As much
"Not as **much** (food) as I'd like to see, anyway"

1. Category label (to be reproduced exactly from the source book/article at the lowest level mentioned by the author, if more than one are mentioned by her/him, such as EFFECT FOR CAUSE, etc.):
UPPER PART OF SCALE FOR WHOLE SCALE

ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

2. Hierarchical level (Generic/ high / basic / low level, with various possible degrees of specificity):

Generic: PART FOR WHOLE

↓

High: PART OF SCALE FOR WHOLE SCALE

↓

Basic: UPPER PART OF SCALE FOR WHOLE SCALE

↓

Low:
High-low: UPPER PART OF QUANTITATIVE SCALE FOR WHOLE SCALE
Lowest: "MUCH" FOR "QUANTITY" (general, neutral quantitative meaning)

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: This is the meaning of the lexical morpheme {much} in *as much*, *how much* or *so much*. The meaning of the quasi-pronoun *as much* is 'an identified type of entity in the same number or amount'. The meaning of the quasi-determiner is 'the same number or amount of X' (X = a variable type of entity, coded by the nominal head in the full NP).

3. Purely-schematic, typical, prototypical (Barcelona, "Reviewing the properties..." [2011])
Typical
ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

4. Examples of the metonymy offered by the author at any of the hierarchical levels discussed by her / him + Label each example to indicate the taxonomic domain (feelings, objects, geographical entities, actions, etc.) activated by the target.
ANSWER:

- **Example 1**: "Not as **much** (food) as I'd like to see, anyway" + A CONTEXTUALLY SPECIFIED QUANTITY (A HIGH QUANTITY) OF FOOD
- **Example 2** : "How **old** are you?" + AN UNSPECIFIED AGE LEVEL, i.e. an "age quantity / amount"
- **Example 3**: "He's six feet **tall**" + A CONTEXTUALLY SPECIFIED HEIGHT/SIZE LEVEL
- **Example 4**: "He loves you as **much** as John" + A CONTEXTUALLY SPECIFIED DEGREE OF EMOTIONAL INTENSITY

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: In example 4, CONCRETE INTENSITY is mapped onto (EMOTIONAL) INTENSITY via the metaphor ABSTRACT INTENSITY SCALES ARE CONCRETE QUANTITATIVE SCALES

5. Conventionality:
(i) Conceptual conventionality only (guiding reasoning, purely inferential/pragmatic purpose).
(ii) Conceptual and linguistic conventionality (either in oral or sign languages; reflected in the motivation of *conventional linguistic meaning or form*, and / or in *the guidance of inferencing to morphosyintactic categorization of a construction*; indicate which of these two areas the metonymy is involved in).
ANSWER:
(ii) Conceptual and linguistic conventionality. Motivates the conventional linguistic meaning of the lexical morpheme {much} in this construction.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

6. Language: English / Spanish / The relevant sign language, including the national variety of the oral languages and the regional / national sign language.

ANSWER:

American English

ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

7. Linguistic domains / levels where the metonymy has been attested.

7.1. Grammatical rank:
Morpheme
Indicate morphemic class: lexical, derivational, inflectional
Lexeme
Indicate lexical class: noun, full verb, adjective, etc.
Phrase
Clause
Sentence
Involves various levels. Indicate which.

7.2. MEANING
Constructional Meaning: (i) prototypical conventional meaning of a grammatical construction; (ii) non-prototypical conventional meaning of a grammatical construction; (iii) implied (inferred), non-conventional meaning of a grammatical construction;
+ Guiding morphosyntactic categorization? YES / NO
Utterance and discourse meaning (general pragmatic inferences)

7.3. FORM
Constructional Form: (i) prototypical conventional form of a grammatical construction; (ii) non-prototypical conventional form of a grammatical construction.
+ Guiding morphosyntactic categorization? YES / NO

7.4 GRAMMATICAL PROCESS INVOLVED (if any) (e.g. the metonymy may motivate an instance of grammaticalization, of affixal derivation, of conversion, etc.)

ANSWER:
7.1. Grammatical rank: lexical morpheme

7.2. MEANING
a) *Constructional Meaning*: (i) prototypical conventional meaning of a grammatical construction: Neutral quantitative meaning of the lexical morpheme {much} in the quasi-pronoun '**as much**'
+ Guiding morphosyntactic categorization? NO

7.3. FORM: NOT APPLICABLE

7.4 GRAMMATICAL PROCESS INVOLVED:
- Grammaticalization of the lexeme *much* as a lexical morpheme.
- Conversion and downgrading of lexeme (determiner 'much') to lexical morpheme ({much}) within the quasi-determiner phrase "**as much...(as)**".

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: 7.2. The metonymy seems to have operated only historically in the development of this morphemic meaning. Hence it does not seem to guide inferencing to morphosyntactic categorization in present-day American English.

8. Metonymic trigger(s) (factors) leading to the operation of the metonymy.
(i) Co-textual
(ii) Contextual other than co-textual (Grammatical knowledge, Frames / ICMs, cognitive-cultural context, situational context, communicative context (participants, time and place of utterance, etc), communicative aim and rhetorical goals of the speaker / writer, genre. Other contextual / pragmatic factors).

ANSWER:
To be investigated

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: The metonymy seems to have had a purely motivational role (i.e. only historical). The triggers (whichever they were) operated historically. This requires investigating this issue or consulting the literature on the historical development of this morpheme.

9. Metonymic chaining (as in Barcelona 2005a) YES / NO
Indicate the metonymy/ies chained to the metonymy under analysis according to the author (in the diachronic or synchronic motivation of the forma or the meaning of a construction; in the referential value of an NP; or in a metonymy-guided inferential chain)

ANSWER:

YES

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: Indirect chaining to the metonymy SALIENT PART OF FORM FOR WHOLE FORM, which co-motivated the ellipsis leading to the *historical* shift from the determiner "as much...(as)" to the pronoun "as much".

10 . Conceptual connections to other metonymic hierarchies. Can the metonymy be included in other hierarchies apart from those in field 2?

NO

ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

11. Patterns of interaction with metaphor and with other metonymies:

11.1. In the conceptual motivation of metaphor or metonymy (Introduction to Barcelona 2000 and Barcelona 2002 ("Clarifying")):

A metonymy motivates the existence of a metaphor (register only if the author mentions this point).

A metaphor motivates the existence of a metonymy (register only if the author mentions this point).

11.2. In the conceptual motivation of the conventional form or meaning of a construction

11.3. In discourse understanding: Indicate any combination observed between the metonymy under analysis and one or more metaphors or metonymies in the example analyzed by the author, whether or not the author states this.

ANSWER:

11.1. **NO**

11.2. **NO**

ADDITIONAL REMARKS: Since the metonymy is purely *motivational*, it cannot be said to be combined textually (hence synchronically) with the metaphor ABSTRACT INTENSITY SCALES ARE CONCRETE QUANTITATIVE SCALES in the comprehension of one of the examples in Field 4 (example 4, *He loves you as much as John*).

12. (Reference to) Relevant contextualized authentic corpus examples for parameters 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, y 11. **This entry field will only be applicable at the corpus analysis stage.**

13. Barcelona, Antonio (2009) "Motivation of construction meaning and form. The role of metonymy and inference". In Thornburg, Linda, Panther, Klaus-Uwe, y Barcelona, Antonio (eds.), *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar* (*Human Cognitive Processing* 25). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 363-401.