

**THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIALIZED EDUCATION  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTON**

**UZBEKISTAN STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE FACULTY I**

# **SELF STUDY**

**THE THEME: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF A SENTENCE IN THE  
ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGE**

**DONE BY: AZIZOVA SAYYORA**

**GROUP 306A**

**CHECKED BY: DJABBAROVA K.A.**

**TOSHKENT-2015**

# **CONTENTS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The development and change of the semantic structure of a word
2. Metaphor as a means of semantic change in Stylistic
3. Metonymy and its use as semantic change source

## **CONCLUSION**

## **REFERENCE LIST**

## INTRODUCTION

As there appeared opportunity to study several foreign languages with the help of independence, the president of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov mentioned: “At present great importance is attached to the study and teaching of foreign languages. No doubt, it happens not without purpose. Today the importance of our people’s perfect knowledge of foreign languages can scarcely be exaggerated as our country aspires to win a decent place in the world community, because our people see their great future as a life in mutual accord and cooperation with their foreign partners.”<sup>1</sup> So, we have opportunity to know each language which we need and go abroad. If you know some foreign language you can translate its masterpieces into your language.

This paper is devoted to the study of semantic change of words in the context.

**The theme** of semantic change is one of the actual issues in the field of Semasiology.

**The subject** is Lexicology and Methodology of teaching.

**The object** is metaphor and metonymy and their thorough investigation.

**The actuality** of the work is that the realization of change in meaning is studied from different view points as in Lexicology, Stylistics and others.

**The meaning** of a word can change in the course of time. Changes of lexical meanings can be proved by comparing contexts of different times. Transfer of the meaning is called lexical-semantic word-building. In such cases the outer aspect of a word does not change.

The causes of semantic changes can be extra-linguistic and linguistic, e.g. the change of the lexical meaning of the noun «pen» was due to extra-linguistic causes. Primarily «pen» comes back to the Latin word «penna» (a feather of a bird). As people wrote with goose pens the name was transferred to steel pens which were later

---

<sup>1</sup> Karimov.I.A. “Harmoniously developed generation is the basis of progress of Uzbekistan”.Manaviyat, Tashkent 1997. -p9.

on used for writing. Still later any instrument for writing was called « a pen».

On the other hand causes can be linguistic, e.g. the conflict of synonyms when a perfect synonym of a native word is borrowed from some other language one of them may specialize in its meaning, e.g. the noun «tide» in Old English was polysemantic and denoted «time», «season», «hour». When the French words «time», «season», «hour» were borrowed into English they ousted the word «tide» in these meanings. It was specialized and now means «regular rise and fall of the sea caused by attraction of the moon». The meaning of a word can also change due to ellipsis, e.g. the word-group «a train of carriages» had the meaning of «a row of carriages», later on «of carriages» was dropped and the noun «train» changed its meaning, it is used now in the function and with the meaning of the whole word-group.

Semantic changes have been classified by different scientists. The most complete classification was suggested by a German scientist Herman Paul in his work «Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte». It is based on the logical principle. He distinguishes two main ways where the semantic change is gradual (specialization and generalization), two momentary conscious semantic changes (metaphor and metonymy) and also secondary ways: gradual (elevation and degradation), momentary (hyperbole and litote).

Why study semantics? Semantics (as the study of meaning) is central to the study of communication and as communication becomes more and more a crucial factor in social organization, the need to understand it becomes more and more pressing. Semantics is also at the centre of the study of the human mind - thought processes, cognition, conceptualization - all these are intricately bound up with the way in which we classify and convey our experience of the world through language.

Because it is, in these two ways, a focal point in man's study of man, semantics has been the meeting place of various cross-currents of thinking and various disciplines of study. Philosophy, psychology, and linguistics all claim a deep interest

in the subject. Semantics has often seemed baffling because there are many different approaches to it, and the ways in which they are related to one another are rarely clear, even to writers on the subject. (Leech 1990: IX).

Semantics is a branch of linguistics, which is the study of language; it is an area of study interacting with those of syntax and phonology. A person's linguistic abilities are based on knowledge that they have. One of the insights of modern linguistics is that speakers of a language have different types of linguistic knowledge, including how to pronounce words, how to construct sentences, and about the meaning of individual words and sentences. To reflect this, linguistic description has different levels of analysis. So - phonology is the study of what sounds combine to form words; syntax is the study of how words can be combined into sentences; and semantics is the study of the meanings of words and sentences.

It has often been pointed out, and for obvious reasons, that semantics is the youngest branch of linguistics (Ullmann 1962, Greimas 1962). Yet, interest in what we call today "problems of semantics" was quite alive already in ancient times. In ancient Greece, philosophers spent much time debating the problem of the way in which words acquired their meaning. The question why is a thing called by a given name, was answered in two different ways.

Some of them believed that the names of things were arrived at naturally, *physei*, that they were somehow conditioned by the natural properties of things themselves. They took great pains to explain for instance that a letter like "rho" seems apt to express motion since the tongue moves rapidly in its production. Hence its occurrence in such words as *rhoein* ("to flow"), while other sounds such as /s, f, ks/, which require greater breath effort in production, are apt for such names as *psychron* ("shivering") or *kseon* ("shaking"), etc. The obvious inadvertencies of such correlations did not discourage philosophers from believing that it is the physical nature of the sounds of a name that can tell us something about its meaning.

Other philosophers held the opposite view, namely that names are given to

things arbitrarily through convention, *thesei*. The *physei-thesei* controversy or *physis-nomos* controversy is amply discussed in Plato's dialogue *Cratylus*. In the dialogue, Cratylus appears to be a part of the *physei* theory of name acquisition, while Hermogenes defends the opposite, *nomos* or their point of view. The two positions are then debated by Socrates in his usual manner. In an attempt to mediate between the two discussants he points out first of all that there are two types of names. Some are compound names which are divisible into smaller constituent elements and accordingly, analyzable into the meaning of these constituent elements: *Poseidon* derives his name from *posi* ("for the feet") and *desmos* ("fetter") since it was believed that it was difficult for the sea god to walk in the water.

The words, in themselves, Socrates points out, give us no clue as to their "natural" meaning, except for the nature of their sounds. Certain qualities are attributed to certain types of sounds and then the meaning of words is analyzed in terms of the qualities of the sounds they are made of. When faced with abundant examples which run counter to the a priori hypothesis: finding a "l" sound ("lambda") "characteristic of liquid movements" in the word *sklerotes* ("hardness") for instance, he concludes, in true Socratic fashion, that "we must admit that both convention and usage contribute to the manifestation of what we have in mind when we speak".

In two other dialogues, *Theatetus* and *Sophists*, Plato dealt with other problems such as the relation between thought, language, and the outside world. In fact, Plato opened the way for the analysis of the sentence in terms which are partly linguistic and partly pertaining to logic. He was dealing therefore with matters pertaining to syntactic semantics, the meaning of utterances, rather than the meaning of individual words.

Aristotle's works (*Organon* as well as *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*) represent the next major contribution of antiquity to language study in general and semantics in particular. His general approach to language was that of a logician, in the sense that he was interested in what there is to know how men know it, and how they express it

in language (Dinneen, 1967: 70) and it is through this perspective that his contribution to linguistics should be assessed.

In the field of semantics proper, he identified a level of language analysis - the lexical one - the main purpose of which was to study the meaning of words either in isolation or in syntactic constructions. He deepened the discussion of the polysemy, antonymy, synonymy and homony and developed a full-fledged theory of metaphor.

The contribution of stoic philosophy to semantics is related to their discussion of the nature of linguistic sign. In fact, as it was pointed out (Jakobson, 1965: 21, Stati 1971: 182, etc.) centuries ahead of Ferdinand de Saussure, the theory of the Janus-like nature of the linguistic sign - *semeion* - is an entity resulting from the relationship obtaining between the signifier - *semainon* - (i.e. the sound or graphic aspect of the word), the signified - *semainomenon* (i.e. the notion) and the object thus named - *tynkhanon* -, a very clear distinction, therefore, between reference and meaning as postulated much later by Ogden and Richards in the famous "triangle" that goes by their name.

Etymology was also much debated in antiquity; but the explanations given to changes in the meaning and form of words were marred on the one hand by their belief that semantic evolution was always unidirectional, from a supposedly "correct" initial meaning, to their corruption, and, on the other hand, by their disregard of phonetic laws (Stati, 1971: 182).

During the Middle Ages, it is worth mentioning in the field of linguistics and semantics the activity of the "Modistae" the group of philosophers so named because of their writings *On the Modes of Signification*. These writings were highly speculative grammars in which semantic considerations held an important position. The "Modistae" adopted the "thesei" point of view in the "physei-thesei" controversy and their efforts were directed towards pointing out the "modi intelligendi", the ways in which we can know things, and the "modi significandi", the various ways of signifying them (Dinneen, 1967: 143).

It may be concluded that throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages, and actually until the 19<sup>th</sup> century almost everything that came to be known about meaning in languages was the result of philosophic speculation and logical reasoning. Philosophy and logic were the two important sciences which left their strong impact on the study of linguistic meaning.

It was only during the 19<sup>th</sup> century that semantics came into being as an independent branch of linguistics as a science in its own right. The first words which confined themselves to the study of semantic problems as we understand them today, date as far back as the beginning of the last century.

In his lectures at Halle University, the German linguist Ch. C. Reisig was the first to formulate the object of study of the new science of meaning which he called *semasiology*. He conceived the new linguistic branch of study as a historical science studying the principles governing the evolution of meaning.

Towards the end of the century (1897), M. Bréal published an important book *Essay de sémantique* which was soon translated into English and found an immediate echo in France as well as in other countries of Europe. In many ways it marks the birthday of semantics as a modern linguistic discipline. Bréal did not only provide the name for the new science, which became general in use, but also circumscribed more clearly its subject-matter.

The theoretical sources of semantic linguistics outlined by Bréal are, again, classical logic and rethorics, to which the insights of an upcoming science, namely, psychology are added. In following the various changes in the meaning of words, interest is focused on identifying certain general laws governing these changes. Some of these laws are arrived at by the recourse to the categories of logic: extension of meaning, narrowing of meaning, transfer of meaning, while others are due to a psychological approach, degradation of meaning and the reverse process of elevation of meaning.

Alongside these theoretical endeavours to "modernize" semantics as the

youngest branch of linguistics, the study of meaning was considerably enhanced by the writing of dictionaries, both monolingual and bilingual. Lexicographic practice found extensive evidence for the categories and principles used in the study of meaning from antiquity to the more modern approaches of this science: polysemy, synonymy, homonymy, antonymy, as well as for the laws of semantic change mentioned above.

The study of language meaning has a long tradition in Romania. Stati mentioned (1971: 184) Dimitrie Cantemir's contribution to the discussion of the difference between categorematic and syncategorematic words so dear to the medieval scholastics.

Lexicography attained remarkably high standards due mainly to B. P. Hasdeu. His *Magnum Etymologicum Romaniae* ranks with the other great lexicographic works of the time.

In 1887, ten years ahead of M. Bréal, Lazar Saineanu published a remarkable book entitled *Incercare asupra semasiologiei limbii romane. Studii istorice despre tranzitiunea sensurilor*. This constitutes one of the first works on semantics to have appeared anywhere. Saineanu makes ample use of the contributions of psychology in his attempts at identifying the semantic associations established among words and the "logical laws and affinities" governing the evolution of words in particular and of language in general.

Although it doesn't contain an explicit theory of semantics, the posthumous publication of Ferdinand de Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale* 1916, owing to the revolutionary character of the ideas on the study of language it contained, determined an interest for structure in the field of semantics as well.

Within this process of development of the young linguistic discipline, the 1921-1931 decade has a particular significance. It is marked by the publication of three important books: Jost Trier, *Der Deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes* (1931), G. Stern, *Meaning and Change of Meaning* (1931) and C. K. Ogden and J. A.

Richards: *The Meaning of Meaning* (1923).

Jost Trier's book as well as his other studies which are visibly influenced by W. von Humboldt's ideas on language, represents an attempt to approach some of the Saussurean principles to semantics. Analyzing the meaning of a set of lexical elements related to one another by their content, and thus belonging to a semantic "field", Trier reached the conclusion that they were structurally organized within this field, in such a manner that the significative value of each element was determined by the position which it occupied within the respective field. For the first time, therefore, words were no longer approached in isolation, but analyzed in terms of their position within a larger ensemble - the semantic field - which in turn, is integrated, together with other fields, into an ever larger one. The process of subsequent integrations continues until the entire lexicon is covered. The lexicon therefore is envisaged as a huge mosaic with no piece missing.

Gustav Stern's work is an ambitious attempt at examining the component factors of meaning and of determining, on this ground, the causes and directions of changes of meaning. Using scientific advances psychology (particularly Wundt's psychology) Stern postulates several classifications and principles which no linguist could possibly neglect.

As regards Ogden and Richard's book, its very title *The Meaning of Meaning* is suggestive of its content. The book deals for the most part with the different accepted definitions of the word "meaning", not only in linguistics, but in other disciplines as well, identifying no less than twenty-four such definitions. The overt endeavour of the authors is to confine semantic preoccupations to linguistic problems exclusively. The two authors have the merit of having postulated the triadic relational theory of meaning - graphically represented by the triangle that bears their names.

A short supplement appended to the book: *The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages* due to an anthropologist, B. Malinowski, was highly instrumental in the development of a new "contextual" theory of meaning advocated

by the British school of linguistics headed by J. R. Firth.

The following decades, more specifically the period 1930-1950 is known as a period of crisis in semantics. Meaning was all but completely ignored in linguistics particularly as an effect of the position adopted by L. Bloomfield, who considered that the study of meaning was outside the scope of linguistics proper. Its study falls rather within the boundaries of other sciences such as chemistry, physics, etc., and more especially psychology, sociology or anthropology. The somewhat more conciliatory positions which, without denying the role of meaning in language nevertheless allotted it but a marginal place within the study of language (Hockett, 1958), was not able to put an end to this period of crisis.

Reference to semantics was only made in extremis, when the various linguistic theories were not able to integrate the complexity of linguistic events within a unitary system. Hence the widespread idea of viewing semantics as a "refuge", as a vast container in which all language facts that were difficult to formalize could be disposed of.

The picture of the development of semantics throughout this period would be incomplete, were it not to comprise the valuable accumulation of data regarding meaning, all due to the pursuing of tradition methods and primarily to lexicographic practice.

If we view the situation from a broader perspective, it becomes evident that the so-called "crisis" of semantics, actually referred to the crisis of this linguistic discipline only from a structuralist standpoint, more specifically from the point of view of American descriptivism. On the other hand, however, it is also salient that the renovating tendencies, as inaugurated by different linguistic schools, did not incorporate the semantic domain until very late. It was only in the last years of the sixties that the organized attacks of the modern linguistic schools of different orientations was launched upon the vast domain of linguistic meaning.

At present meaning has ceased to be an "anathema" for linguistics. Moreover,

the various linguistic theories are unanimous in admitting that no language description can be regarded as being complete without including facts of meaning in its analysis.

A specific feature of modern research in linguistics is the ever growing interest in problems of meaning. Judging by the great number of published works, by the extensive number of semantic theories which have been postulated, of which some are complementary, while some other are directly opposed, we are witnessing a period of feverish research, of effervescence, which cannot but lead to progress in semantics.

An important development in the direction of a psycholinguistic approach to meaning is Lakoff's investigation of the metaphorical basis of meaning (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). This approach draw on Elinor Rosch's notion of prototype, and adopt the view opposed to that of Chomsky, that meaning cannot be easily separated from the more general cognitive functions of the mind.

G. Leech considers that the developments which will bring most rewards in the future will be those which bring into a harmonious synthesis the insights provided by the three disciplines which claim the most direct and general interest in meaning: those of linguistics, philosophy and psychology.

## **The development and change of the semantic structure of a word**

The development and change of the semantic structure of a word is always a source of qualitative and quantitative development of the vocabulary.

All the types discussed depend upon some comparison between the earlier (whether extinct or still in use) and the new meaning of the given word. This comparison may be based on the difference between notions expressed or referents in the real world that are pointed out, on the type of psychological association at work, on evaluation of the latter by the speaker or, possibly, on some other feature.

The order in which various types are described will follow more or less closely the diachronic classifications of M. Breal and H. Paul. No attempt at a new classification is considered necessary. There seems to be no point in augmenting the number of unsatisfactory schemes already offered in literature. The treatment is therefore traditional.

M. Breal was probably the first to emphasize the fact that in passing from general usage into some special sphere of communication a word as a rule undergoes some sort of specialisation of its meaning. The word *case*, for instance, alongside its general meaning of 'circumstances in which a person or a thing is' possesses special meanings: in law ('a law suit'), in grammar (e.g. *the Possessive case*), in medicine ('a patient', 'an illness'). Compare the following:

*One of Charles's cases had been a child ill with a form of diphtheria.* (C. P. SNOW) (*case* = a patient).

*The Solicitor whom I met at the Holfords' sent me a case which any young man at my stage would have thought himself lucky to get.* (Idem) (*case* = a question decided, in a court of law, a law suit)

The general, not specialized meaning is also very frequent in present-day English. For example: *At last we tiptoed up the broad slippery staircase, and went to our rooms. But in my case not to sleep, immediately at least.* (Idem) (*case* = circumstances in which one is).

This difference is revealed in the difference of contexts in which these words occur, in their different valency. Words connected with illnesses and medicine in the first example, and words connected with law and court procedures in the second, form the semantic paradigm of the word *case*.

The word *play* suggests different notions to a child, a playwright, a footballer, a musician or a chess-player and has in their speech different semantic paradigms. The same applies to the noun *cell* as used by a biologist, an electrician, a nun or a representative of the law; or the word *gas* as understood by a chemist, a housewife, a motorist or a miner.

In all the examples considered above a word which formerly represented a notion of a broader scope has come to render a notion of a narrower scope. When the meaning is specialized, the word can name fewer objects, i.e. have fewer referents. At the same time the content of the notion is being enriched, as it includes -a greater number of relevant features by which the notion is characterized. Or as St. Ullmann puts it: "The word is now applicable to more things but tells us less about them." The reduction of scope accounts for the term "narrowing of the meaning" which is even more often used than the term "specialization". We shall avoid the term "narrowing", since it is somewhat misleading. Actually it is neither the meaning nor the notion, but the scope of the notion that is narrowed.

There is also a third term for the same phenomenon, namely "differentiation", but it is not so widely used as the first two terms.

H. Paul, as well as many other authors, emphasizes the fact that this type of semantic change is particularly frequent in vocabulary of professional and trade groups.

H. Paul's examples are from the German language but it is very easy to find parallel cases in English. So this type of change is fairly universal and fails to disclose any specifically English properties.

The best known examples of specialization in the general language are as follows: OE *dēor* 'wild beast' > ModE *deer* 'wild remnant of a particular species' (the original

meaning was still alive in Shakespeare's time as is proved by the following quotation: *Rats and mice and such small deer*); OE *mete* 'food' >ModE *meat* 'edible flesh', i.e. only a particular species of food (the earlier meaning is still noticeable in the compound *sweetmeat*). This last example deserves special attention because the tendency of fixed context to preserve the original meaning is very marked as is constantly proved by various examples. Other well-worn examples are: OE *fuzol* 'bird' (cf. Germ *Vogel*) > ModE *foal* 'domestic birds'. The old, meaning is still preserved in poetic diction and in set expressions, like *fowls of the air*. Among its derivatives, *fowler* means 'a person who shoots or traps wild birds for sport or food'; the shooting or trapping itself is called *fowling*; *a fowling piece* is a gun. OE *hund* 'dog' (cf. . Germ *Hund*) >*hound* 'a species of hunting dog'. Many words connected with literacy also show similar changes: thus, *teach*<.OE *tæcan* 'to show', 'to teach'; *write* <OE *wrītan* 'to write', 'to scratch', 'to score' (cf. Germ *reißen*)< writing in Europe had first the form of scratching on the bark of the trees. Tracing these semantic changes the scholars can, as it were, witness the development of culture.

In the above examples the new meaning superseded the earlier one. Both meanings can also coexist in the structure of a polysemantic word or be differentiated locally. The word *token* < OE *tāce*, || Germ *Zeichen* originally had the broad meaning of 'sign'. The semantic change that occurred in it illustrates systematic interdependence within the vocabulary elements. Brought into competition with the borrowed word *sign* it became restricted in use to a few cases of fixed context (*a love token, a token of respect, a token vote, a token payment*) and consequently restricted in meaning. In present-day English *token* means something small, unimportant or cheap which represents something big, important or valuable. Other examples of specialization are *room*, which alongside the new meaning keeps the old one of 'space'; *corn* originally meaning 'grain', 'the seed of any cereal plant': locally the word becomes specialized and is understood to denote the leading crop of the district; hence in England *corn* means 'wheat', in Scotland 'oats', whereas in the USA, as an ellipsis for Indian corn, it came to

mean 'maize'.

As a special group belonging to the same type one can mention the formation of proper nouns from common nouns chiefly in toponyms, i.e. place names. For instance, *the City*,— the business part of London; *the Highlands* — the mountainous part of Scotland; *Oxford* — University town in England from *ox+ford*, i.e. a place where oxen could ford the river; *the Tower* (of London) — originally a fortress and palace, later a state prison, now a museum.

In the above examples the change of meaning occurred without change of sound form and without any intervention of morphological processes. In many cases, however, the two processes, semantic and morphological, go hand in hand. For instance, when considering the effect of the agent suffix *-ist* added to the noun stem *art-* we might expect the whole to mean any person occupied in art, a representative of any kind of art, but usage specializes the meaning of the word *artist* and restricts it to a synonym of *painter*.

The process reverse to specialisation is termed generalisation and widening of meaning. In that case the scope of the new notion is wider than that of the original one (hence widening), whereas the content of the notion is poorer. In most cases generalisation is combined with a higher order of abstraction than in the notion expressed by the earlier meaning. The transition from a concrete meaning to an abstract one is a most frequent feature in the semantic history of words. The change may be explained as occasioned by situations in which not all the features of the notions rendered are of equal importance for the message.

Thus, *ready* <OE *ræde* (a derivative of the verb *rīdan* 'to ride') meant 'prepared for a ride'. *Fly* originally meant 'to move through the air with wings'; now it denotes any kind of movement in the air or outer space and also very quick movement in any medium.

The process went very far in the word *thing* with its original meanings 'cause', 'object', 'decision', 'meeting', and 'the decision of the meeting', 'that which was decided

upon'. (Cf. Norwegian *storting* 'parliament'.) At present, as a result of this process of generalisation, the word can substitute nearly any noun, and receives an almost pronominal force. In fact all the words belonging to the group of generic terms fall into this category of generalization. By *g e n e r i c t e r m s* we shall mean non-specific, non-distributive terms applicable to a great number ; of individual members of a big class of words. The grammatical meaning of this class of words becomes predominant in their semantic components. Notice the very general, character of the word *business* in the following: "*Donald hasn't a very good manner of interviews.*"—"All this good-manner *business,*" *Clun said, "they take far too much notice of it now in my opinion"* (A. WILSON) ,

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the instances of generalization proper from generalization combined with a fading of lexical meaning ousted by the grammatical or emotional meaning that take its place. These phenomena are closely connected with the peculiar characteristics of grammatical structure typical of each individual language. One observes them, for instance, studying the semantic history of the English auxiliary and semi-auxiliary verbs, especially *have, do, shall, will, turn, go*, and that of some English prepositions and adverbs which in the course of time have come to express grammatical relations. The weakening of lexical meaning due to the influence.

The factors accounting for semantic changes may be roughly subdivided into two groups: a) extra-linguistic and b) linguistic causes. By extra-linguistic causes we mean various changes in the life of the speech community, changes in economic and social structure, changes in ideas, scientific concepts, way of life and other spheres of human activities as reflected in word meanings. Although objects, institutions, concepts, etc. Change in the course of time in many cases the soundform of the words which denote them is retained but the meaning of the words is changed. The word *car*, e.g., ultimately goes back to Latin *carrus* which meant 'a four-wheeled wagon' (ME. *carre*) but now that other means of transport are used it denotes 'a motor-car', 'a railway carriage' (in the USA), 'that portion of an airship, or balloon which is intended to carry personnel, cargo or equipment'. Some changes of meaning are due to what may be

described as purely linguistic causes, i.e. factors acting within the language system. The commonest form which this influence takes is the so-called ellipsis. In a phrase made up of two words one of these is omitted and its meaning is transferred to its partner. The verb to starve, e.g., in Old English (OE. *steorfan*) had the meaning 'to die' and was habitually used in collocation with the word hunger (ME. *sterven of hunger*). Already in the 16th century the verb itself acquired the meaning 'to die of hunger'. Similar semantic changes may be observed in Modern English when the meaning of one word is transferred to another because they habitually occur together in speech. Another linguistic cause is discrimination of synonyms which can be illustrated by the semantic development of a number of words. The word *land*, e.g., in Old English (OE. *land*) meant both 'solid part of earth's surface' and 'the territory of a nation'. When in the Middle English period the word *country* (OFr. *contree*) was borrowed as its synonym, the meaning of the word *land* was somewhat altered and 'the territory of a nation' came to be denoted mainly by the borrowed word *country*. Some semantic changes may be accounted for by the influence of a peculiar factor usually referred to as linguistic analogy. It was found out, e.g., that if one of the members of a synonymic set acquires a new meaning other members of this set change their meanings too. It was observed, e.g., that all English adverbs which acquired the meaning 'rapidly' (in a certain period of time — before 1300) always develop the meaning 'immediately', similarly verbs synonymous with *catch*, e.g. *grasp*, *get*, etc., by semantic extension acquired another meaning — 'to understand'.

Generally speaking, a necessary condition of any semantic change, no matter what its cause, is some connection, some association between the old meaning and the new. There are two kinds of association involved as a rule in various semantic changes namely: a) similarity of meanings, and b) contiguity of meanings. Similarity of meanings or metaphor may be described as a semantic process of associating two referents, one of which in some way resembles the other. The word *hand*, e.g., acquired in the 16th century the meaning of 'a pointer of a clock or a watch'

because of the similarity of one of the functions performed by the hand (to point at something) and the function of the clockpointer. Since metaphor is based on the perception of similarities it is only natural that when an analogy is obvious, it should give rise to a metaphoric meaning. This can be observed in the wide currency of metaphoric meanings of words denoting parts of the human body in various languages (cf. 'the leg of the table', 'the foot of the hill', etc.). Sometimes it is similarity of form, outline, etc. that underlies the metaphor. The words warm and cold began to denote certain qualities of human voices because of some kind of similarity between these qualities and warm and cold temperature. It is also usual to perceive similarity between colours and emotions. It has also been observed that in many speech communities colour terms, e.g. the words black and white, have metaphoric meanings in addition to the literal denotation of colours. *C o n t i g u i t y* of meanings or metonymy may be described as the semantic process of associating two referents one of which makes part of the other or is closely connected with it. This can be perhaps best illustrated by the use of the word tongue—'the organ of speech' in the meaning of 'language' (as in mother tongue; cf. also L. *lingua*, Russ. *язык*). The word bench acquired the meaning 'judges, magistrates' because it was on the bench that the judges used to sit in law courts, similarly the House acquired the meaning of 'members of the House' (Parliament). It is generally held that metaphor plays a more important role in the change of meaning than metonymy. A more detailed analysis would show that there are some semantic changes that fit into more than the two groups discussed above. A change of meaning, e.g., may be brought about by the association between the sound-forms of two words. The word boon, e.g., originally meant 'prayer, petition', 'request', but then came to denote 'a thing prayed or asked for'. Its current meaning is 'a blessing, an advantage, a thing to be thanked for.' The change of meaning was probably due to the similarity to the sound-form of the adjective boon (an Anglicised form of French *bon* denoting 'good, nice'). Within metaphoric and metonymic changes we can single out various subgroups. Here, however, we shall confine ourselves to a very general outline of the main

types of semantic association as discussed above. A more detailed analysis of the changes of meaning and the nature of such changes belongs in the diachronic or historical lexicology and lies outside the scope of the present textbook. Results of semantic change can be generally observed in the changes of the denotational meaning of the word (restriction and extension of meaning) or in the alteration of its connotational component (amelioration and deterioration of meaning). Changes in the denotational meaning may result in the restriction of the types or range of referents denoted by the word. This may be illustrated by the semantic development of the word *hound* (OE. *hund*) which used to denote 'a dog of any breed' but now denotes only 'a dog used in the chase'. This is also the case with the word *fowl* (OE. *fuzol*, *fuzel*) which in old English denoted 'any bird', but in Modern English denotes 'a domestic hen or cock'. This is generally described as "restriction of meaning" and if the word with the new meaning comes to be used in the specialised vocabulary of some limited group within the speech community it is usual to speak of specialisation of meaning. For example, we can observe restriction and specialisation of meaning in the case of the verb *to glide* (OE. *glidan*) which had the meaning 'to move gently and smoothly' and has now acquired a restricted and specialised meaning 'to fly with no engine' (cf. *aglider*).

Changes in the denotational meaning may also result in the application of the word to a wider variety of referents. This is commonly described as extension of meaning and may be illustrated by the word *target* which originally meant 'a small round shield' (a diminutive of *targe*, cf. ON. *targa*) but now means 'anything that is fired at' and also figuratively 'any result aimed at'. If the word with the extended meaning passes from the specialised vocabulary into common use, we describe the result of the semantic change as the generalisation of meaning. The word *camp*, e.g., which originally was used only as a military term and meant 'the place where troops are lodged in tents' (cf. L. *campus* — 'exercising ground for the army') extended and generalised its meaning and now denotes 'temporary quarters' (of travellers, nomads,

etc.).

As can be seen from the examples discussed above it is mainly the denotational component of the lexical meaning that is affected while the connotational component remains unaltered. There are other cases, however, when the changes in the connotational meaning come to the fore. These changes, as a rule accompanied by a change in the denotational component, may be subdivided into two main groups: a) pejorative development or the acquisition by the word of some derogatory emotive charge, and b) ameliorative development or the improvement of the connotational component of meaning. The semantic change in the word *boor* may serve to illustrate the first group. This word was originally used to denote 'a villager, a peasant' (cf. OE. *Zebur* 'dweller') and then acquired a derogatory, contemptuous connotational meaning and came to denote 'a clumsy or ill-bred fellow'. The ameliorative development of the connotational meaning may be observed in the change of the semantic structure of the word *minister* which in one of its meanings originally denoted 'a servant, an attendant',

It is of interest to note that in derivational clusters a change in the connotational meaning of one member does not necessarily affect the others. This peculiarity can be observed in the words *accident* and *accidental*. The lexical meaning of the noun *accident* has undergone pejorative development and denotes not only 'something that happens by chance', but usually 'something unfortunate'. The derived adjective *accidental* does not possess in its semantic structure this negative connotational meaning (cf. also *fortune*: *bad fortune*, *good fortune* and *fortunate*).

As can be inferred from the analysis of various changes of word-meanings they can be classified according to the social causes that bring about change of meaning (socio-linguistic classification), the nature of these changes (psychological classification) and the results of semantic changes (logical classification). Here it is suggested that causes, nature and results of semantic changes should be viewed as three essentially different but inseparable aspects of one and the same linguistic phenomenon as a change

of meaning may be investigated from the point of view of its cause, nature and its consequences. Essentially the same causes may bring about different results, e.g. the semantic development in the word knight (OE. *cniht*) from 'a boy servant' to 'a young warrior' and eventually to the meaning it possesses in Modern English is due to extra-linguistic causes just as the semantic change in the word boor, but the results are different. In the case of book we observe pejorative development whereas in the case of knight we observe amelioration of the connotational component. And conversely, different causes may lead to the same result. Restriction of meaning, for example, may be the result of the influence of extra-linguistic factors as in the case of glide (progress of science and technique) and also of purely linguistic causes (discrimination of synonyms) as is the case with the word fowl. Similarity of referent as the basis of association, may bring about different results, e.g. extension of meaning as in target and also restriction of meaning as in the word fowl. To avoid terminological confusion it is suggested that the terms re-striction and extension or amelioration and de-terioration of meaning should be used to describe only the results of semantic change irrespective of its nature or causes. When we discuss metaphoric or metonymic transfer of meaning we imply the nature of the semantic change whatever its results may be. It also follows that a change of meaning should be described so as to satisfy all the three criteria. In the discussion of semantic changes we confined ourselves only to the type of change which results in the disappearance of the old meaning which is replaced by the new one.

## Metaphor as a means of semantic change in Stylistics

"Specialization" and "generalization" are thus identified on the evidence of comparing logical notions expressed by the meaning of words. If, on the other hand, the linguist is guided by psychological considerations and has to go by the type of association at work in the transfer of the name of one object to another and different one, he will observe that the most frequent transfers are based on associations of similarity or of contiguity. As these types of transfer are well known in rhetoric as ; figures of speech called *m e t a p h o r* (Gr *meta* 'change' and *phero* 'bear') and *m e t o n y m y* (Gr *metonymia* from *meta* and *onoma* 'name') and the same terms are adopted here. A metaphor is a transfer of name based on the association of similarity and thus is actually a hidden comparison. It presents a method of description which likens one thing to another by referring to it as if it were some other one. A cunning person, for instance, is referred to as *a fox*. A woman may be called *a peach, a lemon, a cat, a goose*, etc. In a metonymy, this referring to one thing as if it were some other one is based on association of contiguity. Sean O'Casey in his one-act play "The Hall of Healing" metonymically names his personages according to the things they are wearing: *Red Muffler, Grey Shawl*, etc. Metaphor and metonymy differ from the two first types of semantic change, i.e. generalization and specialization, inasmuch .as they do not originate as a result of gradual almost imperceptible change in many contexts, but come of a purposeful momentary transfer of a name from one object to another belonging to a different sphere of reality.

In all discussion of linguistic metaphor and metonymy it must be borne in mind that they are different from metaphor and metonymy as literary devices. When the latter are offered and accepted both the author and the reader are to a greater or lesser degree aware that this reference is figurative, that the object has another name. The relationship of the direct denotative meaning of the word and the meaning it has in the literary context in question is based on similarity of some features in the objects compared. The poetic metaphor is the fruit of the author's creative imagination, as for example when England is called by Shakespeare (in "King Richard II") *this precious stone set in the*

*silver sea*, or when A. Tennyson writes: *What stamps the wrinkle deeper on the brow?/ To view each loved one blotted from life's page.*

In a linguistic metaphor, especially when it is dead as a result of long usage, the thing named often has no other name. In a dead metaphor the comparison is completely forgotten, as for instance in the words *gather*, *source* and *shady* in the following example dealing with some information: / *gathered that one or two of their sources were shady, and some not so much shady as irregular in a most unexpected way.* (SNOW)

The meaning of such expressions as a *sun beam* or a *beam of light* are not explained by-allusions to a tree, although the word is actually derived from OE *beam* 'tree' || Germ *Baum*, whence the meaning *beam* a long piece of squared timber supported at both ends' has also developed. The metaphor is dead. There are no associations with hens in the verb' *brood* 'to meditate' (often sullenly), 'though the direct meaning is 'to sit on eggs'.

There may be transitory stages: *a bottleneck* 'any thing obstructing an even flow of work", for instance, is not a neck and does not belong to a bottle. The transfer is possibly due to the fact that there are some common features in the narrow top part of the bottle, a narrow outlet for road traffic, and obstacles interfering with the smooth working of administrative machinery.

Metaphors, H. Paul points out, may be based upon very different types of similarity, for instance, similarity of shape: *head of a cabbage*, *the teeth of a saw*. This similarity may be based on a similarity of function. The transferred meaning is easily recognized from the context: *the head of the school*, *the key to a mystery*. The similarity may be supported also by position: *foot of a page*, *of a mountain*, or behaviour and function: *bookworm*, *wirepuller*. The word 'whip' a lash used to urge horses on' is metaphorically transferred to an official in the British Parliament appointed by a political party to see that members are present at debates, especially when a vote is taken, to check the voting and also to advise the members on the

policy of the respective party, etc.

In *the leg of the table* the metaphor is motivated by the similarity of the lower part of the table and the human limb in position and partly in shape and function. Anthropomorphic metaphors are among the most frequent. The way in which the words denoting parts of the body are made to express a variety of meanings may be illustrated by the following: *head of an army, of a procession, of a household; arms and mouth of a river, eye of a needle, foot of a hill, tongue of a bell* and so on and so forth. The transferred meaning is easily recognized from the context: ... *her feet were in low-heeled brown brogues with fringed tongues.* (PLOMER)

Numerous cases of metaphoric transfer are based upon the analogy between duration of time and space, e.g. *long distance :: long speech; a short path :: a short time.* The transfer of space relations upon psychological and mental notions may be exemplified by words and expressions concerned with understanding: *to catch (to grasp) an idea; to take a hint; , to get the hang of; to throw light upon.*

This metaphoric change from the concrete to the abstract is also represented in such simple words as *score, span, thrill.* *Score* comes from OE *scoru* 'twenty' from ON *skor* 'twenty' and also 'notch'. In OE time notches were cut on sticks to keep a reckoning. As *score* is cognate with *shear*, it is very probable that the meaning developed from the twentieth notch that was made of a larger size. From the meaning 'line' or 'notch cut or scratched down' many new meanings sprang out, such as 'number of points made by a player or a side in some games', 'running account', 'a debt', 'written or printed music', etc. *Span* from OE *spann* 'maximum distance between the tips of thumb and little finger used as a measure of length', came to mean 'full extent from end to end' (of a bridge, an arch, etc.) and 'a short distance'. *Thrill* from ME *thriven* 'to pierce' developed into the present meaning 'to penetrate with emotion'.

Another subgroup of metaphors comprises transitions of proper names into common ones: *an Adonis, a Cicero, a Don Juan,* etc. When a proper name like *Falstaff* is used referring specifically to the hero of Shakespeare's plays it has a unique reference. But when

people speak of a person they know calling him *Falstaff* they make a proper name generic for a corpulent, jovial, irrepressibly impudent person and it no longer denotes a unique being. Cf. *Don Juan* as used about attractive profligates. To certain races and nationalities traditional characteristics have been attached by the popular mind with or without real justification. If a person is an out-and-out mercenary and a hypocrite into the bargain they call him a *Philistine*, ruthlessly destructive people are called *Vandals*.

## Metonymy and its use as semantic change source

If the transfer is based upon the association of contiguity it is called *metonymy*. It is a shift of names between things that are known to be in some way or other connected in reality. The transfer may be conditioned by spatial, temporal, causal, symbolic, instrumental, functional and other relations.

Thus, the word *book* is derived from the name of a tree on which inscriptions were scratched: ModE *book* < OE *boc* 'beech'. ModE *win* < OE *winnan* 'to fight'; the word has been shifted so as to apply to the success following fighting. *Cash* is an adaptation of the French word *caisse* 'box'; from naming the container it came to mean what was contained, i.e. money; the original meaning was lost in competition with the new word *safe*. Spatial relations are also present when the name of the place is used for the people occupying it. *The chair* may mean 'the chairman', *the bar* 'the lawyers', *the pulpit* 'the priests'. The word *town* may denote the inhabitants of a town and the word *house* the members of the House of Commons or of Lords. *Cello*, *violin*, *saxophone* are often used to denote not the instruments but the musicians who play them.

A causal relationship is obvious in the following development: ModE *fear* < ME *feere* < OE *fær*, *fēr* 'danger', 'unexpected attack'. States and properties serve as names for objects and people possessing them: *youth*, *age*, *authorities*, *forces*. The name of the action can serve to name the result of the action: ModE *kill* < ME *killen* 'to hit on the head', ModE *stay* || Germ *schlagen*.. Emotions may be named by the movements that accompany them: *to frown*, *to start*.

There are also the well-known instances of symbol for thing symbolized: *the crown* for 'monarchy'; the instrument for the product: *'hand* 'handwriting'; receptacle for content, as in the word *kettle*, and some others. Words for the material from which an article is made are often used to denote the particular article: *glass*, *iron*, *copper*, *nickel* are well known examples. The pars pro toto where the name of a part is applied to the whole may be illustrated by such military terms as *the royal horse* for 'cavalry' and *foot* for 'infantry', and the expressions like / *want to have a word with you*. The reverse process is

observed when OE *cēol* 'a ship' develops among other variants into *keel* 'a barge load of coal'.

A place of its own within metonymical change is occupied by the so-called *functional change*. The type has its peculiarities: in this case the shift is between names of things substituting one another in human practice. Thus, the early instrument for writing was a feather or more exactly a quill (OE *pen*, from OFr *penne*, from It *penna*, from Lat. *penna* 'feather'). We write with fountain-pens that are made of different materials and have nothing in common with feathers except the function, but the name remains. The name *rudder* comes from OE *roper* 'oar' || Germ *Ruder* 'oar'. The shift of meaning is due to the shift of function: the steering was formerly achieved by an oar. The steersman was called *pilot*; with the coming of aviation one who operates the flying controls of an aircraft was also called *pilot*. For more cases of functional change see also the semantic history of the words: *filter*, *pocket*, *spoon*, *stamp*, *sail*.

Common names may be derived from proper names also metonymically, as in *macadam* and *diesel*, so named after their inventors.

Many physical and technical units are named after great scientists: *volt*, *ohm*, *ampere*, *watt*, etc.

There are also many instances in political vocabulary when the place of some establishment is used not only for the establishment itself or its staff but also for its policy: *the White House*, *the Pentagon*, *Wall Street*, *Downing Street*, *Fleet Street*.

Examples of geographic names turning into common nouns to name the goods exported or originating there are exceedingly numerous, e.g.

*astrakhan*, *bikini*, *boston*, *cardigan*, *china*, *tweed*.

Garments came to be known by the names of those who brought them into fashion: *mackintosh*, *raglan*, *wellingtons*.

**The analysis of metonymy and synecdoche in “The Path of Thunder” by P. Abrahams.**

1) There was time for a cup of tea(pg.16). A cup of tea is metonymy. This is

used to express “to have a snack and drink something”. The action is changed with the phrase.

Before returning home Lanny wanted to eat something. The author used this metonymy to make the passage vivid and from the speech of Lanny. This way he used neutral and colloquial vocabulary.

2) He crossed the Parade and went into Fatty’s at the foot of District Six.

Fatty’s is in the meaning of a bar. Fatty is the owner of the bar. So the name of the person is used in context in the meaning of a place. We may describe it this way:

3) While he washed, he heard the doorbell then voices. Pg.17

In the meaning of guests who came to see off Lanny.

4) Well, this was the last meaning of The Eight. Pg. 18

In this example The Eight is metonymy. When Lanny was studying he set up the circle with his friends. The amount of them was eight. The others used to call them “The Eight” instead of their names.

5) Lanny was on his way home. Pg. 18

Here the content shows us that the word “home” is metonymy. Lanny thought not only about his community who supported him to get education.

Home is metonymy because it is used instead of the wide idea, his family, his motherland, and his people who are waiting for him.

6) They had sent him to Cape Town to get a teacher’s certificate. Pg. 20

Cape Town is the name of the town but there was situated Coloured Boys’ High school and this school is changed with the name of the town where it was situated.

7) And suddenly Lanny remembered. This was not Cape Town. Pg. 21

Cape Town was a central part of the country and there was not strong race discrimination. The equality of people of different races is held in the town but in

Highveld, there was still race discrimination:

8) He had discussed the color question a lot in the national liberation league and the Noh-European United Front: now it had picked him out. Pg. 22

Color question-the problems about race discrimination the word is changed which is associated with the primary meaning the problem of negroes and their rights and in society.

9) South Africa Lanny thought tiredly. This is South Africa. Pg. 23

The place name is used to describe social, moral, cultural and spiritual life of society, of people who lived in South Africa.

10) From the other room they could hear the hissing of the kettle. Pg. 31

Kettle is a metonymy in this example. It is a type container used instead of the water contained in it. Lanny came home, met with his community and at home he was with his mother speaking. They could hear the kettle boiling.

11) To see a school where the children of Stilleveld can learn the wisdom of the world. Pg. 51

The wisdom of the world – metonymy, the knowledge, much education.

12) ... so that they can open the good book and read it for themselves. Pg. 51

Good book is metonymy. The word is changed with the book “Bible”.

13) ...because one could read and write the colour bar would disappear. Pg. 51

Colour bar is used in meaning of race discrimination in that society.

14) Your people are excited, word of your coming has traveled all over the two valleys, and I believe into houses of the white folk as well. Pg. 53

Word of your coming is metonymy because word is a tool of information or announcement about Lanny’s arrival.

15) Houses of the white folk is also metonymy, because the word house is a kind of building in dictionary meaning, but in this context it means people who are living in them. So the proximity of a place is changed for the people who live in it.

This expression is used by Mako, when he first met Lanny on the way with preacher.

16) And that poor black thins should work for him, heh? Pg. 54

Things – metonymy in the meaning of negro people.

17) That’s all nonsense, Mako, we are suffering for the sins if the world ...

The world is metonymy, all people who live in this world. The place or abstract notion is used for concrete noun-people.

18) He had brought his cape Town manners with him. Pg. 21

Cape Town manners – metonymy. It is used the meaning of Lanny’s life in Cape Town.

19) In Cape Town he would have stepped across and asked for a cup. Pg. 21

A cup is instead of the meaning a cup of coffee. The type of metonymy is a container for the thing contained.

20) Have you any fancy titles?

“Titles” is in the meaning of any qualification and diploma or certificate about his education. (Lanny’s).

21) A strong hand caught him and saved him from falling. Pg. 73

Hand - synecdoche, part of body. It is used in context for the whole person.

The situation describes that Lanny and Mad Sam were going to the big house and Lanny stumbled in the dark. At that moment, Sam held him not to full down.

22) Big house (Pg. 72) – the place where white people live. This word is metonymy, through the whole novel it expressed Gert Viller and his people, white folks.

23) The cold blue eyes studied him impersonally, ran over him three or four times from head to foot not to miss anything and then settled on his face. Pg. 76

Eyes – part of body, synecdoche. Here it expresses the person Gert Viller.

In the example Gert Viller called Lanny to his house, when he came in, Gert

watched him inspectingly.

24) And this quiet was intensified by the lost of and hopeless noises of the little creatures of the veld. Pg. 80

Little creatures – metonymy the word changed instead of the word the people of the veld, the owners of the veld.

Lanny got angry and even outraged when he went to the big house and metaphor with Gert Viller, and on the way home, back he was dissatisfied by the conversation.

25) It is education that makes you behave as you do. Pg. 81

Education is a generalization of a wide idea in this example. Because not only his knowledge, but his manners, life style, attitude and his outlook are described in one word – education.

This is taken from the passage when Sarie Viller. A white girl wondered Lanny's behavior in front of the girl, he behaved as if he were white and as if the girl was a hundred year familiar with him. This event made Sarie wonder.

26) Slowly, very slowly, the bitter fire went out of his body. Pg. 82

Body – is a synecdoche. A whole is used for a part of body. He felt regret the situation and his mind was obsessed with that rage but time passed and his anger on his mind lowered.

In the context we see other transferred meaning with the word “fire” in the meaning of “rage”, “anger” but it is metaphor, we found it better to stop at it in order the passage, the context should be understandable. Because *fire* is not in its dictionary meaning in the context.

27) The house had a head again. Pg. 84

Head – synecdoche, is used in two contextual meanings here. We may call it simultaneously metonymy and metaphor.

Mother thinks that Lanny is a family leader as he was a man it is metaphor.

Head is used for Lanny – metonymy, type synecdoche.

28) Such a long time the house had been without a head. Pg. 83

In this example, also head is a synecdoche. But it is used in general for a person not specifically Lanny.

Mother admits that for nearly nine years they have man in the family. Only mother and her daughter Mabel.

29) She seeped into the pillow. Pg. 84

A part for the whole – metonymy. The pillow is an object for sleeping. It is in the meaning of whole action – to go to bed.

The object is used to express the action.

She – Lanny’s mother, after the conversation with her son.

30) The centuries of oppression that made him see things as he did. Pg. 87

See things is metonymy, it is used to express relate to the events happened around him.

In this example the preacher and Isaac Finkelberg are talking and the preacher is begging his son not to object the reality. His outlook and this is expressed by metonymy as to see things with concrete nation.

31) “Peace is very heavy, is it not, father?” Pg. 92

This word is metonymy. Peace is in the meaning of broad notions as independence of that community from hite folks and establish their position in life.

32) The daughter of the “aristocracy” of Afrikanderdom around here came into black community.

Aristocracy in the meaning of white race. White people lived richer than black community.

33) Isaac strained his ears and peered into the darkness. Pg. 96

It is metonymy – tool is used for the action but it is body for listening function, so Isaac tried to listen to.

34) Lanny flicked over the pages of Steinbeck. Pg. 97

Here Steinbeck is a writer. The author’s name is used for the book that he

wrote, "Pastures of Heaven". We know about it in the next lines.

Metonymy – an author for his book type is used here.

35) Because they have no real roots of their own. Not the past, not the tradition of the white or of the black.

The white – here the words are associated

The black – with races of human.

36) The whites are in power. "The whites" is in the meaning of the white people.

37) Eyes moved. Pg. 159

Lanny's situation when he saw Mad Sam – metonymy, type – synecdoche. Part of body is used for a person for Lanny.

38) I will make you a cup before I go. Pg. 163

A cup – metonymy in the context it is used instead of the word a cup of tea.

39) I will put on the kettle now.

Also the kettle is expressing the water in it. A container instead of the liquid contained.

40) Speaking in the language they spoke centuries ago, before sound was controlled and reduces to an exact and understandable medium, the language of the eyes. Pg. 170

It is metonymy, used to mean the expressions in Lanny's and Sarie's eyes when they metaphor in the store.

41) The steps drew near. Pg. 210

The steps – a man's action in the meaning someone was coming towards them.

42) "Who is that?" The voice asked. Pg. 58

The voice is a synecdoche. It is used for the girl Sarie Viller. The whole body of a person is used by the word "voice".

## CONCLUSION

The topic under discussion is actual for the course paper. Its actuality emerges in the fact that linguistics has found its position in scientific sphere the president of the Republic of the Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov also mentioned about this in one of his recent speeches about strengthening teaching English language “Knowing foreign languages occupies a key position in the system of devil society institutions ensuring transparency and openness of the ongoing democratic reforms in the state and public construction”. (from I.A.Karimov, Speech for the Conference December 12, 2012).

We have dialled in detail with various types of semantic change. This is necessary not only because of the interest the various cases present in themselves but also because a thorough knowledge of these possibilities helps one to understand the semantic structure of English words at the present stage of their development. The development and change of the semantic structure of a word is always a source of qualitative and quantitative development of the vocabulary.

Metaphor is based on a different type of relations between the dictionary and contextual meanings, a relation based not on identification, but on some kind of association connecting the two concepts, which these meanings represent.

Metonymy is based on a different type of relations between the dictionary and contextual meanings, a relation based not on identification, but on some kind of association connecting the two concepts, which these meanings represent.

The constant development of industry, agriculture, trade and transport bring into being new objects and new notions. Words to name them are either borrowed or created from material already existing in the language and it often happens that new meanings are thus acquired by old words.

## REFERENCE LIST

1. Karimov I.A. Yuksak ma'naviyat - yengilmas kuch.- Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 2008.
2. "Ta'lim to'g'risidagi qonun". Kadrlar tayyorlash milliy dasturi. Toshkent , 1997
3. Ahmedov E., Saydaminova Z., O'zbekiston respublikasi.-Toshkent: O'zbekiston, 2006.
4. Aron. A and Aron. E. N. *Statistic for the Behavioral and Social Sciences: A brief course*. London: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1977.
5. Brown. A and Dowling. P. *Doing Research/Reading Research: A mode of Interrogation for Education*. London: The Falmer Press. 1998.
6. Brown, James Dean. *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press. 1988.
7. Bygate, Martin. *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. London: Longman. 2000.
8. Derewianka, Beverly. *Exploring How Texts Work*. London: Primary English Teaching Association. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Direktorat Pendidikan1990.
9. Lanjutan Pertama. *Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Kelas VII*. Jakarta: Dit.PLP, Ditjen Dikdasmen, Depdiknas2004.
10. Gay, L. R. *Educational Research*. Columbus: Memill Publishing Company. 1987.
11. Gronlund, Norman. E. *Constructing Achievement Tests*. USA: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1982.
12. Gronlund. N.E. *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. USA: Collier Macmillan Int. 1981.
13. Harmer, Jeremy. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman. 2001.
14. Harris, P. David. *Testing English as a Second Language*. USA: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1969.

15. Haycraft, John. *An Introduction to English Language Teaching*. London: Longman. 2002.
16. Heaton, J.B. *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman. 1984.
17. Johnson. D. M. 1987. *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
18. Lado, Robert. *Language Testing*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1972.
19. Larsen, Diane and Freeman. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press. 2000.
20. Mc Niff, Jean..*Action Research: Principle and Practice*. United Kingdom: Routledge. 1988
21. Nagaraj, Geetha. *English Language Teaching: Approaches, Methods, andTechniques*. India: Sangam Books. 1998.
22. Ramelan. *Linguistics and Its Contribution to Language Teachers*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press. 1980.
23. Richards, Jack C and Theodore S.Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods inLanguage Teaching: A Description and Analysis*. United. States ofUnderhill, N.1987. *Testing Spoken Language* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press America: Cambridge University Press. 1986.
24. Saleh, Mursid. *Penelitian Pengajaran Bahasa*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press. 2001.