LEXICAL STYLISTIC DEVICES: METONYMY
Supervisor: **G'ofurova Sarvaraxon Madaminjanovna**
Student: **Azimova Dildoraxon Akramjon qizi**
Andijan State Institute Of Foreign Language

Abstract

This paper explores the lexical stylistic device of metonymy, a figure of speech that involves substituting the name of one thing with the name of something else closely associated with it. By examining the mechanisms and functions of metonymy in language, we aim to highlight its significance in enhancing meaning, creating vivid imagery, and facilitating communication. The study delves into various types of metonymy, including synecdoche and the use of brand names as substitutes for products.

Keywords: Metonymy, lexical stylistic devices, figures of speech, language, communication, synecdoche, imagery, textual analysis, cultural narratives.

Metonymy is one of the major figures of speech recognized in classical rhetoric. The anonymous author characterizes metonymy as "a trope that takes its expression from near and close things by which we can comprehend a word that is not denominated by its proper word. This ancient characterization already points to the notions of contiguity and substitution that have ever since been criterial in distinguishing metonymy from metaphor. Traditionally, metonymy has been regarded as a stand for relation in which the name of one thing, the source or vehicle, is used to refer to another thing, the target, with which it is associated or to which it is contiguous. This view can be called the substitution theory of metonymy. A corollary of the substitution theory is that the source and the target are, at some level of analysis, considered to be equivalent ways of picking out the same referent. For example, in the sentence Buckingham Palace issued a statement this morning the place name Buckingham Palace may be said to stand for the British Queen or one of her spokespersons. Under this view, the source expression indirectly achieves the same referential purpose as the more direct referring expression the Queen [1].

The substitution theory is, however, too simplistic in at least two respects. First, it typically focuses only on cases of referential metonymy, neglecting the fact that there are also predicational and illocutionary metonymies. For example, in She is just a pretty face the noun phrase a pretty face is not used referentially but predicatively. A pretty face is not just a substitute expression for a pretty person but also highlights the prettiness of the person's face, from which the prettiness of the person can be inferred. This the above sentence expresses more content than She is just a pretty person. 2

Metonymy as a conceptual and pragmatic phenomenon Recent studies have shown that metonymy is more than a rhetorical trope, i.e. not just a matter of words but is deeply rooted in human cognition. Metonymic reasoning is in fact a pervasive and ubiquitous phenomenon. An important facet of conceptual metonymy is that it provides the basis for pragmatic inferences. These two aspects of metonymy are elaborated below. 2.1 Metonymy as a conceptual phenomenon The conceptual nature of metonymy has been demonstrated by Lakoff in his study of the source of prototype effects. For example, the term mother evokes prototype effects of a housewife mother. The source of these effects is the social stereotype of mothers as housewives in our culture. The relationship between mothers and housewives is metonymic and operates only on the conceptual level: the category mother is metonymically associated with the subcategory housewife mother as one of its members [2].

Metonymic links are used for reasoning or inferencing purposes. Like implicatures, metonymies can become completely conventionalized, i.e. end up as senses of a polysemous word. A metonymy may thus relate established senses of a word, but it may also be used in communication situations to produce novel meanings. Metonymic coercion also seems to play a role in the interpretation of other non-finite clauses that involve the problem of "control". For example, in The teacher asked Johnny to go the bathroom, the usual (unmarked) interpretation is that Johnny is supposed to go to the bathroom—i.e., the object of the main clause "controls" the reference of the understood subject in the infinitive clause. In contrast, in Johnny asked the teacher to go to the bathroom, the most likely interpretation is that the referent of the subject Johnny will go to the bathroom. The latter reading may be seen as a metonymy where going to the bathroom stands for „being allowed to go to the bathroom". The infinitive highlights the intended pragmatic effect of such an act of permission, which itself is not expressed in the sentence. In other words, the interpretation of this sentence involves the metonymy action for precondition of action, more specifically, pragmatic effect of speech act for speech act. as another example, consider Nikiforidou's observation that there is a systematic ambiguity in the interpretation of nominalizations in English. [3].

Metonymy is one of the four categories of metaphor (the second category, though he never used the word metonymy explicitly). Since then his study of metonymy has been confined within the study of metaphor for centuries. The study of metonymy in cognitive linguistics starts with the publication of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's influential book Metaphors We Live By (1980, p.37), in which it is claimed that metonymy, like metaphor, is not only a linguistic form but also a powerful cognitive

tool for people's conceptualization of the world:" Metonymy allows us to conceptualize one thing by means of its relation to something else; metonymic concepts structure not just our language but our thoughts, attitudes, and actions; Metonymic concepts (like THE PART FOR THE WHOLE) are part of the ordinary, everyday way we think and act as well as talk." Langacker explains metonymy as "a process consists in mentally accessing one conceptual entity via another entity". This definition points out the cognitive nature of metonymy. Blank's definition seems clearer, which considers metonymy as "a linguistic device based on salient conceptual relations within a frame network". In this definition, Blank points out that "salient" is an important notion in the view of metonymy. Later on, Radden and Kovecses define metonymy from a cognitive perspective as: "metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealized cognitive model" [4].

All in all, despite the different viewpoints they adopt, most cognitive linguists agree on the fact that, metonymic process consists in mentally accessing one conceptual entity via another entity; metonymy is not merely a figure of speech, but is part of people's everyday way of thinking; and, the function of metonymy is not just to achieve some artistic or aesthetic purpose but rather to better understand concepts. It is an effective cognitive tool for people to conceptualize the world. 2.2 The cognitive classification of metonymy Classification of metonymy is one of the crucial concerns of research in both traditional rhetoric and cognitive linguistics, as it contributes to understanding the exact nature of metonymy. It seems there are no systematic criteria for the classification and it lacks generality, so it is hard for people to understand the real nature of metonymy. Cognitive linguists take a different view at the classification. One particular appealing proposal is offered by Panther and Thornburg, who have classified metonymies pragmatically into three groups: referential metonymies, predicational metonymies and illocutionary metonymies (or speech act metonymies). The first one is the often-heard claim that metonymies are typically used for indirect referring, example like PLACE FOR INSTITUTION helps to identify the intended referent of the organization. In predicational metonymies, a statement is used to refer to a different statement. She was able to finish her dissertation. b. She finished her dissertation. Sentence a and b are not semantically synonymous, and sometimes it is possible to assert a and to deny b without contradiction. Yet on many occasions, speakers can use a to pragmatically convey the same propositional content as that expressed in b. In this sense, the statement a can be used to stand for the statement b, the only difference being that in the first case the speaker predicts the ability to finish

the dissertation of the subject she, whereas in the second case the speaker predicts the actuality of finishing it. In pragmatic terms, b is a generalized conversational implicature induced by a. This predicational metonymy exemplifies the POTENTIALITY FOR ACTUALITY metonymy, which is very common in English language: A potential event (e.g. the ability, possibility, permission, obligation to undertake an action) is metonymically linked to its actual occurrence. Panther and Thornburg also put forward the concept of illocutionary metonymies wherein one illocutionary act stands for another illocutionary act. I don't know where the bath soap is. b. Where is the bath soap? In this case, sentence a has the direct illocutionary force of an assertion about what the speaker does not know, but in many contexts it is used with the indirect illocutionary force of a question, that is, a may metonymically stand for the question or inquiry b. The significance of Panther and Thornburg's classification lies in the fact that for them metonymy is not restricted to its referring function but is much more pervasive in ordinary language use [5].

In conclusion, metonymy serves as a vital lexical stylistic device that enriches language by establishing connections between concepts through associative relationships. Its ability to condense complex ideas into more accessible forms enhances both the clarity and emotional resonance of communication. The analysis presented in this paper demonstrates that metonymy is not merely a linguistic curiosity but a fundamental aspect of how we construct meaning in everyday interactions and literary works alike. As we continue to explore the nuances of language, recognizing the role of metonymy can deepen our understanding of how words shape our perceptions and cultural expressions. Future research may further investigate the implications of metonymic usage across different languages and cultures, providing insights into the universal and particular aspects of human communication.

References:

1. Blank, A. (1999). Co-presence and succession: A cognitive typology of metonymy. In K. Panther & G. Radden (Ed.), Metonymy in Language and Thought (PP.169-191). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

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

3. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Lakoff, G. (1987) Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

4. Blake, W. (1794). *Songs of Experience*. Oxford University Press.

5. Langacker, R. W. (1993). Reference-Point Constructions. Cognitive Linguistics, 4, 29-40. Panther, K. & Radden, G. (1999). Introduction. In K. Panther & G. Radden (Ed.), Metonymy in Language and Thought (PP.1-14). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.