Metonymical Interpretation of Conceptual Mappings in Kiswahili Metonymy

Mary Njeri Ndung'u and *P. I. IribeMwangi*
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract

According to traditional theorists, metonymy is interpreted as a figure of speech used in language. This means that metonymical processes involve transfer of meaning of words or entities which have a reference relationship with the meaning of other words or entities. Further, metonymy has been studied as an aesthetic figure of speech used in poetry and literature as a literary device. However, in recent times, this traditional view about metonymy has taken a different perspective where cognitive linguists such as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have shown that metonymy is conceptual in nature. This approach theorizes that metonymy is a relationship between concepts and not just mere words. This view is supported by Langacker (1993) who points out that metonymy is a cognitive process through which language users gain access to a mental entity through another entity. Arising from this shift in paradigm about metonymy, there is need to investigate how conceptual mappings in the mind are interpreted in Kiswahili metonymical constructions. To achieve this, this chapter is guided by the Conceptual Metaphor Theory as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

Key Words: Metonymy, Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM), Source Entity, Target Entity, Cognitive Grammar.

Introduction

This chapter investigates the interpretation of conceptual mappings in Kiswahili metonymy.This is significant because metonymy is not only seen as a figure of speech and an aesthetic tool in poetry according to traditional theorists but it is also a conceptual entity used in language and thought. That is, metonymical concepts, such as *the whole for the part*, are part of the ordinary, everyday way of how language users think, act as well as talk. These are functions which are active in their culture. In achieving the stated objective, the study examines

meaning aspects in Kiswahili metonymy, while at the same time explicating the systematic concepts in the interpretation of Kiswahili metonymical constructions.

Methodology

The methodology applied in this study is made up of four steps: identification, description, analysis, and discussion of metonymical constructions. Data for analysis has been sourced, specifically from four selected Kiswahili literary plays; Mazrui(1981, 2003), wa Mberia (2004, 2008), wa Mberia (1997, 2011), and Arege (2009) through the preferred sampling technique. The four Kiswahili literary plays have been purposively sampled for the study as they contain actual language examples which are conversational in nature. The metaphorical constructions selected for analysis were translated from Kiswahili to English, first into a word-to-word translation followed by semantic translation. These are the two ways of translation proposed by Mwansoko (1996:23, 25) in order to facilitate data analysis and interpretation. Finally, the grammatical constructions that build metaphor in Kiswahili are analysed vide Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

Theoretical Framework

This study is guided by the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) that was introduced by Lakoff and Johnson in1980. It has been highly influential within Cognitive Linguistics. This theory   explains cognitive systems and language as they occur in the general study of the brain and the mind. The field of CMT has its reference on Cognitive Psychology, Cognitive Neuroscience, and Developmental Psychology. Cognitive Linguistics brings together these disciplines in order to explain various language structures which include syntax, semantics, and discourse. Some of the basic elements of CMT and Cognitive Linguistics about metonymy relevant to this articles include the following statements:

a. Metonymy, just like metaphor, is conceptual in nature,
b. Metonymy is not a matter of linguistic substitution but a cognitive process through which language users gain mental access vide another mental access,
c. Metonymy is a relation between two contiguously related conceptual entities, and
d. Metonymy is not simply the use of a non-literal word for a literal one but a more natural use of language.

Meaning in Kiswahili Conceptual Metonymy

Metonymy in Cognitive Grammar is a term that is largely concerned with the interaction between form and meaning within a linguistic construction or symbol. Metonymy investigates the interaction between a linguistic construction or a sign

and its referent, as well as the relationship that obtains between, for example, an acronym and its full form, and the special interaction between a commonly used entity and the category it stands for. According to Lakoff (1987:78), metonymy is a term used to refer to a relation which exists in only one particular Idealized Cognitive Model[1] (ICM). An ICM can be seen as a whole that is composed of parts; more specifically, having the conceptual entities, or elements, making up the ICM as a whole. It is significant to note that there are some background requirements in a given ICM such as the "stands for" relation that may hold between two entities A and B, such that one entity of the ICM, B, may be used to cognitively access another entity A or it is called by the name of which it is associated or connected with. For example, in the construction **Wamitila** *amesomwa na wengi* (**Wamitila** has been read by many), people talk about reading the author **Wamitila** when they mean that his work has been read widely. The author's name, **Wamitila,** gives us mental access to the conceptual entity of the books he has authored and which have been accessed by many readers as reference materials.

Of significance also is that, as observed by Langacker(1993:30), metonymy allows access to a particular element of a domain and thus gives mental access to the target concept. In a Kiswahili metonymy such as *bara linalonyongwa kwa magugu ya ubeberu* (a continent that is being strangled by weeds of imperialism) as used in *Kilio cha Haki* (2003:6), it is notable that the metonymical construction *bara* (continent) designates the reference point which offers cognitive access to the expected target entity, that is, the entity *watu* (people) who are being represented. A target entity represented by the metonymical construction is accessed within the source domain because of domain highlighting. Metonymy in this perspective functions by laying emphasis on one domain within a concepts' domain model (Croft 1993). That is, the information or the encyclopaedic entries of a particular metonymical construction is used to give reference to another

---

[1]Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs) are understood as a 'complex structured whole, a gestalt' which organizes knowledge and uses metonymical mapping as one of its structuring principles, (Lakoff, 1987:68). ICMs are idealized models in that they have several characteristics. First, ICMs are created by human beings and may vary among cultures. For example the understanding of the Kiswahili construction *jogoo* (cock) receives different interpretation from one culture to another. It may be used to represent the *cock, a man who has many lovers,* and so on. Secondly, ICMs are wholes made up of parts like in the domain of a *week* which is made up of parts, that is, the days of the week; Monday, Tuesday, etc. Lastly, they aid in distinguishing metonymies which show the relation between two elements within an ICM and the relation existing between an ICM as a whole and its elements.

entity within the source domain. This idea is elaborated further through the following Kiswahili metonymical constructions:

    1. *Ulimwengu ni rafiki na adui.*
       (World is friend and enemy.)
       (The world is a friend and an enemy.)   (Mberia 2011:10)

    2. *Ulimwengu una marafiki na maadui.*
       (World has friends and enemies.)
       (The world has friends and enemies.)

In example (1), the speaker is a man. This man, identified as Mzee Balu in Kithaka wa Mberia's *Natala* addressing Mama Alika or Natala in that case, about how *ulimwengu* (world) is equated to *rafiki* (friend) and *adui* (enemy). In the cited sentence, the construction *ulimwengu* (world) is used to refer to the *people* living in it and not just a place as it is expressed in example (2). In example (2), part of the domain model associated with *ulimwengu* is that it is a place where one can find friends and enemies alike, giving this construction a literal interpretation. This shows that when a construction *ulimwengu* (world) is mentioned in a conversation and as used in example (1), the speakers and listeners will identify themselves with the *people* being referred to in the construction. The information or encyclopaedic entries of *ulimwengu* (world) such as has life, goes through hardships, kindness, has or lacks integrity, etc, are used to give reference to the entity of a place within the same source domain and making it conceptualized as *watu* (people).

From this point of view of domain models adopted from Langacker (1993), it is notable that a particular construction can metonymically highlight well defined but related aspects of language users' encyclopaedic knowledge. For instance, on listening to Mzee Balu, Mama Alika/Natala associates *ulimwengu* (world) to *people*. This is because in Natala's response, she says '*kwa nini inanifuata hivi?''* (Why is it following me like this?). we note that, after conceptualizing the metonymy in example (1), we establish the principal of hiding some aspects or features and highlighting others as specified in CMT in its interpretation. With reference to example (1), aspects of *ulimwengu* (world) as people are highlighted while those of *ulimwengu* (world) as a place as understood in example (2) are hidden. Only those specific aspects about *ulimwengu* (world) relevant in the metonymical construction are accounted for: for instance referring to people, asloving but at the same time hating. The relationship between the metonymy's source domain *ulimwengu* (world) and its target entity *ulimwengu* (people) is within one ICM. Thus, *ulimwengu* (world) is used to give mental access to the conceptual entity or to refer to *watu* (people). As such, the interpretation of conceptual metonymy observes the principle of highlighting a specific element of a single domain model.

Consequently, in the interpretation of conceptual metonymy, there are three main kinds of motivating relationships pointed out by Kovesces (2004) and, *Radden* and Kövecses (1999) that give rise to the metonymical constructions that occur often in language. The first is the one relating the part to the whole organization of a given source domain so that parts or substructures of the source domain represent the entire entity being represented as illustrated in:

3. *Bw. Chifu nimepokonywa **jasho langu.***
   (Mr. Chief they have stolen my sweat.)
   (Chief, my sweat has been stolen from me.)   (Mberia 2011: 46)

In example (3), the construction *jasho langu* (my sweat) is used by Natala while addressing Chifu at the time her land was in the process of being taken away from her by her brother in-law, Wakene. The metonymy *jasho langu* (my sweat) construes that the Natala's land was in the process of being forcefully taken away from her. 'Sweat' is a product of someone's sweat glands and therefore a part of someone's body. The construction 'sweat' is used in this case to refer to the speaker's property/land. We note that property/land is a whole entity which in the construction is represented by a part entity *jasho* (sweat); a part of a person's waste product. All highlighted encyclopaedic entries of *jasho*(sweat) which is the source entity such as odourless, produced after labour, a product of something, etc are mapped within the same domain through referential mapping into the ICM of land or property which is the target entity. Land or property could be interpreted as what is owned by Natala. As such, all the highlighted encyclopaedic entries of sweat, the source entity, are mapped onto land/property which is the target domain, both of them being within the same ICM. The second relationship involves an entity which has the organization of a whole representing a part as illustrated in the following example:

4. *Mama Alika, ulimwengu ni rafiki na adui.*
   (Mother Alika, world is friend and enemy.)
   (Mother of Alika, the world is a friend and an enemy.)

   (Mberia 2011:10)

It is observable that example (4) is similar to example (1) although they both receive different metonymical interpretation dependent on the context of use in Kithaka wa Mberia's play *Natala*. In this context, *ulimwengu* (world) is literally conceptualized as a place where living and non-living things thrive. When the construction *ulimwengu* (world) is used, the speaker points to the whole domain which entails all the things found in the world. However, the construction *ulimwengu* (world) as used by Mzee Balu is used metonymically to represent a part of the world, the specific place where they live, or even the people. It is notable that other things such as plants, animals, air, non-living things, etc, are hidden from the metonymical interpretation. Hence, *ulimwengu* (world) is

construed as the source entity used to refer to people who are the target entity represented. Of interest also is the noun *ulimwengu* (world) which is the construction selected to communicate the conceptual metonymy. The third relationship involves a part standing for another part organization or a part allowing conceptual access to another part of an entity. For instance, in the construction:

> 5. *Ukiyatazama (maafa)* **moyo** *unabubujikwa na machozi.*
>   (You if them look **heart** it is overflow with tears.)
>   (If you look at it (killings) the **heart** overflows with tears.)

(Mberia 2008:52)

Example (5) is a construction used by Nali in *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi* while expressing what she witnessed while on a mission to help people who had been affected and killed during tribal clashes. The metonymy *moyo* (heart) is an entity that is a part of the human body and it is used here to represent what another part of the body *jicho* (eye) could do during the act of *kububujikwa na machozi* (overflowing with tears). She is expressing what she had witnessed by using a part of the body *moyo* (heart) to give access or to refer to *jicho* (eyes) which is another part of the body. In this case, the action of the eyes of getting filled with tears is accessed through the construction *moyo* (heart).

The relationship for 'part for part' metonymical organization is observed. It is significant to note that the two entities; 'heart' and 'eye' are within the 'body' ICM where, as explained by Lakoff (1987:78), mapping is within the same ICM, in this case using the attributes of *moyo* (heart); solid, sympathetic, easily shaken, etc as the source domain and mapping them on to target entity *jicho* (eyes) without any cross domain mapping as it is in the interpretation of conceptual metaphors.

Moreover, there are a number of cognitive communicative principles which account for the selection of a vehicle for metonymical relationships. It is notable that in the interpretation of Kiswahili metonymical constructions, there are two basic principles with the first being 'Non-Human' entities being used metonymically to represent 'Human' entities and the second being 'Concrete' entities to metonymically represent 'Abstract' entities. In instances where non-human entities are used in a metonymical construction such as in the concrete construction *ulimwengu* (world), they are used to represent human entities such as the abstract entity *watu* (people), illustrated in example (1). However, there are instances as presented in example (5) where a human entity could be metonymically used to represent another human entity. For instance where the construction *moyo* (heart) is a human entity used to access another human entity *jicho* (person), although the principle of concrete entity versus abstract entity is observed.

Systematic Semantic Concepts in the Interpretation of Metonymical Constructions

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980; 2003), metonymical concepts are systematic, that is, in their interpretation there are ways through which language users organize their thoughts and actions. In metonymy, concepts allow language users to conceptualize one thing by means of its relation to something else. Similarly, as Panther and Radden (1999) and Panther and Thornburg (2003) point out, metonymical models in language users' mental system underlie the use of many kinds of symbolic expressions which are systematic. The models include 'The Place' used in reference to 'The Institution Located at that Place', 'Object Used' in reference to 'The User', 'Controller' in reference to the 'Controlled', and 'The Place' for 'The Event' among other systematic conceptual models. Kövecses (2010) also emphasizes that metonymy involves speaking about an important reference point which allows language users' to access another conceptual entity, the target. The reference point and the accessed conceptual entity must be within the source domain. Guided by these principles, this section further investigates the common metonymical entities and typical source elements in Kiswahili metonymy. Metonymical concepts are systematic and are analysed or categorised in a variety of ways in light of semantic representations which readily exist in language users' cultural orientation as supported by Lakoff and Johnson (1980; 2003). This applies also to the interpretation of metaphorical constructions. In the investigation of Kiswahili metonymical constructions from the selected literary texts, we examine the construction used, besides interpreting the metonymical expression guided by language users' embodied experience and cultural orientation about the specific metonymy. It is observable that the concept on the 'Part for a whole' allows language users to use a part of an entity to gain access to a whole of the same entity. In the following example:

> 6. ***Moyo*** *wangu ulianza kushikwa na jasho.*
> (Heart my it did start to get with sweat.
> (My heart started to sweat.)   (Mberia 2008: 51)

the construction *moyo* (heart) is used metonymically since it is a part of the body which is used by the speaker to access the attributes of the whole body which could only experience the biological process of sweating. Through the metonymy a 'part for a whole' the source domain is being accessed through the construction *moyo* (heart), the human body that started producing sweat. The construction is used in context where the young man *Waito* is narrating to his girlfriend, Nali, about his feelings to her, the first time they had an opportunity to be together.

Notably also is the instance of a Kiswahili metonymy used to process the concept of 'The part for the whole' where the source domain which is the carrier

of the metonymy is interpreted when a part of whole is referential to or stands for a whole, as illustrated in the following example:

7. *Hawajui kuwa kutoka sasa hawatakuwa na **mikono miwili** ya kuwahimili.*

(Not they know from now not they have with hands two of to them support.)

(They are not aware that from now they will not have two hands to support them.)   (Mberia 2011:23)

In example (7) the construction *mikono* (hands) is a part of the body, among other body parts such as the head, legs, etc, which is used to metonymically stand for a whole, that is, two parents who support their children as they grow up into adulthood. The construction *mikono* (hands) is the source domain concept and the part used in reference to the whole, in this case, the parents. For referential conceptual mapping to be successful, it is notable that, language is not just the only factor that is considered but the cultural orientation about what two hands would represent in relation to the context of use of the metonymy in *Natala*. Thus, the concept of *mikono miwili* (two hands) is the domain accessed to represent two parents, the target entity, which is understood, in reference to the parents' responsibility of supporting and nurturing the children. In case of the absence of one of them, the lives of their children will continue but differently in comparison to a case where there are two parents are available and engaged.

It is also significant to note that Kiswahili represents a 'Whole for Part' metonymical concept, where a 'Whole' entity which is the source domain serves as a reference point for allowing access to one of its parts. This shows that the functions of a whole entity are conceptually used in reference to the part to allow its access. It is notable that according to CMT, mapping is within the same ICM. The following Kiswahili construction is used to illustrate the systematicity of this metonymical concept:

8. *Tazameni **miji** ikinyongeka kwa magugu ya ubeberu*

(Look cities they get strangled by weeds of imperialism.)

(Look towns getting strangled by weeds of imperialism.)

(Mazrui 2003:27)

The construction in example (8) is sourced from Mazrui's *Kilio cha Haki* where a voice is heard lamenting about how people are being oppressed by foreigners in their own country. The construction *miji* (towns) is literally used to refer to a place. However, when used metonymically the conceptual entity *miji* (towns) is used in reference to the people in a specific part of a country who are being exploited by foreigners. Therefore, *miji* (towns) as a metonymical concept is an important reference point in that it is used as the vehicle in this metonymical

construction. It is worth noting that the target entity being referred to; the people, are fully independent parts of the towns and represents the target entities represented by *miji*(towns). Following Radden & Dirven(2007:14), the'Whole for Part'metonymy in example (8) is conceptual in nature because one entity is understood in respect to another. That is the metonymical concept *miji* (towns) as used in *Kilio cha Haki* is a part of Kiswahili users' cultural knowledge which is conceptualized through its attributes such as, supports life, full of human activity, organized, etc. These attributes are understood to access another entity, the people living in those towns.

Of significance also is the metonymical concept of 'Producer for Product', a system also evident in the processing of Kiswahili metonymy. This representation states that the source domain in the metonymy is the product produced or processed by a specific producer who, in this case, is a person. It is worth noting that the person's name is highlighted and any other concepts about the person such as how he behaves, how he looks, etc are hidden. The highlighted entity, the person's name, is thus used in reference to the product she/he produces; the concept in the mind of the language user is that of the product and not the person. The following metonymical concept mostly used among shoppers of leso/khanga is used to illustrate this systematic concept:

    9. *Amenunua **Abdalla***.

       (She has bought Abdalla.)

       (She bought Abdalla.)

In example (9) *Abdalla* is the name of a shop that sells kanga/leso in Mombasa town. The shop specializes in the sale of *kanga* and the construction *Abdalla*in this example is used as a referential entity for the product that is sold at that shop, the *kanga*. Of worth noting is that the construction *Abdalla* is the name of the person who produces *kanga*,thus the 'Producer' and the vehicle or the source domain and source entity in which referential mapping is done to represent the 'Product' it trades in, *kanga* which is the target element/entity. Referential mapping entails the use of all highlighted encyclopaedic entries of *Abdulla* the 'Producer' and using them to understand the 'Product'; one who produces the cloth, stitches the *kanga*, transports them, and markets them at his wholesale and retail shop. Kiswahili metonymy is also processed through the 'Object Used for User' metonymical concept. In this case, the object is the carrier or the source domain which represents the person who is known by other people to use it. From the example:

    10. *Tulinusurika kutokana na **panga na mishale***.

       (We did survive from by machetes and arrows.)

       (We survived the **machetes and arrows**.)

          (Mberia 2004:4)

The metonymical concepts *panga* and *mishale* (machetes and arrows) are weapons used during warfare by most traditional African communities. The example is used in *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi* by Nyagachi while explaining to Kabitho how they had survived the wrath of their enemies during the tribal clashes. These metonymical concepts are objects used in reference to the users or the people who used them in attacking Nyagachi's tribe. The construction used to represent the object is mentioned in a conversation between two characters in the play; Nyagachi and Kabitho. By mentioning the objects *panga* and *mishale* (machetes and arrows) the character *Nyagachi* does not literally mean the real objects, but the metonymical concepts of the constructions *panga na mishale* (machetes and arrows) are used to access the concept of the enemy/warriors who used them to attack another tribe. It is significant to note that due to cultural understanding of the construction *panga na mishale* (machetes and arrows) both *Nyagachi* and *Kabitho* are familiar with the tools/objects mentioned and when used in the conversation, they are able to construe what they represent, that is, in reference to people who used them. The use of the metonymy allows the reader or listener to conceptualize the referential entity; the warriors, without much effort because the tools/objects are part of the cultural encyclopaedic knowledge of what warriors use in attacking the enemy.

Worth noting also is the Kiswahili concept of 'Controller for Controlled'system where the construction in the metonymy that carries the source domain represents the person or entity that is in charge of the situation. The controller's role can be taken over by the person or entity that is ruled or controlled. In this case, the controlled is the source domain which is understood to represent another entity which is controlled but takes the role of the controller. We use the following example, though not sourced from the Kiswahili selected plays for purposes of analysis:

> 11. ***Al Shabab*** *yalipua Mogadishu.*
> (*Al Shabab* it has bombed Mogadishu.)
> (***Al Shabab*** bombed Mogadishu.)

In example (11), the construction *Al Shabab* represents a terrorist group in Somalia whose activities are grounded in the Islamic religion and it camouflages itself in this religion to terrorize their enemies and gain control of their territories. This terrorist group is made up of a group of people who are under the presidency of Somalia. So they are the 'Controlled', but when they threaten governance they are said to be the 'Controller'. *Al Shabab* and *Mogadishu* are both the source domains and the source entities and vehicles in this metonymical construction representing the target entities, a small group of rebellious people and the leadership in Somalia respectively.

Another metonymical concept is the one on 'Institution for People Responsible' which is realized in Kiswahili metonymy. This concept specifies that when a place is mentioned in a construction, in written or oral form, the place can be understood literally or metonymically. In this case, the construction used to name the place carries the source domain and it is used to refer to another entity within that single source domain to represent the people who are in charge of that institution. For example, in the metonymical construction:

12. *Mbona hamna heshima? Mbona mnadharau* **serikali** *namna hii*?

(Why don't you have respect? Why you now disrespect government like this?)

(Why don't you have respect? Why do you disrespect the government like this?) (Mberia 2011:29)

In example (12), the construction *serikali* (government) is the 'Institution' that represents the 'People Responsible' in its leadership. This example is used in *Natala* by Chifu who, in his style of soliciting for a bribe, wanted to know why Natala's family had proceeded with the burial before his arrival at the burial site. The systematic concepts or frame elements of the construction *serikali* (government) are the president, deputy-president, all the way down the ladder to the chief, and assistant chief. It is notable that all the other concepts relating to *serikali* (government) are not highlighted in the interpretation of the metonymical concept except the concept chiefwhich is highlighted and therefore used as the entity being accessed through the conceptual mapping of *serikali* (government) as used in the selected literary play. This is in agreement with one of the functions of metonymy in CMT that only relevant concepts are highlighted in the interpretation of a metonymical expression. This shows that when the name of the institution is mentioned in a conversation, it is not the concrete institution that is responsible but the people in authority. The source domain is *serikali*(government) within which mapping is done to represent the institution which in turn represents the people in charge of the institution in this case the *chief* who is demanding that mourners have to seek for permit through his office before they proceed with the burial of *Tango, Natala's* husband. Consequently, the metonymical concept of 'The Place for the Institution' domain mapping system is also observed through a Kiswahili metonymy. The place mentioned in the metonymy avails mental access to the institution as illustrated in the following example:

13. **Geneva** *ina haki ya kupigana vita kama inavyotaka*.
(Geneva it has right of to fight with war they way it is how want.)
(Geneva has a right to fight its wars the way it seems fit for them.)

(Mberia 2008:67)

The construction *Geneva* in example (13) is 'The Place' which is used in reference to 'The Institution'. Geneva is a city in Switzerland which hosts the offices where International Diplomatic meetings are held to produce agreements on Humanitarian Law of Armed Conflicts. When the construction *Geneva* is mentioned in a conversation between Kabitho and Tungaiin *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*, it is understood as the institution that holds and controls decisions on International Diplomatic meetings on Humanitarian Law on Armed Conflicts. Conceptual mapping of the metonymical concept, Geneva, is therefore done within the source domain which allows mental access to the international diplomatic activities carried out in Geneva.

Lastly, Kiswahili metonymy is also conceptualized through 'The Place for the Event'metonymical concept where the construction in the metonymy mentions a place where a certain or specific memorable event took place. In this case, the place once mentioned in a conversation contributes to the mapping of the place in relation to the event that took place there. For instance an example which describes a historical political scenario in Kenya is used:

14. ***Bomas*** *isiwe **Kasarani** mwaka huu.*
    (*Bomas* it not be *Kasarani* year this.)
    (*Bomas* should not become *Kasarani* this year.)

In example (14) the metonymical concept *Bomas* represents a place in Nairobi, Kenya, where a set up of Kenyan rich cultural heritage is realized, and also where political meetings and other activities are usually held. At the *Bomas*, any meetings held there have ended up successfully with agreements signed and honoured later after. This is contrary to *Kasarani*, the name of a place in Nairobi, Kenya,and an international sports complex. At the complex is a stadium for indoor games and often hired for meetings. In this metonymical construction, the metonymy *Kasarani* in example (14) is used to represent the place where at some point in the political history of Kenya, a political meeting was held and it ended up in a political betrayal. During the meeting, some politicians expected to receive political positions or favours but they were left cheated. So *Kasarani* is used in a conversation to refer to a place of political betrayal.

It is worth noting that when *Kasarani* is mentioned in the same in example (14), the participants in the conversation will not conceptualize it as an international sports stadium, as it was built for that purpose, but is used as the source domain or the carrier of the source entity on which mapping is done. The metonymical concept *Kasarani* in this construction is used in a conversation not to represent the place where meetings and games are held but to represent a historic event where political betrayal has taken place not once but twice in the political history of Kenya. A speaker uses this metonymical construction, *Kasarani* to represent the event that took place there. Other places in Kenya could

have witnessed other types of betrayal but this specific one is politically historical.

To conclude, it is significant to note that metonymical semantic patterns or systems are the types of relations between the explicit source entities and implicit source entities which form patterns or models such as 'Part for Whole', 'Whole for Part', 'Part for Whole', 'Place for Institution', 'Producer for Product', etc (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Some of these patterns or models are general such as 'Part for Whole' while other patterns/models are specific such as the 'Place for the Event'. Of worth noting also is that from this analysis is that some metonymical systems could not be available from the selected Kiswahili literary plays and were thus sourced by the researcher. This is an indication that use of metaphorical constructions and metonymy constructions in Kiswahili literary plays could not be given equal measure in their availability and usability. Metaphorical constructions are observed to be more preponderant in comparison to metonymical constructions.

Conclusion

This paper examined how conceptual mappings are interpreted in Kiswahili metonymy. The investigation has established that in Kiswahili metonymy, a target entity represented by the metonymical construction is accessed within the source domain because of domain highlighting. That through metonymy, a particular construction can metonymically highlight well defined but related aspects of language users' encyclopaedic knowledge such as associating *ulimwengu* (world) to *watu* (people). The paper also established that three main kinds of motivating relationships give rise to the metonymical constructions that occur often in language; part for the whole organization, 'whole for a part' organization, a part standing for another part organization or a part allowing conceptual access to another part of an entity.

It is also evident that metonymical interpretation in Kiswahili grammatical structures is in most cases understood in context and also through the encyclopaedic knowledge of the language users; socially, culturally, etc. That is the metonymy in a construction show that the information explicitly provided by a source entity does not itself establish the precise connections captured/conveyed by the speaker and hearer in using an expression but that such connections are only successful through cultural knowledge about the entity by language users and the context in which the metonymy is used.

References

Arege, T. M. (2009). *Kijiba cha Moyo*. Nairobi: Longhorn Publishers.

Croft, W. (1993). The Role of Domains in the Interpretation of Metaphors and Metonymies'. In *Cognitive Linguistics*. De Gruyter: Walter de Gruyter Foundation. Vol. 4. Pp 335-370.

Iribemwangi, P. I. & Ndung'u, M. N. (2018). "Metaphorical Extension of Kiswahili Tense: An Application of Conceptual Metaphor Theory" in *Mwanga wa Lugha*. Kiswahili Journal of Moi University.Vol. 2, No. 2, pp 55-75.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980, 2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1993). "Reference-point Constructions". In *Cognitive Linguistics* Vol.4: Pgs1-38. Birmingham: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mazrui, A. (1981, 2003). *Kilio cha Haki*. Nairobi: Longhorn.

Mberia, K. (1997, 2011). *Natala*. Nairobi: Marimba Publications.

Mberia, K. (2004, 2008). *Maua KwenyeJua la Asubuhi*. Nairobi: Marimba Publications.

Mwansoko, H. J. M. (1996).*Kitangulizi cha Tafsiri: Nadharia na Mbinu*. Dar es Salaam. TUKI

Panther, K. and Radden, G. (Eds). (1999). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Panther, K. and Thornburg, L. L. (1999). 'The Potentiality for Actuality in English and Hungarian' In Panther, K.& G. Radden, (Eds). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Panther, K. and Thornburg, L. L. (2003). 'The Role of Conceptual Metonymy in Meaning Construction'. In *Conceptual Metonymy*. Pgs 91-116.Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Radden, G. and Kövecses, Z. (1999). 'Towards a Theory of Metonymy'. In Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Radden (Eds). *Metonymy in Cognition and Language*. Pgs 17-59. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.