauconnier, G. & Turner, M. (1999). Metonymy and conceptual integration. In *Metonymy in language and thought*. Panther, K.-U. & Radden, G. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, Ch. (1977). Scenes-and-frames semantics. In *Linguistic structures processing*. Zampolli, A. (ed.). Amsterdam: North Holland, p. 55-82.
- Frisson, S. (2009). Semantic underspecification in language processing. In *Language and linguistics compass*, 3 (1), p. 111-127.
- Gayduk, I.V. / Гайдук И.В. (2001). *Особенности функционирования антропонимов в английской и американской прессе*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Воронеж: Воронежский Государственный Педагогический Университет.
- Golubkova, E.E. & Bratseva, A.L. / Голубкова Е.Е., Братцева А.Л. (2015). "Сказка о руководящей золушке" или механизм распределения внимания в прецедентном феномене как источник его полифункциональности в дискурсе. In *Когнитивные исследования языка: сб. научных трудов*, 23. Лингвистические технологии в гуманитарных исследованиях. Болдырев Н.Н. (ред.). Москва-Тамбов: Издательство Тамбовского Государственного Университета имени Г.Р. Державина, с. 90-100.
- Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 1 (3), p. 323-340.
- Goossens, L. (2003). Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action [revised version]. In *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. Dirven, R. & Pörings, R. (eds.). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 349-378.

Grady, J. (1997). Theories are buildings revisited. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 8 (4), p. 267-290.

'How 'MacGyver' became a verb'. Available at:

<http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-34075407>

Iriskhanova, O.K. / Ирисханова О.К. (2014). Игры фокуса в языке. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.

Kagramanov, K.R. / Каграманов К.Р. (2007). *Автономасия как средство языковой номинации: семантика и прагматика (на материале англоязычной прессы)*.

Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Лингвистический Университет.

Kanashina, S.V. / Канашина С.В. (2016). *Интернет-мем как новый вид полимодального дискурса в интернет коммуникации*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Лингвистический Университет.

Karaulov, Yu.N. / Караулов Ю.Н. (2010). Русский язык и языковая личность. Москва: ЛКИ, УРСС Эдиториал.

Konnova, M.N. / Коннова М.Н. (2015). Когнитивные сдвиги в семантике темпоральных лексем: корпусный аспект. In *Методы когнитивного анализа семантики слова*. Заботкина В.И. (ред.). Москва: Языки славянской культуры, с. 269-311.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langacker, R. (1993). Reference-point constructions. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 4, p. 1-38.

Langacker, R.W. (2009). Metonymic grammar. In *Metonymy and metaphor in grammar*. Panther, K.-U., Thornburg, L. & Barcelona, A. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 45-71.

Lavrova, N.A. / Лаврова Н.А. (2013). *Контаминация как словотворческая модель: структура, семантика, стилистика, прагматика (на материале современного*

английского языка). Диссертация на соискание степени доктора филологических наук. Москва: Московский Педагогический Государственный Университет.

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

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary of New Words and Slang: 'MacGyver'. Available at: http://nws.merriam-webster.com/opaendictionary/newword_search.php

Moiseyenko, L.V. / Моисеенко Л.В. (2015). *Лингвокогнитивные основы теории прецедентности*. Диссертация на соискание степени доктора филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Лингвистический Университет.

Nikitina, A.A. / Никитина А.А. (1997). *Имена собственные (антропонимы) в языке англоязычной рекламы*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Санкт-Петербург: Санкт-Петербургский Государственный Университет.

NOW Corpus. News on the Web. Available at: <http://corpus.byu.edu/now/>

'Obama's misplaced Robin Hood complex'. Available at: <http://www.libertyreborn.com/2008/10/24/obama%E2%80%99s-misplaced-robin-hood-complex/>

Peirsman, Y. & Geeraerts, D. (2006). Metonymy as a prototypical category. In *Cognitive linguistics*, 17 (3), p. 269-316.

Petrovich, Yu.V. / Петрович Ю.В. (2004). *Когнитивные основы образования новых фразовых глаголов в современном английском языке*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Калининград: Калининградский Государственный Университет.

Prokhorova, S.R. / Прохорова С.Р. (2005). *Особенности образования неологизмов со значением деятеля в современном английском языке*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Педагогический Университет.

Radden, G., Köpcke, K.-M., Berg, T., & Siemund, P. (2007). The construction of meaning in language. In *Aspects of meaning construction*. Radden, G., Köpcke, K.-M., Berg, T. & Siemund, P. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 1-15.

Radden, G. & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In *Metonymy in language and thought*. Panther, K.-U. & Radden, G. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 17-59.

'Robin Hood complex: foreigners fighting Daesh'. Available at:

<https://www.funker530.com/robin-hood-complex-foreigners-fighting-daesh/>

'Robin Hoodlum'. Available at: <https://nerdybookclub.wordpress.com/2015/08/02/the-robin-hood-within-by-kekla-magoon>

Ruiz de Mendoza, F. & Velasco, D. (2002). Patterns of conceptual interaction. In *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Cognitive linguistics research* 20. Dirven, R. & Pörings, R. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 489-532.

Sheremet, L.G. / Шеремет Л.Г. (1984). *Значение и стилистический потенциал английских имен собственных (именования людей)*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Ленинград: Ленинградский Государственный Педагогический Институт имени А.И. Герцена.

Shokina, I.M / Шокина И.М. (2006). *Словообразовательная номинация на базе антропонимов в современном английском языке*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Лингвистический Университет.

Talmy, L. (1985). Lexicalisation patterns semantic structure in lexical forms. In *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. 3, Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Shopen, T. (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 93-121.

Talmy L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Massachusetts and L.: The MIT press.

'The Dorian Gray effect'. Available at: <http://timemanagementedge.com/articles/time-as-a-commitment/139-dorian-gray-effect>

The International Dictionary of Neologisms. Available at:

<http://www.neologisms.us/>

The Rice University Neologisms Database. Available at:

<http://neologisms.rice.edu/>

'The Robin Hood Within by Kekla Magoon'. Available at: <https://nerdybookclub.wordpress.com/2015/08/02/the-robin-hood-within-by-kekla-magoon/>

Urban dictionary: 'Cinderfella'. Available at:

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=cinderfella>

Urban dictionary: 'Romney Hood'. Available at:

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Romney+Hood&defid=6707520>

Unwords. Available at:

<http://www.unwords.com/>

'What is a 'Robin Hood tax'?' Available at:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robin_Hood_tax

Wojciechowska, S. & Szczepaniak, R. (2013). *Modified idioms with HAND: a corpus based study of the metaphor-metonymy interplay*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the UK Cognitive Linguistics Association, King's College London.

Yermolovich, D.I. / Ермолович Д.И. (2005) *Основания переводоведческой ономастики*. Диссертация на соискание степени доктора филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Лингвистический Университет.

Yermolovich, D.I. / Ермолович Д.И. (1981). *Функционально-семантические особенности индивидуализирующих знаков*. Диссертация на соискание степени кандидата филологических наук. Москва: Московский Государственный Лингвистический Университет.

Zabotkina, V.I. / Заботкина В.И. (2012). *Слово и смысл*. Москва: Российский Государственный Гуманитарный Университет.

Abbreviations:

BofE – Bank of English.

COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English.

DPN(s) – derivatives from precedent names.

<p>Contact data</p> <p>Ekaterina Golubkova, DSc. (Philology), professor at Moscow State Linguistic University, Ostozhenka str. 38, 119034, Moscow, Russian Federation e-mail: katemg@yandex.ru</p>	 A photograph of Ekaterina Golubkova, a woman with dark hair and glasses, wearing a pink jacket, standing on a riverbank in Moscow. In the background, there are historic buildings and a canal with boats.	<p>Fields of interest</p> <p>Cognitive semantics, corpus linguistics, language variation, multimodal discourse.</p>
<p>Anastasia Zakharova, Lecturer at Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO University) of the Foreign Ministry of the Russian Federation, 119454, Prospekt Vernadskogo 76, Moscow, Russian Federation. e-mail: un_bello_gesto@mail.ru</p>	 A portrait photograph of Anastasia Zakharova, a young woman with long brown hair, wearing a dark top, looking directly at the camera.	<p>Cognitive semantics, word-formation, corpus linguistics, linguocultural studies.</p>

Résumé in English

The paper addresses the issue of meaning-making in a highly prolific and sprawling segment of English vocabulary – words derived from precedent names (DPNs) (famous fiction characters, film or cartoon heroes, and celebrities). These units seem to thrive especially in mass media discourse adding cultural and connotative expressiveness to narration. Within the framework of prior research they were basically studied in the works on anthroponyms, regular phraseological patterning and as a cross-cultural issue. In our research, we inventorized the basic derivational patterns of DPNs, revealing the four most frequent ways of their creation: compounding, blending, affixation, and conversion. Then we investigated three case studies of DPNs – Robin Hood cluster, Cinderella-based blends and Dorian Gray effect polysemy, with the aim of describing

the process of their meaning creation. In doing so we drew on the combination of methods worked out in the schools of contemporary cognitive linguistics, which proved to be quite complementary and non-contradictory: Frame analysis, Conceptual integration theory, the Theory of conceptual metaphor and metonymy, and windowing of attention theory. The major finding is that the alternating venues of processing the semantics of DPNs, which underlie their bias towards polysemy, seem to be basically grounded in the process of metonymic zoom-in on the selected content in the event frame that describes the precedent name. Likewise in DPN-blends metonymy is at work in the process of foregrounding the salient features of the two blended inputs, which sometimes leads to the so-called domain extension or restructuring of the initial event frame in the emerging blend. Corpus data, too, are suggestive of the fact that metonymy leaves a certain degree of indeterminacy which can be resolved in the context provided the user has sufficient backstage and cultural knowledge of the precedent phenomena.

Key words: precedent name, derivative, cognitive linguistics, frame semantics, conceptual integration, blend, metonymy, metaphor, windowing of attention, derivative from precedent name (DPN), Dorian Gray effect.

Résumé in German (translation by Maria Yelizaryeva)

Der Aufsatz befasst sich mit der Bedeutungsentstehung von Derivaten, die von Präzedenznamen abgeleitet wurden (bekannten Helden der literarischen Werke, Filme, Zeichentrickfilme sowie berühmten Personen). Solche Ableitungen, die in der einschlägigen Literatur auch als Deonyme bezeichnet werden, kommen im modernen Englischen viel vor, besonders im Medien-Diskurs, der dadurch an Expressivität und konnotativer Besetzung gewinnt. Bis jetzt wurden Deonyme vor allem in der Anthroponymie, Phraseologie sowie in der interkultureller Kommunikation studiert. In der vorliegenden Untersuchung werden grundsätzliche Ableitungsmodelle von Deonymen analysiert und es wird festgestellt, dass es vier viel benutzte Arten der

Derivation gibt, und zwar Zusammensetzung, Kontamination, Affigierung sowie Konversion. Ferner wurde die Semantik von drei Deonymenarten unter die Lupe genommen: das Cluster von Robin Hood-Ableitungen, Kontaminante, die vom Präzedenznamen Cinderella abgeleitet wurden, und Polysemie des Kompositums 'Dorian Gray effect'. Die Untersuchung beruht auf methodologischen Ansätzen von mehreren Richtungen der modernen kognitiven Linguistik, die sich als kombinierbar erwiesen. Dazu gehören Frameanalyse, die Theorie der konzeptuellen Metapher und Metonymie sowie windowing of attention. Aus der Untersuchung geht hervor, dass der Polysemie von Deonymen hauptsächlich Metonymie zugrunde liegt. Dies ist dadurch bedingt, dass der Präzedenznamenframe, der ein Ereignis beschreibt, mehrere Slots hat und diese werden auf einen anderen Frame aufgrund von Metonymie übertragen. Die Metonymie spielt auch eine große Rolle bei der Entstehung von Kontaminanten (Blends) in Folge von konzeptueller Integration. Nicht selten führt dies zur Erweiterung und "Metaphorisierung" der Kontaminantenbedeutung bzw. Restrukturierung vom originären Frame. Überdies zeugen Korpusbelege von semantischer Vagheit, die Deonyme in verschiedenen Kontexten aufweisen, welche allerdings durch das kulturelle Wissen über den Präzedenznamen aufgelöst werden kann.

Stichwörter: Präzedenzname, Derivate, kognitive Linguistik, Framesemantik, konzeptuelle Integration, Kontaminant, Metonymie, Metapher, windowing of attention, Deonyme, Dorian Gray effect.

Résumé in French (translation by Anna Bratseva)

Dans cet article, nous considérons le processus de la formation de la signification des designations dérivées des noms précédents (DPNs) (des noms des personnages des oeuvres littéraires, des films, bandes dessinées et des célébrités). Ces mots dérivés manifestent une haute activité dérivative dans la langue anglaise moderne. Ils dominent dans le discours des médias et ils lui ajoutent de l'expression et de la

signification connotative. Les DPNs ont été étudiés dans des recherches précédentes de l'antroponymie, de la modélisation phraséologique et de la communication interculturelle. Dans la recherche présente, nous avons analysé les modèles principaux des DPNs et nous avons établi les quatre modes de leur formation les plus fréquents: composition, contamination, affixation et conversion. Ensuite, nous avons effectué une analyse détaillée de la formation de la sémantique des trois DPNs – cluster avec le nom Robin des Bois, les contaminants avec l'élément Cinderella (Cendrillon) et nous avons étudié problème de la polysémie du composite Dorian Gray effect. Dans le processus de l'analyse, nous nous sommes appuyées sur une méthodologie développée dans plusieurs secteurs modernes de la linguistique cognitive, qui se sont manifestés comme cohérents. Ce sont l'analyse des frames, la théorie de l'intégration conceptuelle, la théorie de la métaphore conceptuelle et de la métonymie et la théorie de la distribution de l'attention. À la suite de l'analyse, nous avons conclu que le mécanisme cognitif principal du développement de la polysémie des DPNs, c'est la métonymie, ou la projection sélective métonymique du contenu des slots distincts d'un frame qui décrit la sémantique d'un nom précédent sur le frame résultant. Dans le processus de l'intégration conceptuelle des domaines qui accompagne la formation des contaminants, la métonymie est aussi importante. Elle entraîne souvent l'expansion de la signification métaphorisée du contaminant et/ou la réstructuration du frame d'origine. Les données des corpus montrent aussi un certain degré d'indétermination sémantique, que manifestent les DPNs dans les contextes différents, et qui, généralement, est éliminé grâce au soi-disant contexte culturel et la connaissance de l'essence du nom précédent.

Mots-clés: nom précédent, mot dérivé, linguistique cognitive, sémantique des frames, intégration conceptuelle, contaminant, métonymie, métaphore, mécanisme de la distribution de l'attention, nominations dérivées des noms précédents (DPN), Dorian Gray effect.

Résumé in Russian

В статье рассматривается процесс формирования значения производных номинаций, созданных на базе прецедентных имён (известных героев художественных произведений, фильмов, мультфильмов и знаменитостей). Данные производные, называемые в лингвистической литературе также деонимами, проявляют в современном английском языке высокую деривационную активность, преобладая в медийном дискурсе и придавая ему дополнительную экспрессивность и коннотативную нагруженность. В предшествующих исследованиях деонимы изучались в исследованиях по антропонимии, фразеологическому моделированию и в трудах по межкультурной коммуникации. В настоящем исследовании мы провели анализ основных деривационных моделей деонимов и выявили четыре наиболее частотных способа их создания: словосложение, контаминацию, аффиксацию и конверсию. Далее мы провели подробный анализ формирования семантики трёх разновидностей деонимов – кластера с именем Робин Гуд, контаминантов с элементом Cinderella (Золушка) и изучили проблему многозначности композита Dorian Gray effect. В процессе анализа мы опирались на методологию, разработанную несколькими направлениями современной когнитивной лингвистики, которые проявили себя как сопрягаемые и непротиворечивые. К ним относятся: фреймовый анализ, теория концептуальной интеграции, теория концептуальной метафоры и метонимии и теория распределения внимания. В результате анализа мы пришли к выводу о том, что основным когнитивным механизмом, лежащим в основе развития многозначности деонимов, является метонимия, или избирательное метонимическое проецирование содержания отдельных слотов событийного фрейма, описывающего семантику прецедентного имени, на результирующий фрейм. В процессе концептуальной интеграции доменов при образовании контаминантов метонимия также играет ведущую роль, приводя зачастую к расширительному "метафоризированному" значению контаминанта и/или переструктуриации исходного фрейма. Корпусные

данные также свидетельствуют о некоторой степени семантической неопределенности, которую проявляют деонимы в различных контекстах, и которая, как правило, снимается за счёт опоры на так называемый культурный контекст и знания сути прецедентного имени.

Ключевые слова: прецедентное имя, дериват, когнитивная лингвистика, фреймовая семантика, концептуальная интеграция, контаминант, метонимия, метафора, механизм распределения внимания, деоним, эффект Дориана Грея.

Article was received by the editorial board 30.10.16;

Reviewed 17.11.16. and 8.12.16.

Similarity Index 14%.