

# Onomastic Metaphors in The Works of Utkir Hoshimov

Xaydarova Feruza

Lecturer at Jizzakh Polytechnic Institute, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 30 April 2025; **Accepted:** 28 May 2025; **Published:** 30 June 2025

**Abstract:** This article explores the use of onomastic metaphors in the literary works of Utkir Hoshimov, a prominent Uzbek writer known for his rich and culturally nuanced language. Onomastic metaphors—those derived from proper names such as personal names, place names, and ethnonyms—serve as a significant stylistic device in Hoshimov’s narratives. They not only enrich the imagery and expressiveness of the text but also reflect the national mentality, historical consciousness, and sociocultural context of the Uzbek people. The study analyzes selected examples from Hoshimov’s major works to identify how proper names are metaphorically transformed to convey emotional, symbolic, or evaluative meanings. These metaphorical usages highlight the deep interconnection between language, identity, and cultural memory in Uzbek literature.

**Keywords:** Utkir Hoshimov, onomastic metaphor, Uzbek literature, cultural memory, stylistic device, personal names, toponyms, ethnonyms, linguistic imagery, national identity.

**Introduction:** The metaphor is described as “a necessary tool of thinking, a form of scientific reasoning,” “a means that extends the hand of the intellect,” and “one of the most powerful tools for understanding the world,” serving as a key to grasping the universe and reflecting the features of human cognition. Attention has been given to metaphor since the time of Aristotle. The scholar defines metaphor as a linguistic tool based on the process of transferring the properties of one object to those of another [2;686].

One of the leading contemporary specialists on metaphor, N.D. Arutyunova, states: “There is no more beautiful method of providing vivid illustrations in speech than metaphor” [3;188]. In recent years, linguoculturology has emerged as a relatively new scientific discipline. Within this field, metaphor has primarily been studied as a means of artistic expression and has been recognized as an integral component (object) of linguoculturology. Of particular note is N. Mahmudov’s article “Term, Figurative Word, and Metaphor,” which deserves special attention. This article emphasizes that metaphor has been studied in the field of world philology for over two thousand years, and nearly all philosophers of the classical era interpreted metaphor mainly as an embellishment of

speech, a rhetorical device, and a tool of artistic expression. However, by the 20th century, perceptions of metaphor had changed: its spheres of existence had expanded, and metaphor came to be seen as a true manifestation of fundamental cognitive activity. Notably, the article also stresses that metaphor, while being one of the most productive tools for understanding the world, simultaneously serves to economically and intelligently regulate the number of separate lexical units in a language [4;117].

D. Khudoyberganova evaluates metaphors not only as possessing significant cognitive-semantic value in a text but also as phenomena that reflect the unique aspects of the national cultural mindset of a language community. She asserts that texts constructed on the basis of similes and metaphors allow for the identification of patterned textual structures characteristic of a given language. The scholar has assessed them as precedent forms of text [9;18] and has proposed a classification of metaphors into word, word combination, sentence, and microtext forms [7;36].

Metaphor is a universal means of understanding the world, through which the interaction of cognition, language, consciousness, and culture is manifested. It

undoubtedly arouses interest in linguocultural research.

The use of metaphor in literary works individualizes the speech of characters and imbues it with the author's unique style. A new image, a new metaphor expands the cultural space and reveals its inner essence and meaning.

In recent years, onomastic metaphor has been distinguished as a specific type of metaphor in linguistics. As is known, “onomastic metaphors, which are one type of metaphor, are phenomena that reflect the expressive potential of our language. A name endowed with metaphorical meaning, particularly in literary texts, becomes an exceptionally impactful unit” [6;60]. In Uzbek linguistics, onomastic metaphors have been studied to a certain extent by D. Andaniyozova [1;54].

Precedent names, considered as linguocultural units, are among the primary objects of study in linguoculturology. As D. Khudoyberganova emphasizes, “precedent names, as one type of precedent unit, are also regarded as units within the onomastic scope of a particular language” [9; 132]. It is known that “precedent names are names associated with famous texts or situations, as well as symbolic names that refer to a set of exemplary qualities” [5; 35]. The scholar proposes studying onomastic units, including precedent names, from both a linguopoetic and linguocultural perspective, writing: “In general, the names used in Uzbek literature form an entire system. The history of their formation, their linguopoetic features, and their place in Uzbek linguoculture are among the pressing issues in linguistics that demand dedicated research” [8; 36]. Therefore, examining precedent names from a linguocultural standpoint and analyzing them in connection with literary texts can rightly be considered one of the key problems of Uzbek linguoculturology. “Indeed, these are among the most essential units that reflect national culture. The onomastic scope of a given nation is a multifaceted phenomenon that encompasses its history, culture, aesthetic views, and spiritual values” [9; 131]. Preserving the national and natural character of names and ensuring their conformity with the laws of the national language is a requirement of the times. Determining and studying the function of onomastic metaphors used in specific authors' works within literary texts will undoubtedly have a positive impact on the development of onomastics, linguopoetics, and linguoculturology. However, it should be noted that the linguocultural characteristics of onomastic metaphors used in the works of specific authors have not yet been the subject of special research. It is well known that one of the functions of precedent names in literary texts is

their appearance as onomastic metaphors. “Onomastic units may also be used metaphorically in literary texts. When metaphor is manifested through such units, it is referred to as an onomastic metaphor, which involves using a specific onomastic unit in a non-name context — that is, relying on the similarity between a concept and a name (for example, expressing the meaning of a generous person through the anthroponym Hotam)” [1; 54]. “If a metaphorically used onomastic unit has been accepted as a cultural standard of a specific feature in a particular linguoculture, its connection to the concepts and ideas formed in the minds of the representatives of that linguoculture also becomes evident. In other words, the fame of a particular onomastic unit — its precedent nature — is one of the necessary conditions for its metaphorical use” [9; 131]. It is known that “precedent names are classified as national or universal, depending on their affiliation with a particular linguoculture” [9; 131]. Names like Hamlet (a symbol of hopeful emotions) and Othello (a symbol of jealousy) are universal precedent names that are understood and accepted similarly by people across the world. However, every nation has its own national precedent names. For instance, in Uzbek linguoculture, Alpomish symbolizes honor and dignity; Barchin — a faithful beloved; Qorabotir — a vile rival; Gorogly — a fearless, brave, and courageous young man; Layli — a loyal beloved; Majnun — a symbol of mad, devoted love. In the present text, Layli and Majnun serve as onomastic metaphors, used by the author as a linguopoetic device to fulfill an artistic purpose: It seems that Rais Buva once again acted as a matchmaker. Realizing that Nargiskhon and I had been wandering around like Layli and Majnun, he agreed to hold the wedding in the summer. (O. Hoshimov, “Two Times Two Is Five”) As is known, Layli and Majnun are the names of the main characters in Alisher Navoi's poem Layli and Majnun. In Uzbek literature, these names are invoked as symbols of true love and faithful lovers. Therefore, in literary texts, the names Layli and Majnun refer to “beloved ones, ideal lovers” and fulfill a linguocultural function. These anthroponyms are used in the story Two Times Two Is Five as onomastic metaphors meaning “lovers.” Titles of works that employ metaphorical meanings often capture the reader's attention immediately. For instance, the titles of works by master wordsmith Utkir Hoshimov such as “Where There Is Light, There Is Shadow”, “The Pure Notebook of the Heart”, and “Between Two Doors” support our point. These types of individual onomastic metaphors are the result of Uzbek perception and the Uzbek worldview.

Thus, metaphor represents the past, present, and future of language. By analyzing metaphors, one can

evaluate the formation and development of a language. From the early stages of the science that emerged at certain points in the development of language to its present state, it is impossible to imagine language without metaphor. Studying onomastic metaphors used in literary texts from a linguocultural perspective also enables the collection and preservation of cultural information.

We believe that onomastic metaphor should also be taken into account in the linguopoetic and linguocultural analysis of literary works. Studying onomastic metaphor as a method of creating new meanings within the linguistic picture of the world contributes to a broader understanding of the linguocultural features of our language.

## REFERENCES

Анданиязова Д. Ономастик бирликларнинг лингвопоэтик тадқиқи. – Тошкент: Turon zamin ziyo, 2016. – Б.54-61.

Аристотель. Поэтика /Собр. соч. в 4 томах. Т. 2. – М.: Мысль, 1983. – 686 с.; Аристотель. Риторика // Аристотель и античная литература. – М.: Наука, 1978. – С. 164-229; Аристотель. Этика. Политика. Риторика. Поэтика. Категории. – Минск, 1998. – 459 с.

Арутюнова Н.Д. Номинация, референция, значение //Языковая номинация. Общие вопросы. – М., 1979. – С. 188-206; Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс: Вступительная статья к сборнику “Теория метафоры”. – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 5-32; Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1998. – 895 с.; Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора в языке чувств // Язык и мир человека. М., 1999. – С. 385-402.

Маҳмудов Н. Термин, образли сўз ва метафора / Тил тилсими тадқиқи. – Тошкент: Mumtoz so‘z, 2017. – Б. 117-126.

Худойберганава Д. Лингвокультурология терминларининг қисқача изоҳли луғати. – Тошкент: Turon zamin ziyo, 2015. – Б. 35.

Худойберганава Д. Лингвостилистиканинг тадқиқ объекти хусусида / Ўзбек тилшунослигининг долзарб муаммолари. – Тошкент, 2018. – Б.60-65.

Худойберганава Д. Матннинг мазмуний таркибида метафоралар //Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент, 2012, 1-сон. – Б. 36.

Худойберганава Д. Ўзбек тили поэтонимларининг изоҳли луғатини тузиш хусусида // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент, 2016. – №2. – Б. 36.

Худойберганава Д.С. Ўзбек тилидаги бадий матнларнинг антропоцентрик талқини: Филол. фан.

д-ри дисс.... автореф. – Тошкент, 2015. – Б.18.