HSR London International Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research
(HSR-ICMAR) 2026
https://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF "CONCEPTUAL METONYMY" IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Qurbonova Kamola Abdurahmonovna
2nd year student of the Faculty of Philology, Namangan State University
E-mail: k.qurbonova.06@mail.ru
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21331670

Annotation: This article provides detailed information about the term conceptual metonymy, which is widely used in the field of cognitive linguistics, including its origin, scholarly research conducted on this topic both worldwide and in our country, its application in various fields, as well as relevant examples.

Key words: cognitive linguistics, conceptual metonomy, metonymic relationship, metaphorical metonymy, domain matrix, category.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada kognitiv tilshunoslik sohasida faol qo'llanuvchi konseptual metonimiya termini haqida ma'lumot, uning kelib chiqishi, bu bo'yicha dunyoda va yurtimizda qilingan ilmiy ishlar, uning turli sohalarda qo'llanilishi haqida batafsil ma'lumot hamda namunalar keltirilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: kognitiv tilshunoslik, konseptual metonimiya, metonimik munosabat, metaforik metonimiya, domenlar matritsasi,

Аннотация: В данной статье представлена подробная информация о термине концептуальная метонимия, широко используемом в области когнитивной лингвистики, его происхождении, научных исследованиях, проведённых по данной теме в мире и в нашей стране, его применении в различных сферах, а также приведены соответствующие примеры.

Ключевые слова: когнитивная лингвистика, концептуалная метонимия, метонимическое отношение, метафорическая метонимия, матрица доменов, категория.

Introduction

The development of cognitive linguistics, an interdisciplinary field that integrates linguistics and cognitive science, has introduced a new approach to the study of language. Like any other scientific discipline, cognitive linguistics has its own specialized terminology that facilitates a deeper understanding and investigation of its theoretical foundations. One such key term is conceptual metonymy.

It is well known that people use words from their vocabulary not only for their literal meanings but also to create various comparisons and semantic extensions. In such cases, the interpretation of words is closely connected with the processes of human cognition. Therefore, a cognitive approach to metonymy is well justified. For this reason, the term conceptual metonymy is widely used in the field of cognitive linguistics.

Literature Review

The idea of conceptual metonymy as a cognitive phenomenon and its role in human thought was comprehensively discussed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their 1980 book Metaphors We Live By. The concept of conceptual metonymy has also been examined by Uzbek scholars. For

example, D. Khudoyberganova's monograph Anthropocentric Study of the Text and A Concise Explanatory Dictionary of Linguocultural Terms, as well as D. Ashurova and M. Galiyeva's Stylistics of Literary Text and Cognitive Linguistics, are among the notable works in this field. These studies discuss the role of conceptual metonymy in text analysis, its formation in the human mind, and its manifestations across different languages.

Research Methodology

This study was conducted on the basis of the theoretical principles of cognitive linguistics. Descriptive, comparative-analytical, semantic, and cognitive analysis methods were employed throughout the research. The origin of the term conceptual metonymy, its scholarly interpretations, and its application across various fields were examined through both international and Uzbek academic sources. Furthermore, the semantic structure and pragmatic characteristics of metonymic expressions were analyzed using examples from literary, journalistic, and everyday discourse. The study scientifically demonstrates that conceptual metonymy functions as a cognitive mechanism that reflects the relationship between language and human thought.

Results and Discussion

In Metaphors We Live By, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson discuss not only conceptual metaphor but also conceptual metonymy. In cognitive linguistics, conceptual metonymy is regarded as a conceptual mapping mechanism based on part–whole or whole–part relationships, whereby one entity within a conceptual domain serves as a cognitive access point to another entity within the same domain. While conceptual metaphor describes one entity in terms of another belonging to a different conceptual domain, conceptual metonymy enables the understanding of one entity through another within the same domain.

According to William Croft, metaphor requires a relationship between two entirely distinct domain matrices, whereas metonymy highlights a particular aspect within a single conceptual domain. For example, in the metaphor “a girl with a flower-like face,” the concepts of flower and face belong to different semantic domains. In contrast, in the metonymic expression “to read Navoi,” both Navoi and his works belong to the same semantic domain and represent different aspects of a single conceptual domain.

The primary reason for adopting a cognitive approach to metonymy is that information in the human mind is understood through interconnected conceptual structures. Likewise, the categorization of the world depends on the relationships among categories, which are established through cognitive processes. A speaker's ability to connect two related concepts in discourse, as well as a listener's ability to recognize that connection, is a product of human cognition. Metonymy is therefore a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity provides mental access to another conceptual entity within the same domain (Kövecses & Radden, 1998, p. 39). Thus, in the metonymic expression “to read Navoi,” the name Navoi refers not only to the author himself but, more specifically, to his literary works.

In their study, Kövecses and Radden (1998) analyze the types of relationships that give rise to the most frequently occurring metonymies in language. According to their observations, there are two principal types of relationships that motivate metonymy:

1. Relationships based on the part–whole structure of a particular domain (or domain matrix), in which a part or substructure of a domain represents the whole domain.

2. Relationships in which one part of a domain provides mental access to another part of the same domain.

An example of this relationship can be found in the use of the word aspirin. In everyday language, aspirin is often used to refer to any type of painkiller. In this case, a member of a category stands for the entire category, thereby establishing a metonymic relationship.

Kövecses and Radden also propose several cognitive and communicative principles to explain the selection of the vehicle in metonymic relations. Among the most important are the following:

1. The Human over Non-human Principle. According to this principle, human-related entities are preferred over non-human entities as metonymic vehicles. For example, in the expression “He read Fuzuli,” the author's name is used instead of his literary works. Here, the person is conceptually more salient than his creative output.

2. The Concrete over Abstract Principle. This principle states that concrete entities are generally preferred over abstract ones. For instance, in the Uzbek expression “Hold your tongue,” the body part tongue stands for the act of speaking. Likewise, in the expression “He saved his life,” the visible and concrete concept of life represents the abstract notion of existence.

Conceptual metonymy may also merge with conceptual metaphor, resulting in a phenomenon known as metaphoric metonymy (or metaphtonymy, as defined by D. Khudoyberganova in An Explanatory Dictionary of Modern Linguistic Terms). This theoretical approach was developed by Goossens to explain the interaction between metaphor and metonymy. According to this theory, the first type of interaction is metaphor derived from metonymy. In this case, the creation of a metaphor is based on an underlying metonymic relationship. For example, in the expression “a tight-mouthed person,” the physical condition of a body part initially gives rise to a metonymic relation, where mouth represents the act of speaking. This metonymic association subsequently develops into a metaphor, so that “a tight-mouthed person” refers to someone who does not disclose important information even when speaking.

The second common form of interaction is metonymy within metaphor. For example, in the sentence “This experience opened his eyes,” the expression opened his eyes metaphorically means to understand or to realize. At the same time, the metaphor contains a metonymic relationship, since eyes represent the process of perception and understanding.

The Conceptual Integration Theory, developed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, also shares certain similarities with conceptual metonymy. Whereas conceptual metonymy involves two entities belonging to the same conceptual category, conceptual integration combines selected features of two entities from different conceptual categories to create a new conceptual structure.

A well-known example is the expression “That surgeon is a butcher.” The concepts surgeon and butcher belong to different conceptual domains. However, the surgeon's manner of operating on the human body is blended with the butcher's act of slaughtering animals, thereby conveying the idea that the surgeon is incompetent or lacks professional skill. The study of conceptual integration demonstrates the remarkable capacity of human cognition to combine distinct conceptual structures and clearly illustrates the close relationship between language and thought.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study of conceptual metonymy, metaphoric metonymy, and conceptual integration is of considerable importance in cognitive linguistics. These concepts provide valuable insights into the cognitive processes of the human mind and the mechanisms underlying conceptual structures. Furthermore, the ability of conceptual metonymy to reflect cultural knowledge makes it a useful tool for understanding the worldview, cultural values, and national identity of different linguistic communities. Consequently, conceptual metonymy, metaphoric metonymy, and conceptual integration occupy a significant place in cognitive linguistics and are widely regarded as clear manifestations of the anthropocentric approach to language, emphasizing the close relationship between language, cognition, and human experience.

References

1. Evans V, Green M. Cognitive Linguistics (An Introduction) – Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press, 2006. 830p

2. Kövecses, Radden. Constraints on possible vehicles in metonymy, 1998
3. Kövecses Z, Radden G. Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view//Cognitive Linguistics 9 (1), 1998. – P. 37–77. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1998.9.1.37.
4. Бабушкин А.П, Стернин И.А. Когнитивная лингвистика и семасиология. Монография. – Воронеж: ООО “Ритм”, 2018. – 229с.
5. Боброва О.Б. К вопросу о роли когнитивной, языковой и индивидуально-авторской метафоры в описании языковой картины мира // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 9: Филология. 2018. № 2.
6. Коннова М. Н. Введение в когнитивную лингвистику : учебное пособие. — Калининград: Изд-во БФУ им. И. Канта, 2012. 313с.
7. Романова Т. В, Колчина О. Н, Куликова В. А, Хоменко А. Ю. Проектный словарь-справочник когнитивных терминов: учебное пособие. – Нижний Новгород: Деком, 2022. 216с.
8. Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик. – Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006. 92б.
9. Сафаров Ш. Семантика. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2013. 343б.