METONYMY ANALYSIS INVOLVING SOME LEXICONS

Ganieva Dildora Azizovna

Doctor of Philology, Associate professor of Ferghana State University

Sharipova Shokhsanam Kadirjon kizi

Ferghana State University, Linguistics, 2nd year master's degree in English.

Abstract. The main goal of the article is to present a survey of recent research on the role of conceptual metonymy in grammar and discourse. A related goal is to argue that metonymy is more than just a lexical phenomenon. After defining conceptual metonymy from a cognitive-linguistic perspective, a detailed summary of recent research (including the author's own contributions) on the functioning of metonymy in conceptualization, phonology, grammar and discourse-pragmatic inferencing is offered.

Keywords: metonymy, metaphor, cognitive linguistics, grammar, discourse.

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this paper is to present a brief survey of recent research in cognitive linguistics (CL) on metonymy aimed at (a) providing illustrative examples of the role of metonymy in grammar and discourse, (b) emphasizing the usually overlooked fact that metonymy regularly operates *under* (phonology, morphemics), *in,* and *above* (phrases, clauses, sentences, utterances and discourse) the lexicon. The reason for its multi-level operation is that metonymy is a fundamentally cognitive phenomenon.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Another problem is the status of certain WHOLE FOR PART metonymies, especially "active-zone" (AZ) metonymies [1]. This issue is connected to the controversial distinction between metonymy and "facets" or "modulation". Only those AZ phenomena which are clearly metonymic will be considered, that is, instances like *The Times criticized the minister* [where a mapping of COMPANY (NEWSPAPER) onto EMPLOYEE(S) (JOURNALIST(S))] occurs, but not unclear instances like *Your dog bit my cat*, where the conceptual shifts

ANIMAL (DOG) to ANIMAL'S BODY PART (DOG'S SET OF TEETH) and ANIMAL (CAT) to UNSPECIFIED PART OF ANIMAL'S (i.e. CAT'S BODY) are not clearly metonymic (it is not clear whether there is a stable pragmatic function relating source and target in these shifts). In any case, the difference between AZ and metonymy is a *gradual* one. The characterization of metonymy presented is very broad, but only uncontroversial instances will be discussed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One of the main tenets in CL is that "invisible" conceptual operations and conceptual structures often underlie online linguistic structure at all levels of linguistic processing [2]. The role of metonymy in them is evidence both of the conceptual nature of metonymy and of the fact that metonymy is not confined to lexical meaning.

Among the various types of metonymic models, Lakoff (Lakoff 1987: 77-90) cites what he calls "social stereotypes".

An example of the MOTHER stereotype is the "housewife-mother" who metonymically stands for the whole MOTHER category. See this instance of reasoning in terms of this stereotype (the concessive conjunction is quite revealing): *Jane is an excellent mother although she has a very demanding job outside her home.*

Another example is the BACHELOR stereotype, which presents bachelors as dating a lot, frequenting single bars, and being only interested in sexual conquest,

stands for the whole BACHELOR category. It motivates such examples as *Mary's husband is a real bachelor*, which does not constitute a logical contradiction in the metonymic model. It would count as a contradiction in the "standard", "rigid" BACHELOR model, whose prototype is an *unmarried* male adult human who has reached marriageable age. There are many more examples of metonymic cognitive models in the literature.

An example is the metonymic motivation of nominal morpheme {*ful*}, as in *armful* (Barcelona 2005a: 320-21). This morpheme occurs in this text in Eugene O'Neill's play *Long Day's Journey into Night*: TYRONE. *You're a fine armful now, Mary, with those twenty pounds you've gained*. This derivational morpheme derives nouns from nouns (*armful* from *arm*); other nouns with this morpheme are *bottleful, boxful, canful*, *worldful, churchful*. It historically originates in the adjective *full*. The meaning of the morpheme is "the quantity of X that fills or would fill Y" (adapted from the Webster's dictionary, 2nd edition, and the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), 2nd edition.. This sense of the morpheme seems to have been motivated in part by the metonymy DEGREE OF FILLING OF A CONTAINER FOR QUANTITY OF CONTENT FILLING IT, related to HEIGHT FOR QUANTITY. The domain of quantity is not directly activated by the subdomain of content within the FILLING ICM / frame, but by the subdomain of the degree to which the container has been filled by the content. In O'Neill's example, "the container" is a metaphorical one, namely Mary's arms.

Lexical metonymies are extremely frequent although they seem to be less frequent than purely inferential discourse-level metonymies (Barcelona 2005a). Therefore, most of the examples of metonymy usually offered in rhetoric and semantics handbooks are lexical metonymies, many of them of the sort that motivates polysemy, such as those motivating the extended senses of *hand* as manual worker or sailor, *nose* as the sense of smell illustrated by *this dog has a good nose*, or *chicken* as in *chicken meat*. These metonymies are well-known in historical linguistics,

rhetoric and lexical semantics, and they have been the object of detailed research in CL. Additional examples of lexical metonymies are discussed in sections six and seven on metonymy in grammar and discourse. We are mainly concerned here with the grammatical consequences of lexical metonymies (especially with regard to the morphosyntactic categorization of the respective lexemes) and with their discourse function (especially with regard to their role in reference-maintenance, discourse-pragmatic inferencing and, in general, in the creation of discourse coherence).

CONCLUSION

A rich amount of evidence and information has been provided to illustrate the role of metonymy in grammar and discourse and to emphasize the often overlooked fact that metonymy also regularly operates *under* (phonology, morphemics), *above* (phrases, clauses, sentences, utterance and discourse) the lexicon and *outside* oral language (such as sign languages, gestures, art), and that it is a primarily *conceptual mechanism*.

This conceptual nature explains why we regularly find the same general types of conceptual metonymies (EFFECT FOR CAUSE, PART FOR WHOLE, RESULT FOR CONDITION, ENTITY FOR SALIENT PROPERTY) operating at very different linguistic levels and in very different expressive and communicative modes.

Metonymies, on the other hand, chain to each other and to other conceptual factors such as metaphors and other types of contextual information to guide the processing of discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Alm-Arvius, Christina 2013: *Figures of Speech*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

2. Хаитов, Л. А. (2014). Значение эстетического воспитания в развитии личности студента педагогического вуза. *Наука. Мысль: электронный периодический журнал*, (10), 40-44.

3. Azamatovich, X. L. (2021). The Concept of Heart In The Treatises Of Hakim Termizi. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE*, *2*(3), 63-67.

4. Azamatovich, K. L. (2020). The role of the Hakim Termizi architectural complex in visiting tourism in Uzbekistan. *Вопросы науки и образования*, (9 (93)), 27-31.

5. Yuldasheva, D. THE IMPORTANCE OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING AND GROUP WORK IN ENGLISH CLASSES. *Zbiór artykułów naukowych recenzowanych.*, 100.

6. Artikbayeva, Z. A., & Egamova, G. A. (2022). Boshlang 'ich sinf ona tili darsliklarida so 'z birikmasi yuzasidan berilgan bilimlar tahlili. *Science and Education*, *3*(2), 734-739.

7. Sadikov, E. (2022). TIL O 'QITISHDA PRAGMATIKA MASALALARI: TA'RIFLAR, TANQIDLAR, TAHLILLAR VA TALQINLAR. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, *24*(24).