



**METONYMY AND METAPHOR IN LITERARY DISCOURSE:
SEMANTIC AND STYLISTIC INTERRELATIONS IN ENGLISH,
UZBEK AND KARAKALPAK**

Kosbergenova Umida Jumabek qizi

Master's student, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

umidakosbergenova@gmail.com Phone number: 91 303 21 72

Academic supervisor: **Baisov Axmad Sabijonovich**

Abstract

The thesis examines the semantic and stylistic relations between metonymy and metaphor in literary discourse, using English examples and Karakalpak material from stylistic studies. Both phenomena involve semantic transfer, but they are motivated by different relations: metonymy by contiguity between connected entities, metaphor by similarity between concepts. The thesis discusses how each mechanism contributes to meaning construction and expressiveness, and why the boundary between them requires contextual analysis.

Keywords

metonymy, metaphor, semantic transfer, literary discourse, stylistic function, similarity.

Annotatsiya. Tezisdagi badiiy diskursda metonimiya va metaforaning semantik va stilistik o'zaro munosabati ingliz tili misollari hamda stilistik tadqiqotlardagi qoraqalpoq tili materiali asosida ko'rib chiqiladi. Ikkala hodisa ham ma'no ko'chishiga asoslanadi, biroq ular turli munosabatlarga tayanadi: metonimiya o'zaro bog'liq predmetlar o'rtasidagi yaqinlikka, metafora esa tushunchalar o'rtasidagi o'xshashlikka asoslanadi. Tezisdagi har bir mexanizmning ma'no hosil qilish va ifodalilikka qo'shgan hissasi hamda ular orasidagi chegarani aniqlash uchun kontekstual tahlil zarurligi muhokama qilinadi.

Kalit so'zlar: metonimiya, metafora, ma'no ko'chishi, badiiy diskurs, stilistik vazifa, o'xshashlik.



Аннотация. В тезисах рассматриваются семантические и стилистические взаимосвязи метонимии и метафоры в художественном дискурсе на примерах английского языка и каракалпакского материала из стилистических исследований. Оба явления связаны с семантическим переносом, но основаны на разных отношениях: метонимия — на смежности (контигуальности) связанных предметов, метафора — на сходстве понятий. Обсуждается вклад каждого механизма в построение значения и выразительность, а также почему для определения границы между ними необходим контекстный анализ.

Ключевые слова: метонимия, метафора, семантический перенос, художественный дискурс, стилистическая функция, смежность, сходство.

Introduction. Figurative language lets writers express complex meanings in concise form, and metonymy and metaphor are among its main mechanisms. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) show that figurative language is not only literary decoration: it takes part in ordinary thought and communication. Metonymy rests on a different relation. In the cognitive account of Radden and Kövecses (1999), one entity gives mental access to another entity within the same conceptual structure. Metonymy can therefore be studied as a mechanism of meaning construction and not only as a stylistic device.

Main part. The key semantic feature of metonymy is the transfer of meaning on the basis of an association between objects, phenomena or concepts. Typical patterns include container and content (*the kettle is boiling*), author and work (*to read Shakespeare*), and place and institution (*the White House announced a decision*). Through such relations an expression can refer to something beyond its direct lexical meaning.

In Karakalpak linguistics, metonymy is treated as transferred meaning based on connections between objects and phenomena. Bekbergenov (1990, p. [78-79]) discusses it within the semantic and stylistic resources of the language. For example, *tabaq* 'dish' may refer not only to the vessel but, in context, to the food it contains. Similarly,



"ZAMONAVIY TA'LIM VA TILSHUNOSLIK RIVOJI"
nomli respublika ilmiy-amaliy masofaviy konferensiyasi
VOLUME-1, ISSUE-7, 2026

shañaraq, the upper circular part of a traditional Karakalpak dwelling, may acquire a broader association with the household or family [78]. In both cases the meaning depends on the relation between the lexical item, its referent and the cultural context, and neither extended sense is automatic. Metonymic expressions may be conventional or created for a stylistic purpose. Conventional ones are familiar and readily understood. Individual ones may foreground a particular feature of an event or situation. In literary discourse both types contribute to conciseness, expressiveness and the organization of textual meaning. The distinction between metonymy and metaphor is central to semantic analysis. Metonymy is based mainly on contiguity. Metaphor involves perceived similarity and, in Kövecses's (2010) account, a conceptual process in which one domain is understood in terms of another. Compare *The White House announced a decision* (place → people acting through it: metonymy) with *Her voice was velvet* (sound compared with the texture of a material: metaphor).

The boundary is not always clear, however. Some expressions combine an associative relation with a perceived similarity, so classification should not rest on lexical form alone. It requires attention to context, conventional meaning and the communicative purpose of the expression. A comparison of English, Uzbek and Karakalpak can show how these mechanisms work in different linguistic and cultural settings. Similar general patterns do not, however, prove that individual expressions have the same meaning or stylistic function in all three languages. Such conclusions need examples from documented literary texts and dictionary or corpus evidence for each language. Uzbek material is not analyzed in this thesis and remains a task for further research.

Conclusion. Metonymy and metaphor contribute to the semantic richness and expressive potential of literary language. They differ in the relation underlying semantic transfer: contiguity in metonymy, similarity in metaphor. Their possible interaction shows that figurative expressions must be interpreted in context. Karakalpak



"ZAMONAVIY TA'LIM VA TILSHUNOSLIK RIVOJI"
nomli respublika ilmiy-amaliy masofaviy konferensiyasi
VOLUME-1, ISSUE-7, 2026

descriptions show that metonymy can reflect established patterns of association and culturally meaningful concepts. Comparative analysis of English, Uzbek and Karakalpak literary material can identify shared mechanisms alongside language-specific features.

References

1. Bekbergenov, A. (1990). *Qaraqalpaq tiliniń stilistikası*. Nókis: Bilim.
2. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Radden, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In K.-U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought* (pp. 17–59). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.