

The Features and Usage of Metaphor and Metonym in English Language

G'affarova Durdona

Master's degree student of Namangan state university

Article Information

Received: February 06, 2023

Accepted: March 07, 2023

Published: April 08, 2023

Keywords: *Stylistics, metaphor, metonym, stylistic devices, semantics, contrast.*

ABSTRACT

This article is aimed to analyze m and metonym, their usage in the texts, their distinct meaning as well as structural and semantic analysis based on the study of instances and excerpts from various contexts. The article viewed concepts of scientists on the lexical-semantic concepts of the metaphor and metonym, their distinct characteristics.

Introduction

Metaphor is a complicated stylistic feature that helps language user to illustrate an object, character or situation resembling or implying another thing. Metaphors are a form of tropological language, which refers to words or expressions that mean commodity different from their nonfictional description. Metonymy works by the contiguity (association) between two generalities, whereas the term "metaphor" is grounded upon their similar similarity.

Method

A Metaphor is a figure of speech that describes an object or action in a way that is not literally true, but helps explain an idea or make a comparison. It equates those two effects not because they actually are the same, but for the sake of comparison or symbolism still, it will presumably sound veritably strange, if you take a Metaphor literally. Metaphors are used in poetry, literature, and anytime someone wants to add some color to their language.

Metaphors are a form of tropological language, which refers to words or expressions that mean commodity different from their nonfictional description. In the case of Metaphors, the nonfictional interpretation would frequently be enough silly.

Metaphors show up in literature, poetry, music, and jotting, but also in speech. However, it presumably means that you should not take what they said as the verity, but as further of an idea, if you hear someone say directly speaking. For illustration, it's tests period and after examinations, scholars are saying effects like "That test was murder. It is a fair conjecture they 're still alive if they 're making commentary about the test, so this is an illustration of speaking directly or figuratively.

Metonymy and related numbers of speech are common in everyday speech and jotting. Synecdoche and metalepsis are considered specific types of metonymy. Polysemy, the capacity for a word or expression to have multiple meanings, occasionally results from relations of metonymy. Both metonymy and Metaphor involve the negotiation of one term for another. In Metaphor, this negotiation is grounded on some specific analogy between two effects, whereas in metonymy the negotiation is grounded on some understood association or propinquity.

American erudite philosopher Kenneth Burke considers metonymy as one of four "master homilies" Metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony. He discusses them in particular ways in his book *A alphabet of Motives*. Whereas Roman Jakobson argued that the abecedarian contradiction in commonplace was between Metaphor and metonymy, Burke argues that the abecedarian contradiction is between irony and synecdoche, which he also describes as the contradiction between dialectic and representation, or again between reduction and perspective.

In addition to its use in everyday speech, metonymy is a figure of speech in some poetry and in important rhetoric. Greek and Latin scholars of rhetoric made significant benefactions to the study of metonymy.

Metonymy works by the contiguity (association) between two generalities, whereas the term "metaphor" is grounded upon their similar similarity. When people use metonymy, they don't generally wish to transfer rates from one referent to another as they do with metaphor. There's nothing press- suchlike about journalists or crown- suchlike about a monarch, but "the press" and "the crown" are both common metonyms.

Results

Some uses of figurative language may be understood as both metonymy and metaphor; for illustration, the relationship between "a crown" and "a king" could be interpreted directly (i.e., the king, like his gold crown, could be putatively stiff yet eventually malleable, over-ornate, and constantly immobile). still, in the expression "lands belonging to the crown", the word "crown" is surely a metonymy.

The reason is that monarchs by and large indeed wear a crown, physically. In other words, there's existent link between "crown" and "monarchy". On the other hand, when Ghil'ad Zuckermann argues that the Israeli language is a "cross with some conversationalist characteristics", he's surely using Metaphor.

There's no physical link between a language and a raspberry. The reason the Metaphor "phoenix" and "ditz" are used is that on the one hand hybridic "Israeli" is grounded on Hebrew, which, like a phoenix, rises from the ashes; and on the other hand, hybridic "Israeli" is grounded on Yiddish, which like a ditz, lays its egg in the nest of another raspberry, tricking it to believe that it's its own egg. likewise, the metaphor "conversationalist" is employed because, according to Zuckermann, hybridic "Israeli" displays the characteristics of a conversationalist, "stealing" from languages similar as Arabic and English.

As regards metaphor, Leech conducted the following "notional classes": a) concreative, b) animistic, c) humanizing (anthropomorphic), and d) esthetic metaphors. These are also seen in Ullmann. Lakov and Johnson, who argue "that metaphors and metonyms are not random but instead form coherent Systems in terms of which we determine our experience", discuss (amongst others) the following metaphorical alternatives: argument is war, time is money, communication is sending, theories are buildings, ideas are food (people, plants, products, commodities, fashions), love is a physical force and several others. One particularly intriguing point in their theory is the link they establish between metaphors, categorization, and the notion of prototype.

For metonymic transfer time related to persons, thing and events may be regarded as an additional semantic component or Inferential Feature, as in Since Napoleon (the bomb, the war etc.). The part-whole relationship and the use of a particular for a general term are often referred to as "synecdoche". Ullmann mentions: spatial connections, content and Container, place of origin for foods and drinks, typical garments for persons, characteristic qualities for persons and objects, and names of actions for their concrete results. Lakoff/Johnson, in addition, give: producer for product, object used for user, Controller for controlled, Institution for people responsible, and place for the institution or event.

Discussion

Metaphor is the cognitive medium whereby one existential sphere is incompletely counterplotted onto a different existential sphere, the alternate sphere being incompletely understood in terms of the first one. The sphere that's counterplotted is called the source or patron sphere, and the sphere onto which it's counterplotted, is called the target or philanthropist sphere. Both disciplines have to belong to different superordinate disciplines.

This is principally the cognitive conception of metaphor proffered by George Lakoff, Mark Johnson and Mark Turner, Sweetser, and by other cognitive linguists who have been probing the field in the once times. Metonymy has not entered as important attention as metaphor in cognitive linguistics, although it's presumably indeed more introductory than metaphor in language and cognition said Taylor. Metonymy is a cognitive medium whereby one existential sphere included in the same common existential sphere.

Metonymy is a case of what Croft calls sphere pressing, whereas metaphor is a case of what he calls sphere mapping. In metonymy the target sphere is "stressed," i.e. mentally actuated, frequently with a limited converse purpose(Lakoff 1987 78- 80), because it is this sphere that's incompletely conceptualized by mapping onto it the source sphere included in the same common sphere. The difference between the two is that while metaphor involves a mapping across different cognitive models, metonymy is a mapping within one model. One order within a model is taken as standing for another order within the same model.

The main function of a metonymic expression, also, is to spark one cognitive order by referring to another category within the same model, and by doing that, to highlight the first category or the sub-model to which it belongs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the metaphor and metonym is essential stylistic devices that are quite prevalent in English language, they are widely used in literature and everyday life English usage. Metaphors are a form of tropological language, which refers to words or expressions that mean commodity different from their nonfictional description. about the test, so this is an illustration of speaking directly or figuratively. Metonymy and related numbers of speech are common in everyday speech and jotting. Synecdoche and metalepsis are considered specific types of metonymy.

REFERENCES

1. Dik, Simon C. 1997. "theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: "e Structure of the Clause (Edited by Kees Hengeveld). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Goldberg, Adele. 1995. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press. Halliday, Michael A.K. 1994. An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd. ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
3. Hopper, Paul J. and Thompson, Sandra. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. Language 56(2): 251–99.

4. Panther, Klaus-Uwe. 2005 The role of conceptual metonymy in meaning construction. In *Cognitive Linguistics. Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction*, Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza and M. Sandra Peña (eds.), 353–86. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
5. Radden, Günter. 2002. How metonymic are metaphors? In *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), 407–34. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Reddy, Michael J. (1979). The conduit metaphor: a case of frame conflict in our language about language. In *Metaphor and "ought"*, Andrew Ortony (ed.), 284–97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J. and Díez Velasco, Olga. 2002. Patterns of conceptual interaction. In *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), 489–532. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
8. Trausan-Matu, Stefan, Adrian Novischi, Stefano Cerri, Daniele Maraschi 2001 Personalised metaphor processing in texts on the web for learning a foreign language. *Proceedings of RILW 2001*, 205–212.
9. Wallington, Alan, John A. Barnden, Marina A. Barnden, Fiona J. Ferguson and Sheila R. Glasbey 2003 *Metaphoricity signals: A corpus-based investigation*. Technical Report CSRP-03-05. The University of Birmingham, School of Computer Science.
10. Wallington, Alan., John A. Barnden, Peter Buchlovsky, Louise Fellows, Sheila R. Glasbey 2003 *Metaphor annotation: A systematic study*, Technical Report CSRP-03-