ISSN NO: 2770-2367
Date of Publication: 21-01-2023

Metaphor and metonymy in literature.

Sultanova Sadoqat Baxridinovna
UzSWLU, student of MA department,
Superviser: Teacher of UzSWLU **Safarova Zarina Giyosovna**

Annotation.
This article is selected examples of metonymy from metaphor and from literalness and anomaly in short English sentences. In the method, literalness is distinguished because it satisfies contextual constraints that the nonliteral others all violate. Metonymy is discriminated from metaphor and anomaly in a way that [1] supports Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) view that in metonymy one entity stands for another whereas in metaphor one entity is viewed as another.

Key words: language, style, literature, figure of speech occasionalism, formal, novel, text.,connotational meaning.

Metaphor in literature is regarded as a figure of speech. It is traditionally based on the notions 'similarity' or 'comparison' between the literal and the figurative meaning of expressions. This can be explained by means of the word 'eye': Whereas 'eye' is a part of the body of people and animals, located in the head, organ of sight and locus of production of tears the word 'eye' can be involved in a figurative use, too:
For example: The expression *the eye of heaven* refers to the sun.
The term "metaphorical expression" refers to a linguistic expression (a word, phrase or sentence) that is the surface realization of a cross-domain mapping, that will be explained in the final draft.
In literature, Metonymy is a figure of speech in which the name of an attribute of a thing is substituted for the thing itself (e.g. the crown for a monarchy, the White House for the US Government [President]). Rather than naming a thing by its proper name, you only name a part of it, which, then, replaces the thing as a whole. Important to note is that the correct understanding of metonymy is highly dependent on the context in which it is uttered.
Take, for example, the following sentence:
Buckingham Palace denied the rumours.
Here you see that the building (Buckingham Palace) stands for the institution (the monarch). It is, of course, not the building itself that denied the rumours, but the monarch. As we all know that the monarch resides in the palace, we all understand that it was him/her, who denied them (Place for Institution). Metonymy is always characterised by a schematic form:
B for A

Differences between Metaphor and Metonymy?

When we use a metaphor, we say that A *is* B. We do not only compare two object (as is the case with similes), but express one word in terms of another. The thing with which another one is compared is called *the vehicle*, the feature that both terms have in common is called *the tenor*.
In metonymy, the formula "B to A" is represented. In contrast to metaphor, metonymy does not refer to the smimilarity between two objects but to their similarity in *function*. In metonymy, however, we do not say that two terms are alike, but use a term as *substitution* for the other, which only represents a certain feature of the term compared.
The sceme is not **"A is B"** but rather **"A for B"**!
Cognitive semanticists argue, that **metonymy** is not a purely linguistic device but is central to human thought.
As for the nature of semantic changes, it is connected with some sort of association between the old and the new meanings. These associations can be of two types: of similarity (linguistic metaphor), of contiguity (linguistic metonymy).

ISSN NO: 2770-2367
Date of Publication: 21-01-2023

Metaphor - a transfer of meaning based on different types of similarity, it is a hidden comparison, e.g. in the area of computers a lot of words acquired new meanings: *mouse, mat, windows, monitor, notebook, worm;* in the sphere of economics: *market, bargain, deal, promotion*.
Metonymy - a transfer of meaning based on contiguity: *The kettle is boiling I recognize his hand. He married money*.
Changes in the denotational meaning may result in the restriction of the types **or** range of referents denoted by the word. This may be illustrated by the semantic development of the word **hound *(OE*. hund)** which used to denote 'a dog of any breed' but now denotes only 'a dog used in the chase'. This is generally described as "restriction of meaning" and if the word with the new meaning comes to be used in the specialised vocabulary of some limited group within the speech community it is usual to speak of specialisation of meaning. For example, we can observe restriction and specialisation of meaning in the case of the verb **to glide *(OE*. glidan)** which had the meaning 'to move gently and smoothly' and has now acquired a restricted and specialised meaning 'to fly with no engine' (cf. **a glider).**
Changes in the denotational meaning may also result in the application of the word to a wider variety of referents. This is commonly described as extension of meaning and may be illustrated by the word **target** which originally meant 'a small round shield' (a diminutive of **targe, cf. *ON*. targa)** but now means 'anything that is fired at' and also figuratively 'any result aimed at'.
If the word with the extended meaning passes from the specialised vocabulary into common use, we describe the result of the semantic change as the generalisation of meaning. The word **camp,** e.g., which originally was used only as a military term and meant 'the place where troops are lodged in tents' (cf. *L*. campus — 'exercising ground for the army) extended and generalised its meaning and now denotes 'temporary quarters' (of travellers, nomads, etc.).
As can be seen from the examples discussed above it is mainly the denotational component of the lexical meaning that is affected while the connotational component remains unaltered. There are other cases, however, when the changes in the connotational meaning come to the fore. These changes, as a rule accompanied by a change in the denotational' component, may be subdivided into two main groups: a) pejorative development or the acquisition by the word of some derogatory emotive charge, and b) ameliorative development or the improvement of the connotational component of meaning. The semantic change in the word **boor** may serve to illustrate the first group. This word was originally used to denote 'a villager, a peasant' (cf. *OE*. **zebur '**dweller') and then acquired a derogatory, contemptuous connotational meaning and came to denote 'a clumsy or ill-bred fellow'. The ameliorative development of the connotational meaning may be observed in the change of the semantic structure of the word **minister** which in one of its meanings originally denoted 'a servant, an attendant', but now — 'a civil servant of higher rank, a person administering a department of state or accredited by one state to another'.
Metaphor and Metonymy are two commonly used literary devices in literature. Metaphor is a figure of speech that compares two unrelated subjects without the use of connecting words like "like" or "as." Metonymy is a figure of speech in which the name of an idea or object is substituted for another name that the original name is closely associated with. The **main difference** between metaphor and metonymy is that **metaphor compares two things whereas metonymy replaces one thing for another**.
It is of interest to note that in derivational clusters a change in the connotational meaning of one member doe's not necessarily affect a the others. This peculiarity can be observed in the words accident an accidental. The lexical meaning of the noun accident has undergone pejorative development and denotes not only 'something that happens by chance', but usually'something unfortunate'. The derived adjective accidental does not possess in its semantic structure this negative connotational meaning (cf. also fortune: bad fortune, good fortune and fortunate).

Used literature

1. J.K. Rowling. Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury, 1998. – p. 110-111

ISSN NO: 2770-2367
Date of Publication: 21-01-2023

2. Translator Sh. Dolimov , Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets / “Harry Potter” Part II of the series of novels / A series of jewels of world literature. Joanna Kathleen Rowling ,– Tashkent, Smart Reader, 2021. – page174.
3. J.K. Rowling. Harry Potter and Philosopher’s Stone. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury, 1997. – p.53
4. Translator Sh. Dolimov , Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets / “Harry Potter” Part I of the series of novels / A series of jewels of world literature. Joanna Kathleen Rowling ,– Tashkent, Literary sparks, 2018. - p. 77.
5. J.K. Rowling. Harry Potter and Philosopher’s Stone. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury, 1997. – p.131
6. Translator Sh. Dolimov , Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets / “Harry Potter” Part I of the series of novels / A series of jewels of world literature. Joanna Kathleen Rowling ,– Tashkent, Literary sparks, 2018. - p. 77