



THE USAGE OF METONYMY AND METAPHOR AMONG MONOLINGUAL CHILDREN

Ilkhomova Umida Djamaliddinovna

Uzbekistan State World Languages University,
ESL Teacher of the Department “Functional Vocabulary of English”
ilxomovaumidadj@gmail.com

Abstract

Following study aims to learn unfamiliar semantic area of thinking principles of children’s language. This analysis gathers monolingual children from three to eight years of age and observes their participation in principle cognitive operations that includes the basic processes of metaphor and metonymy. The results of this issue identifies the difference between cognitive preferences using metaphor and metonymy principles and children’s conceptual complexity levels during their language development. In addition, it offers to enlarge the inventory of functions that take part in cognitive operations.

Keywords: Metaphor, metonymy, cognitive operations, monolingual, conceptual metaphor, language acquisition

Introduction

Metaphor and metonymy are essential parts of daily language that humans imagine, think and speak using them. Metaphor (depicting a similarity between two things) and metonymy (drawing a contiguousness between two things) are fundamentally two opposite pole, which associate to the development the discourse of human language. The word metaphor derived from the 16th century’s old French word *metaphore*, which came from Latin *metaphora*, ‘carrying over’ and the term metonymy comes from Greek *metonomia* “a change of name”. [7,1]

A number of specialists made some researches on these linguistic terms and tried to express their own characterizations. The rhetorical scholar and educator Sonja K. Foss illustrates metaphors as “nonliteral contrasts where a word or phrase from one dominion of experience is applied to another domain”. Besides, she notes that as reality is connected with the language people use to define something, they use metaphors modeling the world and their relations to it. Creating the essential manual “Metaphors we live by”, the linguists George Lakoff and Johnson describe metonyms as “more grounded in our experience’ than metaphors, since they ‘involve direct associations.”[2,]





Furthermore, in the usage of everyday communication metonymy is a symbol of speech for some poetry and mainly rhetoric. Latin and Greek scholars on rhetoric made major contributions for studying metonymy. They describe metonymy as the association between two notions and the term “metaphor” bases to their similarity. While using metonymy people do not normally hope to transfer qualities of one subject to another as they do with metaphor.

As Leon Surette states in his article *Metaphor and Metonymy*, “It is difficult to say which position above most closely represents the way a listener interprets the expression, and it is possible that different listener analyze the phrase in different ways, or even in different ways at different times”. Meanwhile, Lakoff and Johnson also noted that metaphor is original in not only daily speech but also in human’s action and thought. The conceptual system of people, that is responsible for acting and thinking, is naturally metaphoric. They also note that root metaphors can be single for different cultures, nations, organizations or groups. “Life is a journey” in one culture may have a metaphor of life as a journey in one culture, whilst another may see it as opportunity.

It is interesting to note that besides culture, age groups also have a specific cognitive different usage in everyday speech of monolingual or bilingual children. For instance, monolingual children may use broader metonymy and metaphor concerning two languages while bilingual children may not use so widely as monolingual children. “My brother is Pushkin” denotes that his hair is curly or can create poems or stories. Children who speak Russian can understand who is Pushkin or his appearance. “My sister is Masha” refers very talkative girl. During recording bilingual and monolingual children’s communication mostly metaphor and metonymy are used in conversation of monolingual children. Especially visual metaphor is actively produced. Nowadays it is mostly used in graphic software in order to communicate via images, videos, ads, and animations. Therefore, it is easier to use words or phrases from cartoons. Here is given some investigated examples of Uzbek monolingual children.

Table 1.

No	Example in Uzbek.	Meaning
1	Men faqat Jumong bilan do’st bo’laman.	I want to be a friend only with Jumong (very strong).
2	Kel Changa Chunga o’naymiz .	Let’s play Changa Chunga (a game of hunters)
3	Men Neznaykaga tushuntirdim .	I explained Neznayka (less intelligent)
4	U qiz Zolushka.	That girl is Zolushka (obedient, quit)
5	Biz fizkultura qildik.	We did PE (physical exercises)
6	Men adorning kamerasiman.	I am a camera of my father (observer)
7	Oyimning ko’zi manda.	My mother’s eyes are on me (monitoring).
8	Men oyimning radiosiman.	I am a radio of my mother (talkative)
9	U guruhimizning klouni.	He is our group’s clown (funny boy)
10	Men uchta tarelka yedim.	I have eaten three plates (dish)



These are the results of investigation on cognitive operations in the language of young children and highlight the importance of study findings both in the field of first language acquisition and for current concepts of cognitive forming. Moreover, researches show those participants' natural sayings that were copied by their parents or caretakers.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the result of this research leads into new visions of semantic nature of monolingual children's speech. Monolingual children showed visual metaphor in speech. It can be summarized that metaphor can be used differently and may be understood depending on the culture, age groups, life style, time and media. It means that the concept of metaphor and metonymy is an endless field for researches and discussions.

References

1. Black, M. (1981). Review of *Metaphors we live by*. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 40(2), 208–210.
2. Lakoff, and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
3. Richards, I. A. (1938). *Interpretations in teaching*. New York: Harcourt Brace
4. Mathias W. Madsen's article *Cognitive Metaphor Theory and the Metaphysics of Immediacy*. Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, University of Amsterdam. 2015.
5. Leon Surette. Review of *Metaphor and Metonymy: Jakobson Reconsidered*. 2012 CITA.
6. Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., & Schwartz, A. (1991). Master metaphor list, second draft copy. Manuscript circulated by the Cognitive Linguistics Group of the University of California at Berkeley
7. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki>

