TRANSLATION OF METONYMY FROM UZBEK INTO ENGLISH

Nafisa Ochilova

Navoi State Pedagogical Institute., Uzbekistan

Abstract: Studying metonymy translation is done to discover techniques and methods of translating metonymic statements from one language into another, as well as to compare and contrast how the rhetorical device is used in the studied languages. The expressiveness of metonymy should be considered when translating it because trite metonymies, which are frequently found in dictionaries, are simpler to understand and may also be utilized in the same way in the target language. There may be instances where the owners of both languages share the same conspicuous component in metonymic statements, or they may be so dissimilar that they need to be substituted, expanded, or explained in the translation. In the following article, we discuss ways of translating types of metonymies from Uzbek into English, giving accent to the cultural views of the language owners.

Keywords: Metonymy, salient part, translation, free translation, literal translation.

Introduction

Metonymy is a speech phenomenon that depends on the relationships between words in sentences. It frequently arises as a result of the elliptical contraction of phrases and sentences. Therefore, metonymy has the status of spoken usage of the word because it still has some limitations imposed by the conditions of use and does not give rise to a new, context-independent meaning of the word.

Metonymy can be defined as displaced figurativeness in literary text analysis: instead of an object or phenomenon prompted by the context, the reader's attention is focused on some other object associated with the original one or a detail of the original object. Various stylistic and semantic effects are achieved in this manner: the replacement of an abstract concept with a concrete, visual image; the reverse phenomenon is the generalization of the individual by replacing a specific object (phenomenon) with an abstract concept; bringing to the fore a bright, characteristic detail, which can acquire a symbolic meaning within the text.

There is no synthesis between the object and the image in a metaphor. It can be assumed that the picture of metonymy, as it were, obscures the object, and the latter is more or less vividly sensed in the background because the psychological character of metonymy has not yet been fully clarified. Thus, metonymy is a figure of speech or a phrase in which one name of an object is replaced by another that is related to and close in meaning to the replaced meaning of the word.

Materials and Methods

Metonymy as well as metaphor operates on the basis of the interaction of the logical and contextual meanings of the lexical item. It is the second most common item of figurative speech after metaphor, both in Uzbek and English. However, Metaphor's status as a conceptual system is widely acknowledged, whereas metonymy has received less attention.

Further, we will look at the characteristics of metonymy before discussing how to translate them from SL into TL.

Metonymy is a rhetorical device that catches people's attention due to its grammatical and logical oddness or semantic absurdity. Metonymy, like other figures of speech, is a special language use that

can achieve certain communication effects. Metonymy is not only a rhetorical device; it is also a way of referring to something and, more importantly, a way of thinking for people.

Metonymy, etymologically speaking, comes from the Greek word metonumia," which means "a change of Metonymy, etymologically speaking, comes from the Greek word "metonumia," which means "a change of name". Metonymy is built by referring directly to a specific thing using another item that is related to it. For example, "pen" can be used to refer to a writer or an activity of writing; "hand" can replace "worker". Depending on the connection between the elements, metonymy can be of various types. There is a special type of metonymy called synecdoche, in which a part stands for a whole or vice versa. Though it is discussed by some scholars as a category of rhetoric, there is a tendency to admit that the distinction between synecdoche and metonymy is blurred, and synecdoche is regarded as a special case of metonymy, which entails a link between a part and a whole. Most often, synecdoche is considered a type of metonymy, as both of them are based on the relationship of relatedness.

Metonymy is used to serve different purposes in communication. One of them is to make speech concise and clear. For example:

The one in the brown suit gazed at her. The blue suit grinned; he might even have winked. (Priestley)

In the example above, the author uses "blue suit" instead of "a person wearing a blue suit," which avoids repetition of the phrase given earlier and makes the utterance shorter to use? In this example, we can see the relation between the container and content in metonymy. Another implication used by the figure of speech is that the speaker knows little or nothing about the person in question.

Metonymy helps people achieve the communicative purpose of expressing themselves vividly, and at the same time, it performs the function of referring to something economically and effectively, thus earning the name "referential metonymy".

A writer or speaker uses metonymy as a reference to refer to a thing, person, action, or phenomenon that the interlocutor (reader or listener) is supposed to infer. The writer or speaker achieves the desired effect if he or she makes a good choice of referring expression and has a rational anticipation of the listener's or reader's ability to decipher it. In other words, the speaker or writer chooses a metonymical reference relying on the belief that the recipient can figure out the referred word.

Results

Studies of metonymy have given way for particular patterns in relations between references and referents to be worked out. Some of the most common ones are shown by I.R. Gallperin (1981) as follows:

1. **A concrete thing for an abstract notion, or abstract for a concrete thing.**

1) You want a friend in *Washington*? Get a dog. (Harry S. Truman)

   In the example taken from a political speech, it is evident that the speaker means the US government by the place where its headquarters are situated.

2) Odamlar esnaydi, mudraydi, *majlis* raisga xumrayib qaraydi. (Abdulla Qahhor)

3) People snore and doze, and the *hall* looks at the chairman gloomily.

In Uzbek, 'gathering' stands for 'meeting', which is used to refer to the people at the meeting. In translation, the choice is given to 'hall, as it is more common and clearer for an English reader to see 'hall' for people in it.

2. **Container for contained (contained for container)**

4) Pass me the *salt*, please. ('Salt-content for the salt shaker' container)

5) He smoked his *pipe* while enjoying the scenery at dusk. ('Pipe: container for tobacco in it)

6) Avaz's heels were in holes; there was hardly any undamaged shoe.

In the example taken from Uzbek, 'tovon' stands for a part of the body; to be precise, the rounded back part of the foot, which is replacing footwear in the context. This can be an example of metonymy having a relationship with contents for a container'.

3. **Material for a thing made of it;**

7) Little girls *in satin* were running up the street.

In the Uzbek example, atlas stands for a type of fabric and is used in the form of metonymy to make the utterance concise; otherwise, there should have been added a number of words to be very precise, like 'atlas matosidan tikilgan kuylak kiygan...

8) She was dressed in *silk*.

In the example taken form English context, metonymy achieved by means of word 'silk' has the same function as the Uzbek one, i.e. it makes the utterance short and clear.

1. **An instrument for the action or the doer of the action.**

9) What Temur could not reach with *sword*

Alisher managed to get with *pen*.

In the given example 'sword' of Temur stands for military force, while Alisher's 'pen' stands for his written works and influence through his works.

Q. Musayev makes his own contribution to the list:

5. **Creator for his/her creation**

10) *Lermontov* I didn't put aside, and took *Hafiz* in hands by right

And *Pushkin* showed me a Cherkassy girl weeping in the twilight

Lermontov, Hafiz and Pushkin are the writers, whose names the author is using instead of their works.

11) They were auctioning a *Rembrandt*.

The same about the example from English context where name of the painter is used for his painting.

6. **Part for whole or whole for part** The list is not complete, and it could be continued based on the relationships that serve as a basis for metonymy.

12) All *eyes* were on the newlywed couple as they danced around the room.

By the 'eyes, the recipient can understand people staring at the couple, as in most cultures and languages, parts of the body stand for the whole person or the action the mentioned part operates.

13) Aunt Obodkhon and Uncle Safo lived together for fifty years. But they didn't have children. (R.Otayev)

In the example taken from Uzbek, tirnoq stands for a child, and a word-for-word translation would sound ridiculous and unclear to an English reader. As metonymy is not a deliberate choice of language means for beautifying it but a way of expressing thought shared based on experience, culture, and beliefs of a nation, it is not always an easy job to decipher the message of a source language sent

through metonymy and transfer it into the target language keeping to the same type of linguistic means.

Discussion

Metonymy is one of the main ways of achieving expressiveness in the Uzbek language, and it plays no less important role in the enrichment of English. Despite the diversity of cultures, sometimes the thinking patterns of the two nations might meet, most often not completely. For example, the metonymical expression 'open your eyes, i.e., 'realize or admit the truth about something, or close or shut one's eyes to something, to ignore some fact or situation that is difficult or unpleasant, has the same equivalent expression in Uzbek. It looks like a word-for-word translation. However, it is not a fact that the concept achieved by metonymy is always realized through word-for-word translation. On the contrary, due to a lack of knowledge about the functions of metonymy, language learners might have difficulty making expected inferences and rendering concepts from one language into another.

Metonymy is a conceptual tool that shapes people's thinking and aids in their effective communication. Due to regular use, some metonymies get so widely recognized that they start to be considered part of the language as a-system and even get fixed in dictionaries. These types of metonymy are easy to perceive, and the only thing required is to think about ways of rendering the concept into another language. Literal translation, that is, using the meaning of the metonymy fixed in the dictionaries, is the most possible way.

14) The whole *village* came to the meeting. (Abdulla Qahhor)

In the dictionary, the meaning of village is "a settlement smaller than a town" and it can also refer to "a community of people smaller than a town". The second meaning was derived from the first one metonymically.

15) U rosayam shirin tomoq. (word for word: She is a real sweet throat)

In Uzbek, 'throat' is used as salient part that stand for preference in eating. English people think, similarly, use part of mouth to speak about the same think, but in English it varies a bit and they 'tooth' as salient part. So, In English it will be clear and appropriate to use

16) She is a real *sweet tooth.*

Below we have some ore examples to partial correspondence of Uzbek and English metonymy.

17) Suddenly, some kind of blather *caught my ear*.

In Uzbek, like in English, the action of hearing is given by the part of the body that is responsible for it, that is, 'ear' or it is not. Though the salient part of the phrase is the same in both languages, the verbs accompanying it differ. In Uzbek, it is 'chalindi, which means 'rang' in literal translation into English. And in English, they use 'catch, which is 'hold' for Uzbek.

18) Look, Hadicha, tell my granny; explain *in words of one syllable*, like you do it with your pupils, in a convincing way.

In both languages, the salient part of the metonymy is 'syllable', which stands for giving information in the simplest and clearest way.

Conventional metonymy, which is often fixed in dictionaries, does not pose much difficulty in translation as its meaning can be taken directly from the books. Sometimes, the metonymic thinking of cultures might be similar, making it easy to convey the meaning of the metonymy.

However, in all languages and cultures, there exist free metonymies that cannot be found in dictionaries. It might cause problems for language learners to figure out their true meaning. In

translation, the first and foremost goal is to render the meaning, and therefore, a good way out in translation can be liberal translation, through which the translator tries to interpret the meaning by adding words, changing words, or paraphrasing.

In the following example, the Uzbek phrase "go out to eat" is used in a condensed form to stands for "going out from another room to the dining room in order to have meal"

19) The hadji, who was calm, did not mind that his daughter did not come out for dinner.

In the translation, Uzbek word 'food' –"meal" is being replaced by 'dinner' to make it more concrete.

20) We were at the tea-house, and rested for a while.

21) Mullah Narkuzi goes out to the teahouse, gathers people he likes around him, and hangs out all night long talking about women who dismiss the rules of shariat.

The word 'samovar,' which is borrowed from Russian, refers to a teahouse that serves tea boiled in a samovar - a Russian kettle. Word-for-word translation of the word can cause confusion for an English reader, and therefore, clarification by means of replacing the word 'samovar' with 'tea house' is the best choice.

22) - "Okay, Robiya, we'll go together to Andijan. But it will be very difficult to persuade my father… Is Makhmud at home?"

➢ "He went somewhere till iftar. He said he would be back. Why?"

➢ "Tell him to call on us; – I need to talk to him."

This piece of context is full of metonymic expressions as it comes from a conversation of commoners who tend to shorten their speech.

The literal translation of at the door–can cause misunderstanding, as the speaker is asking whether her brother is at home or out. Therefore, the translator chooses to rephrase the utterance.

The answer 'do'konga chiqqan', which might mean that the brother went out either to do shopping or to the workshop they both know about (it is not very clear from the context), and 'iftorgacha kelurlar, means that her brother is going to come back until iftar time, when people break their fasting. The phrase "Nima edi?" could be translated as "What was it?" but the speaker is asking about the reason for the interlocutor asking her brother, so the elliptic question 'Why?' used by English speakers well suits this situation. The word 'bizniki' (ours) stands for 'our house, and the speaker is asking the man to visit his house. And the writer has chosen to rephrase it into "call on us" to convey the meaning of the utterance. "Maslahat bor" in the next piece would be 'There is advice' in word-for-word translation. In Uzbek, the phrase is used when people have to discuss a problem for a solution. That is the reason why the phrase I need to talk to him '' is chosen in translation.

Conclusion

Metonymy has long been used as a rhetorical device because of its peculiar grammatical and logical constructions and semantic abnormalities. Metonymy is a distinctive linguistic use that, like other figures of speech, can have a specific communicative effect. The main function of metonymy is to refer to something in a concise and effective way. A conceptual framework, metonymy, shapes people's thinking and aids in communicating. Some metonymies are so commonplace that the dictionary now includes them. People can simply translate things literally by recalling them. Other metonymies call for a flexible or permissive translation. By introducing new words, altering existing terms, or paraphrasing, the metonymies must be shown or made clear.

This work seeks to present a thorough understanding of metonymy, a less well-known conceptual system, by comparing and examining its features. The stylistic impact, cognitive character, and pragmatic value of metonymies are all appreciated attributes. The ability to translate metonymies is a test of a person's understanding of metonymy. Many metonymies in English have equivalents in Uzbek because people from different cultures share a great deal in terms of cognition that is based on the embodied mind. This makes it simple for learners to comprehend and translate phrases that contain these types of metonymies. For students from diverse cultures, there are, nonetheless, inventive metonymies or metonymies with heavy cultural baggage. In any case, people's comprehension can be enhanced by strong metonymic skills. The cognitive tool of metonymy helps language learning and raises cultural understanding.

References:

1. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna. "Linguocognitive, national and cultural features of the category of modality in French and Uzbek fairy tales.(monograph)." (2016). https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:Tyk-4Ss8FVUC

2. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna. Linguocognitive, national and cultural features of the category of modality in French and Uzbek fairy tales. Tashkent. 233/253 p.(Diss. filol. fan. dok.). – 2017. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:IjCSPb-OGe4C

3. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna. (2016). The national, cultural and linguocognitive peculiarities of modality of the french and uzbek fairytales. GIF. LangLit. An International Peer-reviewed Open Sccess Journal, 3(2), 81-86. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:0EnyYjriUFMC

4. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna Conte, genre précieux de la littérature. Point de vues des linguistes sur des contes. GIF. LangLit. An International Peer-reviewed Open Sccess Journal. V. 3, №2. 2016. India, 2016. – P.102–109. IF - 4.23.

5. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna Theoretical Views of Concept, Frame, Tale-Concept, Tale-Frame in Cognitive Linguistics. International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT) Volume-8, Issue-5S3, 2019.–P.392-395. https://www.ijeat.org/wpcontent/uploads/papers/v8i5S3/E10840785S319.pdf. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:2osOgNQ5qMEC

6. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna Category of modality: research and interpretation. SOI: 1.1/TAS DOI: 10.15863/TAS International Scientific Journal. Theoretical & Applied Science, p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online) Volume: 86/6. 2020. – P. 149-154. http://www.t-science.org/arxivDOI/2020/06-86/PDF/06-86-29.p.

7. Juraeva Malokhat Mukhammadovna. "National-cultural similarities of uzbek and french folk tales. JCC Impact jounals (ISSN (P): 2374-4564) International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature. V. 3, Issue-2. IJRHAL. 2015.–P. 51–56. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:5nxA0vEk-isC

8. M.M. Juraeva. Receils of proverbs (p. 170) Bukhara (Collection of proverbs, English, French, Russian and Uzbek).

https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:Y0pCki6q_DkC

9. M.M.Juraeva. 333 virelangues, poesies, devinettes. Buxoro. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:ufrVoPGSRksC

10. M.M.Juraeva. Linguocognitive, national and cultural features of the category of modality in French and Uzbek fairy tales.(monograph) https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:Tyk-4Ss8FVUC

11. M.M.Juraeva. National-cultural similarities of uzbek and french folk tales. JCC Impact jounals (ISSN (P): 2374-4564) International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature. V. 3, Issue-2. IJRHAL. 2015.–Pp. 51–56. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:5nxA0vEk-isC

12. M.M.Juraeva. Linguocognitive, national and cultural features of the category of modality in French and Uzbek fairy tales.(Avtoref. diss. filol. fan. dok.) https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:UeHWp8X0CEIC

13. M.M.Juraeva. CATEGORY OF MODALITY: RESEARCH AND INTERPRETATION. Theoretical & Applied Science, 2020. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:WF5omc3nYNoC

14. Жўраева М.М. Француз ва ўзбек эртакларида модаллик категориясининг лингвокогнитив, миллий-маданий хусусиятлари. Дисс.филол.фан.док. – Т.: 2017. – Б.233. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=3hdRYAMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=3hdRYAMAAAAJ:hFOr9nPyWt4C

15. Ochilova N. U. Analysis of the translation of anthroponyms in childrens literature (on the example of English and Uzbek folk tales) //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2021. – №. 2. – С. 155-157.

16. Ochilova N. U. Culture is the bridges that lead country to another nationality //International scientific review of the problems of pedagogy and psychology. – 2018. – С. 93-95.

17. Ochilova N. U. Expression of linguistic and stylistic features in the translations of the novel by Pirimkul Kadyrov //Eurasian Journal of Academic Research. – 2022. – Т. 2. – №. 2. – С. 405-408.

18. Conference "Perspectives on Metonymy," held in Łódź, Poland, May 6–7, 2005. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 69-86.

19. Li, Shiping. (1998). A Study of English Rhetoric. Changsha: Hunan People's Press.

20. Murphy, P. (2014). Synecdoche and metonymy. Retrieved November, 2014 from http://www.worldwidewords.org/qa/qa-syn1.htm

21. Newmark, P. (1985): The translation of metaphor. In: Paprotté, W. & Dirven, R. (eds.): The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 295-326.

22. Warren, B. (1999). Aspects of referential metonymy. In Panther, Klaus-Uwe & Radden, G. (Eds.) Metonymy in Language and Thought. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 121-135.

23. Xu, Peng. (2001). Shakespeare's Figures of Speech. Suzhou: Suzhou University Press.

24. Югай E. Digital culture and society: problems of their relationship in the conditions of globalization //Общество и инновации. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 7/S. – С. 58-67.