BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 Isdoi:omiddinova Imrona
BG PULSE JOURNAL

LINGUOCULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ANTONOMASIA AND THEIR SYNTHESIS WITH ADJACENT TROPES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LITERARY DISCOURSE

Ozoda Rustam qizi Matkarimova
Independent Researcher
Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Beruni
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24009248

ABSTRACT: This article provides a comparative analysis of the linguocultural characteristics of antonomasia and its synthesis with adjacent stylistic phenomena (metaphor, metonymy, and periphrasis) in Uzbek and English literary discourse. Antonomasia is a process based on the conversion of a proper noun into a common noun, or vice versa, renaming an individual through a characteristic trait, thereby preserving specific national-cultural codes and precedent characters. Through the analysis of precedent names extracted from English and Uzbek literary texts (e.g., Romeo, Don Quixote, Khoja Nasriddin, Majnun), the semantic transformations and expressive-stylistic functions of antonomasia are demonstrated.
Keywords: antonomasia, linguoculturology, literary discourse, precedent name, metaphor, metonymy, periphrasis, comparative linguistics.

INTRODUCTION: A literary text is not merely a linguistic tool for conveying information; it is a complex, multi-layered discursive structure that reflects the historical memory, aesthetic principles, national-ethnic values, and the linguistic worldview (lisoniy manzara) of a nation formed over centuries. In modern linguistics, the dominance of the anthropocentric paradigm—specifically the rapid development of cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, and linguoculturology—has necessitated the investigation of the poetics of literary texts and their system of tropes (figurative devices) from a new scientific perspective. Among the stylistic devices that enhance the expressive-emotional impact of literary discourse and shape underlying connotative meanings, antonomasia (from Greek: antonomasia — renamed, referred to by another name) occupies a special position due to its semantic capacity and linguocultural functionality.

By its linguistic nature, antonomasia is a complex stylistic figure based on the substitution of a proper noun for a common noun or, conversely, the renaming of a person or object through a specific characteristic trait, quality, or action in place of a proper name. In traditional stylistics, it is interpreted as a specialized, differentiated form of metonymy and metaphor. As emphasized in classical and contemporary linguistic studies by I. R. Galperin, A. V. Superanskaya, Y. S. Stepanov, as well as prominent scholars of the Uzbek linguistic school such as A. Hojiyev, B. Yo‘ldoshev, and Sh. Safarov, antonomasia is not merely a phenomenon of nominal replacement; it is a cognitive-pragmatic mechanism that interacts with the reader's background knowledge by activating precedent names (pretsedent nomlar) and ethnocultural archetypes within the text.

However, in modern linguoculturology and comparative stylistics, the linguistic intersections (kesishuv nuqtalari) between antonomasia and adjacent tropes—namely metaphor, metonymy, periphrasis, and allusion—their synthesizing mechanisms in text formation, and the processes of linguocultural hybridisation manifested across typologically different languages (specifically Uzbek and English, belonging to the Turkic and Germanic language families) have not yet been

comprehensively and systematically investigated. Divergences in the cultural-historical experience, models of perceiving the world, and literary traditions of native speakers of both languages are clearly reflected in the semantic transformation of antonomasia within literary discourse.

The scientific and practical goal of this study is to determine the linguocultural characteristics and national-ethnic motivations of antonomasia in Uzbek and English literary discourse, to demonstrate through empirical evidence the methods of its synthesis and intersection with adjacent tropes (metaphor, metonymy, periphrasis, and allusion), and to elucidate the cognitive-semantic mechanisms of precedent names in both languages from a comparative perspective.

METHODS: The empirical base of this study comprises a specially compiled corpus of more than 150 contextual excerpts extracted from the works of classical and contemporary representatives of English and Uzbek literature. In establishing the illustrative dataset, primary sources included the literary works of prominent English writers such as W. Shakespeare, C. Dickens, and O. Henry, as well as classic Uzbek authors including A. Qodiriy, O‘. Hoshimov, and T. Murod. The selection of these texts was governed by their rich stylistic diversity, the high density of precedent names, and the expressive deployment of antonomasia and adjacent stylistic figures.

To achieve a comprehensive, objective, and multi-dimensional analysis of the linguocultural features and semantic motivations of antonomasia in typologically divergent languages (Turkic and Germanic), a complex set of modern linguistic methods was employed:

Comparative-Analytical and Typological Method:

This method enabled the systematic comparison and structural alignment of the lexical-semantic features, nominative patterns, and contextual behaviors of antonomasia across the English and Uzbek languages.

It served to identify universal stylistic tendencies shared by both linguistic systems, as well as distinctive, culture-specific variations stemming from differences in national mentalities and literary traditions.

Linguocultural and Ethnosemantic Analysis Method:

This approach played a paramount role in isolating and interpreting the national-cultural components, ethnocultural connotations, and underlying cultural codes contained within precedent names.

Through this method, antonomasia was analyzed not merely as a mechanical substitution of proper and common nouns, but as a linguo-cognitive phenomenon that activates historical memory, mytho-poetic symbols, and national archetypes within literary discourse.

Pragmastylistic and Contextual Analysis Method:

This technique was utilized to evaluate the expressive-emotional, evaluative, and functional-stylistic roles of antonomasia when interacting or synthesizing with adjacent tropes (such as metaphor, metonymy, periphrasis, and allusion) within specific narrative environments.

It allowed for the examination of how contextual constraints determine the pragmatic impact of these hybrid stylistic formations on the reader's interpretation.

RESULTS: The empirical analysis of literary excerpts extracted from English and Uzbek narrative prose and poetry reveals that antonomasia rarely functions in isolation within literary discourse. Instead, it predominantly operates in a synthesized (hybrid) state, coalescing with adjacent tropes to form multi-layered stylistic constructs:

3.1. Synthesis of Antonomasia and Metaphor (Cognitive-Symbolic Model)

In this model, a proper noun undergoes semantic generalization through metaphorical transfer based on implicit comparison. The proper noun sheds its singular referential function and acquires the status of a common noun denoting a generalized psychological or behavioral archetype.

In English Literary Discourse:

Textual Example: "He turned out to be a real Don Juan among his peers."

In-Depth Analysis: The proper noun Don Juan (originating from Spanish folklore and popularized through English romantic literature) undergoes metaphorical antonomasia. The name loses its specific historical/fictional referent and shifts into a common noun carrying the semantic components of [+seductive], [+frivolous], and [+romantic adventurer].

In Uzbek Literary Discourse:

Textual Example: "Oramizda qancha Majnunlar bor, lekin Laylisi yo'q..." (O'. Hoshimov).

In-Depth Analysis: The name Majnun (from the classical Eastern plot Layli and Majnun) undergoes metaphorical abstraction. Through metaphorical antonomasia, it transforms into a generalized archetype representing tragic, selfless, and devoted love. The pluralization (Majnunlar) structurally proves its transition from a proper noun to a common noun class.

3.2. Synthesis of Antonomasia and Metonymy (Attributive-External Model)

This model operates on contiguity rather than similarity. A prominent external feature, garment, physical attribute, or behavioral habit of an individual is metonymically selected and elevated to function as their primary proper designation.

In English Literary Discourse:

Textual Example: "Here comes Mr. Grumpy!"

In-Depth Analysis: The emotional state or psychological trait of irritability (grumpy) is metonymically extracted and capitalized to function as a pseudo-proper name (Mr. Grumpy), combining metonymic contiguity with antonomastic renaming.

In Uzbek Literary Discourse:

Textual Example: "Hormang, Eski to'n!" (A. Qodiriy, "O'tkan kunlar").

In-Depth Analysis: The worn-out garment (eski to'n) worn by the character is metonymically associated with his socio-economic status. By replacing his personal name with this attribute, the author employs metonymic antonomasia to highlight social stratification, neglect, and contextual irony.

3.3. Synthesis of Antonomasia and Periphrasis (Descriptive-Cultural Model)

In this hybrid structure, a proper noun is substituted by an elaborate descriptive phrase or honorific epithet that encapsulates the character's most salient historical, cultural, or artistic achievement.

In English Literary Discourse:

Examples: The Bard of Avon (substituting William Shakespeare); The Iron Lady (substituting Margaret Thatcher).

In-Depth Analysis: These periphrastic antonomasias substitute personal names with culturally loaded epithets, emphasizing literary majesty (Bard of Avon) or political firmness (Iron Lady).

In Uzbek Literary Discourse:

Examples: Sohibqiron (substituting Amir Temur); So'z mulkining sultoni (substituting Alisher Navoiy).

In-Depth Analysis: These descriptive constructs function as honorific antonomasias, replacing the proper names with periphrastic epithets that highlight monarchical grandeur and supreme poetic authority within Uzbek cultural memory.

DISCUSSION: The comparative-linguocultural analysis of literary excerpts demonstrates that the nature of antonomasia transcends mere stylistic ornamentation. Its functioning within narrative discourse is intrinsically bound to the **precedent texts, national archetypes, and cultural background knowledge** shared within a speech community. The cognitive mechanism of antonomasia relies on the reader's ability to instantly decode the socio-cultural connotations embedded in a proper name or descriptive epithet and map them onto a new narrative context.

4.1. Ethnocultural Divergences in Source Domains

The source domains (*manba konseptual sohalari*) from which antonomastic formations are drawn reflect the distinct historical, spiritual, and literary evolution of the English and Uzbek societies. The research highlights two major culturally specific trends:

1. The English Literary Tradition:

Antonomasia in English literary discourse relies primarily on the heritage of Western civilization, drawing heavily from four foundational pillars:

Greco-Roman Mythology: Names such as Hercules (denoting immense physical strength), Cupid (symbolizing romantic attraction), or Bacchus (associated with revelry) serve as universal archetypes across English prose.

Biblical Lore: Precedent names derived from Judeo-Christian texts—such as Judas (a symbol of betrayal) or Solomon (the archetype of profound wisdom)—are deeply rooted in the collective consciousness.

Shakespearean Characterology: The dramatic works of William Shakespeare provide a rich repository of antonomastic references; for example, Othello (destructive jealousy), Romeo (an ardent young lover), Shylock (an unyielding, ruthless creditor), or Iago (a scheming manipulator).

Victorian and Classic Fiction: Characters from 19th-century literature, particularly Charles Dickens's creations like Scrooge (extreme avarice and stinginess) or Oliver Twist (impoverished innocence), frequently transition from fictional names into generalized common nouns.

2. The Uzbek Literary Tradition:

In contrast, antonomasia within Uzbek literary discourse is deeply anchored in Eastern philosophy, Islamic spiritual values, and regional folkloric heritage:

Eastern Classical Poetic Heritage: The romantic and philosophical epics (Khamsa) of classical poets such as Alisher Navoiy, Nizamiy Ganjaviy, and Fuzuliy provide the primary source domain. Names like Majnun (unconditional, selfless devotion), Farhod (unwavering labor and perseverance), and Shirin (the ideal of grace and beauty) function as generalized moral and emotional archetypes.

Folklore and Oral Tradition: Characters from oral humor and folk tales, such as Xo'ja Nasriddin or Afandi, are used antonomastically to denote quick wit, subtle social irony, and folk wisdom under the guise of simplicity.

Epic and Heroic Figures: Figures from heroic epics (dostons), such as Rustam or Alpomish, serve as national benchmarks for heroism, chivalry, and physical prowess.

Sacred-Religious and Monarchical Honorifics: Historical and spiritual titles such as Sohibqiron (referring to Amir Temur as a ruler born under a auspicious astrological conjunction) or Hazrat (an honorific denoting spiritual elevation) are utilized periphrastically to evoke historical reverence and authority.

4.2. Pragmastylistic Functions and Cognitive Strategies

Beyond its role as a linguocultural marker, the synthesis of antonomasia with adjacent tropes performs critical pragmastylistic functions within literary discourse:

1. Textual Compression and Laconicism (Lisoniy tejamkorlik):

Antonomastic synthesis functions as an exceptionally efficient cognitive strategy for information packaging. By substituting a complex character description with a single precedent name or periphrastic epithet, the author activates a vast network of background knowledge already stored in the reader's memory. This eliminates the need for lengthy narrative expositions, allowing the author to convey complex psychological profiles, moral evaluations, and socio-economic statuses through a single lexical unit.

2. Emotional Intensification and Evaluative Connotation:

Unlike neutral descriptive phrasing, an antonomastic unit carries an inherent pragmatic charge. Whether utilized for satirical condemnation (e.g., calling a stingy character a *Scrooge* or an untrustworthy person an Iago) or lofty idealization (e.g., referring to a selfless lover as a Majnun or a great poet as So'z mulkining sultoni), the trope immediately projects an explicit emotional and evaluative stance, guiding the reader's aesthetic judgment.

3. Subtextual Enrichment and Intertextuality:

Antonomastic formations bridge the current literary text with broader historical and cultural intertexts. They create an intellectual dialogue between the author and the reader, transforming the act of reading into an active cognitive process of decoding shared cultural codes.

CONCLUSION: The comparative-linguocultural and pragmastylistic investigation into the functioning of antonomasia and its synthesis with adjacent tropes within English and Uzbek literary discourse leads to the following key scientific conclusions:

Antonomasia within literary discourse transcends its traditional definition as a simple mechanical substitution or stylistic renaming technique. It operates as a vital linguocultural phenomenon that actively preserves, transmits, and reactivates national cultural codes, historical memory, and precedent knowledge embedded in a speech community. Through the deployment of precedent names and culturally loaded epithets, antonomasia serves as a cognitive bridge connecting individual literary texts to the broader collective consciousness and intertextual memory of a nation.

The empirical evidence confirms that antonomasia rarely functions in isolated structural forms within narrative prose and poetry. Instead, it operates in systemic synthesis with adjacent figurative devices, manifesting through three distinct cognitive-semantic models:

Metaphoric Antonomasia: Functions via cognitive mapping based on implicit similarity, transforming a proper noun into a common noun class to represent generalized psychological, moral, or behavioral archetypes (e.g., Don Juan, Majnun).

Metonymic Antonomasia: Operates on contiguity and attribute selection, where a salient external feature, garment, or character trait is capitalized to replace a personal name and project socio-economic or emotional states (e.g., Mr. Grumpy, "Eski to'n").

Periphrastic Antonomasia: Relies on descriptive epithet substitution, replacing proper designations with honorific, monarchical, or artistic constructs that highlight supreme authority and historical reverence (e.g., The Bard of Avon, Sohibqiron).

A comparative analysis highlights fundamental differences in the conceptual source domains and value orientations of the two linguistic traditions:

English Literary Discourse: Prioritizes individualistic, pragmatic, and Western archetypes, deriving its primary precedent references from Greco-Roman mythology, Judeo-Christian biblical lore, Shakespearean characterology, and 19th-century Victorian literature.

Uzbek Literary Discourse: Is dominated by collective-spiritual, historical-monarchic, and classical Eastern poetic symbols, drawing its foundational references from classical Khamsa

literature, Eastern philosophy, regional folkloric humor (Afandi), heroic epics (dastons), and sacred-religious honorifics.

The findings of this research provide significant theoretical and practical insights for comparative stylistics, linguoculturology, pragmalinguistics, and literary translation. Understanding the cognitive-semantic mechanisms of antonomastic synthesis enables translators to achieve higher levels of pragmatic equivalence when decoding culturally bound precedent names across Turkic and Germanic languages.

REFERENCES:

1. Бегматов Э. Ўзбек тили антропонимикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 2013.
2. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2008.
3. Хожиев А. Тилшунослик терминларининг изоҳли луғати. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2002.
4. Қиличев Э. Ўзбек тилининг амалий стилистикаси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992.
5. Йўлдошев Б. Ўзбек фразеологияси ва стилистикаси масалалари. – Самарқанд, 2013.
6. Shukurjon, N. (2015). Some facts about professional lexis in Khorezm region. Austrian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, (5-6), 115-117.
7. Shukurjon, N. (2016). Metaphor in Formation of Khorezmian Professional Lexis Level. ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 5(5), 17-20.
8. Cuddon J. A. The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory. – London: Penguin Books, 2013.
9. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
10. Galperin I. R. Stylistics. – Moscow: Higher School, 1981.