Intellectual Meaning: An Analysis of Metonymy in English and Arabic

Magid Aldekhan[a]* iD, Shirley O'Neill[b] iD

[a] Department of Arabic, College of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-Qar, Iraq. Email: aldekhan76@utq.edu.iq

[b] University of Southern Queensland. Email: shirley.O'Neill@usq.edu.au

Abstract

As a kind of indirect and coded language, metonymy not only inspires others but also helps one to reach goals set by cultural standards, society values, practices, and beliefs. Metonymy's rhetorical power comes from its ability to change meaning from a literal interpretation to an intended conceptual message, therefore enabling communication both within a particular community and between several language settings, like Arabic and English. This paper tries to investigate these rhetorical devices and investigate the interaction among metonymy, cognition, and linguistics. Thus, the semantic changes made possible by the notion of immanence in Arabic and the ideas of closeness and touch in English are explained and analyzed using cognitive linguistically models and ideas. The results show that the semantic change across metonymy has moved from a merely rhetorical phenomena to a cognitive linguistic one as the understanding of metonymy depends on complex and exact mental processes.

Introduction

Language operates based on binary polarizations, which emphasizes the need of understanding the meanings expressed by both language and non-linguistic facts within certain situational settings (Saussure, 2016). Environmental, social, and cultural elements all help to define and impact these situational settings. As a linguistic notion, metonymy links intended meanings with these contextual elements at both surface and deep levels (Dąbrowska & Divjak, 2019). Determining the intended meaning of metonymical statements calls for significant cognitive work. Metonymic terms cannot be used indiscriminately and depend on many cultural elements. These statements reflect the cultural values and conventions of certain groups (Eid, Abu-Gub, & Shureteh, 2023).

The rationale for this study is based on the observation that metonymic expressions are prevalent in both Arabic and English. Despite the increasing body of literature addressing metonymic expressions, there remains a significant research gap in this area. Consequently, recent studies have concentrated on exploring these expressions more deeply. Cognitive linguists have particularly highlighted the unique status of metonymy in comparison to other figures of speech, such as metaphor (Yan & Longfeng, 2020; Zhou & Li, 2021). This study specifically examines metonymy and compares its usage between Arabic and English. The objective of this study is to enrich the lexical repertoire within the existing literature. To date, there has been a scarcity of comparative analyses of metonymic expressions across Arabic and English. Hence, this study

aims to explore and investigate: *How does metonymy function differently in English and Arabic languages?* Furthermore, the second research question is: *What are the cognitive processes involved in interpreting metonymic expressions in English and Arabic?*

This study is organized as follows: The first section, "Introduction," provides an overview of the research area and outlines the motivations behind the study. The second section, "Literature Review," examines existing literature on the concept of metonymy. The third section, "Methodology," details the research design employed in this study. The fourth section, "Findings and Discussion," addresses the purpose and function of metonymy, the role of linguistic and non-linguistic data, and the social and cultural dimensions of metonymy. It also investigates the relationship between metonymy and cognitive linguistics, with a focus on metonymy in Arabic. The final section, "Conclusion," summarizes the study's findings, discusses its implications, and identifies its limitations.

Literature Review

The Concept of Metonymy

Cognitive linguists, such as Johnson & Lakoff (1980), assert that the function of metonymy extends beyond the lexical level, encompassing an understanding of societal attitudes, thoughts, and values. They propose that metonymy represents a fundamental cognitive process inherent to human cognition, involving intellectual faculties such as perception and reasoning (Eid et al., 2023). From a rhetorical perspective, several scholars view metonymy as distinct from literal meaning, emphasizing its pragmatic and semantic dimensions (Al-Jurjani, 1983). As a highly productive and enriching linguistic device, metonymy has attracted considerable scholarly attention. However, much of the research has categorized it under the broader concept of metaphor, treating metonymy as a complementary phenomenon and applying a unified definition. Consequently, metonymy is often interpreted as a form of conceptual rethinking based on the similarity of characteristics between the denoted object and its context (Moisiuk et al., 2022; Sokol et al., 2020). Thus, metonymy is defined as a "semiotic pattern" that involves the "transfer of symbols" within a given event, encompassing the naming of a class of objects or the whole to its adjacent part within a specific situation (Langacker, 1993).

Furthermore, metonymy involves the "transfer of names of phenomena, objects, and their attributes through contiguity or, more broadly, through their spatial and temporal connections" (Arutyunova, 1990). It is important to recognize that "communicative culture" is an integral component of "general culture," reflecting the personification of both objective and subjective qualities within the "linguistic hierarchy" (Moisiuk et al., 2022). A notable gap in the existing research is that, despite acknowledging metonymy as a distinct rhetorical figure, scholars often continue to analyse it through the shared characteristics of metaphor. Applying cognitive principles presents a valuable opportunity to examine metonymy from a novel perspective, elucidating the interplay between language and "cognitive structures" (Jenabagha, Najafi Karimi, & Marzban, 2022; Moisiuk et al., 2022).

Metonymy in Arabic

Metonymy is a significant subject within the field of rhetoric, alongside simile and metaphor. Al-Jurjani (1992) defines metonymy as a rhetorical device wherein the speaker intends to convey a particular meaning indirectly. Rather than stating the meaning explicitly, it is implied through a phrase that represents the intended concept. For example, (نجادهطويل هو) (his sword's strap is long). النجاد a sword's strap. Another example is (رمادهكثير he has lots of ashes). They say about the woman: (والضحىنؤوم sleeps till noon) (Al-Jurjani, 1992). Arab lexicographers view metonymy "*al-Kenaya*" in a different way based on its root word "*Kanna*". Given that root words in Arabic possess multiple senses, Arab lexicographers often refer to the connotative meanings associated with metonymy (Eid et al., 2023).

Metonymy in English

The concept of metonymy encompasses various definitions related to the association of meaning between words. Yule (2010) characterizes metonymy as "a type of relationship based on a close connection in daily experience." This relationship can be categorized into three types:

1. "A Container-Contents" Relationship: Bottle-Water
2. "A Whole-Part Relationship": House-Roof
3. "Representative-Symbol Relationship": The President- White House

Metonymy is a form of "sense connection," akin to "polysemy, antonymy, or synonymy," where each word is related to another through association. Understanding metonymy requires a foundational grasp of these

sense connections. Typically, metonymy involves substitution or replacement. Crystal (2018) defines it as a figure of speech in which the name of an entity or property is replaced with the name of the entity itself. Tóth (2018) describes metonymy as "an introspective equation," where an item from one domain is substituted with an item from another domain. The concept of semantic transfer in metonymy, which entails the "extension" or "broadening" of a word's meaning, involves associating a feature or concept with a "semantic domain" to represent the entire domain (Bybee, 2015). For instance, the term "silver" not only refers to the metal but also to objects made from or coated with it, including metal-based eating utensils. This reflects metonymy as a form of semantic shift (Hartmann & Stork, 1972), where changes in meaning occur as a word or phrase applies to another entity with which it is associated.

Methodology

An analytical technique has been used to handle the study's research questions as it is appropriate for the kind of the inquiry. This approach emphasizes the contextual relevance of utterances therefore enabling a comparison of metonymy in Arabic and English (Eid et al., 2023). Along with references to the research on the conceptualization, kinds, and purposes of metonymy, the data sources for this study consist of passages from the Holy Book and fragments from literary works. Two languages' metonymic use has been compared (Ellis, 2021) to find both parallels and variations. Furthermore utilized to this study are ideas from cognitive linguistics. Arabic metonymy has been investigated using the "Principle of Immanence"; English's "Principle of Proximity and Contact" has been used to investigate how meaning is formed by proximity.

Findings and Discussion

Types of Metonymy in Arabic

Metonymy in Arabic is grounded in the principle of conjunction and can be categorized into three types:

1- The first type is metonymy of quality, where the description is directly conveyed through an adjective inherent in the speech. The intended meaning is inferred from the context of the discourse (Khalil, 2004). For example:

Zaid Hits the Palm with Palm.

An example of metonymy of quality is the use of an adjective expressing loss or lamentation over the loss of something significant. This type of metonymy is often employed by individuals who are grieving or feeling the absence of a valuable entity, such as when a person, overwhelmed by their loss, might clap or hit their palms together in a gesture of mourning or regret.

2- The second type is metonymy of description, in which an adjective is explicitly stated. In this case, the adjective refers directly to the noun being described, due to the inherent association between the adjective and the modified noun. When the adjective is mentioned, it directly points to the noun characterized by that property (Khalil, 2004). For example, consider the following instance from Al-Buhturi .

فطلبتعت ها اخفوعأضللتصل ها   بحمدثيكورللب ولرعبـولحّد

(Then I stabbed him once more in a specific area of his body, known as the place associated with valour, fear, and hatred.)

The poet describes a confrontation with a wolf in the desert, where he repeatedly stabs the wolf with his sword in a particular part of its body. This area, associated with feelings of fear and hatred, metaphorically refers to the heart.

3- The third type is metonymy of attribution, where a noun is paired with an adjective that is not directly adjacent but is contextually related to the noun. The relationship between the noun and the adjective is understood through the context. For instance, saying "in his clothes is a lion" refers to courage, which is a key attribute of a lion. Although the adjective "brave" is not explicitly mentioned, the context conveys that the person described is courageous. An example of this type of metonymy is as follows:

الفضرعلهسير حمثسار ند

(The generosity goes wherever Zaid goes.)

In this example, the metonymy attributes credit to Zaid indirectly. The term "generosity" is associated with Zaid's presence or the places he frequents, rather than directly referencing him. This implies that the speaker is describing Zaid indirectly as a person characterized by grace and generosit.

Types of Metonymy in English

Johnson & Lakoff (1980) proposed the following taxonomy for types of metonymy in English:

1. "The portion-for-the-whole metonymy"

In this type of metonymy, reference is made to a distinguishing or significant part to represent the whole it is associated with. For example:

A. "We do not hire longhairs".
B. "Sarah is just a pretty face".
C. "The Giants need a stronger arm in the right field".

The terms 'longhairs,' 'facial,' and 'arm' in these phrases allude to individuals who possess specific traits according to the speaker's perspective.

2. "The producer-for-the product" metonymy

The expression refers to the creator of the object, and it represents the object itself, as in:

A. George bought a Nissan.
B. He likes to read Márquez.
C. He has got a Gogh in his office.

In the expression "Nissan," the term refers to the automobile manufacturer company and represents the cars it produces. Similarly, "Márquez" denotes his literary works, and "Gogh" signifies an artistic creation by Vincent van Gogh.

3. "The object-used-for-the user metonymy"

In this type of metonymy, the object refers to the users who perform the action denoted by the mentioned verb, as in:

A. "The gun Tom hired wanted fifty grand."
B. "The trains are on strike."

The terms "the gun" and "the trains" refer to the people who use them, specifically the "shooter" and the "train driver.

4. "The controller-for-controlled metonymy"

In this type of metonymy, the controlled entity is represented by the controller or operator of an object. This form of metonymy bears resemblance to the previous type in its structure. Examples include:

A. "Napoleon lost at Waterloo."
B. "A Mercedes rear-ended me."

In the examples above, the proper noun "Napoleon" represents the "French army," while the objective pronoun "me" refers to the "speaker's car."

5. "The institution-for-the people responsible metonymy"

People responsible for operating an institution can be referred to by using the name of the institution itself, such as:

A. "You will never get the University to agree to that."
B. "The Army wants to reinstitute the draft."

6. "The place-for-institution"

This type of metonymy refers to the location where an institution is situated and can be used to represent the institution itself, as in:
A. "Wall Street is in panic."
B. "Paris is introducing longer skirts this season."
C. "Hollywood is not what it used to be."

The region where stock exchanges, shares, and companies are located is known as 'Wall Street.' 'Paris' refers to the renowned Parisian fashion houses. Similarly, the term 'Hollywood' denotes the film-making institution in the American city of Hollywood.

7. "The place-for-event"

This type of metonymy uses the location of an event or a significant occurrence to represent the event or occurrence itself:

A. "Remember the Alamo."
B. "Pearl Harbor still has an effect on our foreign policy."
C. "Watergate changed our politics."

"The Alamo" and "Pearl Harbour" commemorate two significant battles in American history. Conversely, "Watergate" refers to a prominent political scandal involving several American officials.

8. "Seeing-for-ensuring"

This type of metonymy involves using the activity of observing something being accomplished to represent the act of ensuring that it is completed (Johnson & Lakoff, 1980).

A. "See that he gets all his money."

9. "A thing-perceived-for-perception"

This type of metonymy involves referring to an object by the impressions it produces, as in:

A. There goes my knee.

The speaker refers to the discomfort in his knee by mentioning "my knee"

10. "More-form-for-more-content"

"Vowel lengthening, repetition, or reduplication" can be employed to signify an expansion of the meaning of an utterance by augmenting the amount of form present in the utterance:

A. He jumped and jumped.

The metonymy created by the repeated use of the verb 'jumped' refers to an increase in either the duration or distance of each individual jump.

Based on the definitions and examples discussed, considerable confusion exists between metonymy and metaphor in English. The examples provided for metonymy in English often actually represent metaphorical usage, as exemplified by the phrase "Sarah drank the whole bottle." This expression illustrates a metaphorical concept rather than true metonymy. Other examples provided, such as expressing the whole through a part, causal relationships, or circumstantial connections, also pertain to metaphor rather than metonymy. In English, metonymy is based on the principle of adjacency, whereas Arabic metonymy is grounded in the principle of conjunction, which exacerbates the confusion. Arab rhetoricians argue that a key issue in Arabic metonymy is the clear distinction between metonymy and metaphor, a distinction that is less evident in English. Arabic metonymy is more precise in its classification, limited to three types: quality (adjective), description, and attribution. In contrast, English metonymy encompasses a broader range of types, making it challenging to differentiate metonymy from metaphor in the same way as in Arabic.

Everyday English expressions often mirror Arabic metonymy. For instance, describing a student as a "teacher's pet" serves as an example of a metonymy of quality (as detailed in Section 4.1) representing a student who is perceived as favoured or spoiled by the teacher. Upon analysing this expression, one might initially interpret it literally, imagining a pet animal within a school setting, which is implausible. Instead, the term metaphorically refers to a student who receives special attention from the teacher, possibly due to exceptional intelligence or other reasons. This preferential treatment evokes envy among other students, who then characterize the favoured student as a "pet" in a figurative sense, reflecting the Western cultural context where pets are often given significant attention. Thus, this example aligns with the Arabic concept of metonymy of quality.

The Purpose and Function of Metonymy

In language, metonymy fulfills a particular purpose that is sometimes shaped by social context and explained by cultural, social, and environmental elements. In linguistics, social context—which closely relates to the situational context—is the collection of social, historical, and non-linguistic factors influencing the usage of phrases or expressions at a given moment and location (Widdowson, 2007). Knowing the intended meaning of a literal phrase requires knowledge of both language and non-linguistic environments including situational elements and surrounding social and environmental variables. These elements are complex, hence their deconstruction is difficult because they are so important in understanding meaning. Analyzing metonymy in Arabic context indicates its close links to social settings and communal life. The language of metonymy captures everyday routines, social customs, and personal events. Using the word "culture" to refer to the collective impressions that define how individuals see their environment, Sapir (1921) argues that language cannot be isolated from the society or culture in which it exists. Being a basic component of this society, language is intrinsically related to it (Strathern & Stewart, 2020).

The study of metonymical cases shows that the literal meaning of metonymy usually deviates from its intended use, so the literal interpretation is useless in delivering the intended meaning. Arab scholars so contend that creating a metonymical reference offers a major benefit and natural worth beyond simple statement. Al-Jurjani (1992) claims that showing an adjective via metonymy—by establishing its evidence—is more emphatic and rhetorically powerful than just saying it straight-forward. It is not hyperbole to claim that metonymy distinguishes itself from other rhetorical strategies by reflecting a unique and superior language ability. Its use of plurality, subtlety, and cultural-linguistic background shared between the speaker and the receiver results in this difference. Metonymy, unlike direct representation, suggests meaning via words and syntax. The receiver understands metonymy not by direct interpretation but by creative and cognitive processes. Furthermore used for many intents and motives is metonymy:

1- Astonishment: The recipient may initially be astonished by the manner in which the meaning is conveyed. However, after careful consideration and mental engagement, the intended meaning becomes clear.

2- Strangeness: The recipient may initially perceive the speaker's language as unusual. However, once the recipient deciphers the meaning through contextual clues, this initial strangeness diminishes. For those unfamiliar with the context, the peculiarity of the speech persists.

3. Avoiding Obscene Speech: Metonymy enables the avoidance of explicit references to socially sensitive or religiously significant topics, which are prevalent in societies with stringent social customs and religious beliefs, as exemplified in the Holy Qur'an. For example, The Quranic verse: " أَوْ لَامَسْتُمُ النِّسَاءَ فَلَمْ تَجِدُوا مَاءً فَتَيَمَّمُوا صَعِيدًا طَيِّبًا", meaning or "you have contacted women and do not find water, then seek clean earth and wipe over your faces and hands with that dirt. Allah does not intend to make it difficult for you, but he intends to purify you and complete his favour upon you so that you may be grateful." It is a metonymy for sexual intercourse between a man and a woman, expressed indirectly. In this context, God referred to the act as one that breaches modesty and is not to be openly declared.

4- Demonstrating Linguistic Mastery: This occurs when the speaker employs metonymy to demonstrate their linguistic proficiency and mastery of its techniques to the recipient. Numerous examples illustrate this, including:

فـمِنّا مِن وِسطِهِمُ حرِير   وصبّحهم وِسطهمُ تُرابُ

(He attacked them in the evening and they were sitting down on silk rugs, but in the morning he left them on the dust.)

In this poetic verse, Al-Mutanabbi (2012) depicts the heroism of Saif Al-Dawla and his triumph over his adversaries. The poet illustrates how Saif Al-Dawla's victory transformed his enemies from a state of pride and luxury—symbolized by their opulent palaces and silk furnishings—into a state of defeat. The metonymy of silk represents luxury, pride, and dignity, while its absence signifies defeat and the leader's triumph. The poet's references to courage are also metonymic. Readers grasp the intended meaning by recognizing the relationships and contextual associations between words and objects. This interpretation relies on the dualities of honour and humiliation (strength and weakness) and wealth and poverty (silk and dust). The use of silk as a metonymy for wealth and comfort reflects the poet's sophisticated linguistic ability and offers insight into ancient Arab cultural values, where the quality of furnishings serves as a metonymy for social and economic status.

5- Observance of Social Taste: The speaker may employ metonymy to address socially sensitive or potentially embarrassing topics, demonstrating respect for the listener by circumventing direct reference to the subject. What is mentioned in the Almighty's saying "or one of you comes from the place of relieving himself" (the Holy Qur'an, An-Nisa, 43) "relieving" is a metonymy for defecation and the expulsion of human waste where in ancient times, people were used the low places to hide from people when they relieved themselves.

6- Encrypted Message: Metonymy can also function as a form of coded communication between the speaker and recipient. This strategy is employed when the speaker aims to obscure the intended meaning from unintended parties, using metonymy to convey messages discreetly.

7- Avoiding Social Embarrassment: Metonymy can also serve to mitigate social embarrassment. When a speaker feels uncomfortable directly requesting something from a listener, they may employ metonymy to veil their request behind more indirect language and stylistic elements, thus avoiding direct confrontation and preserving social decorum.

8- Aesthetic Function: Metonymy also serves to enhance aesthetics, conciseness, and linguistic elegance across various grammatical structures, with numerous illustrative examples. Beyond its application for uniqueness, goals, and social contexts, metonymy frequently appears in puzzles and in the management of socially awkward situations. For instance, when a man encountered a king who was eating, and the king invited him to join the meal, the man responded, "The fasting person does not eat, your highness." This response, motivated by his reluctance to eat the king's food, exemplifies how metonymy can fulfil diverse functions and meanings. Such meanings are often deciphered through context and can be elucidated by cultural norms, social practices, and linguistic traditions.

Metonymy and Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive linguistics encompasses the study of mental processes and intelligence, focusing on understanding the structure and operation of the human mind (Trask, 1999). This field is closely related to metonymy, as the comprehension of metonymy is heavily dependent on cognitive processes and individual intelligence. Moreover, cognitive linguistics examines the interplay between language and cognition, considering social, physical, and environmental contexts—essentially exploring how language interacts with mental and experiential factors (Ruzibaeva, 2021). Consequently, metonymy can be seen as a cognitive perceptual process because:

1. It utilizes cognitive processes to interpret the intended meaning.
2. It encompasses elements of novelty and surprise, which are reliant on cognitive and imaginative processes, as well as the emotional responses generated by the mind.
3. It involves imaginative elements that are rooted in cognitive processes, requiring both the speaker and the listener to grasp the underlying purpose of the communication.

Metonymy represents a transition from traditional rhetoric to cognitive linguistics, where certain metonymic expressions are examined within cognitive frameworks. In other words, metonymy is a conceptual mental-emotional process. This study focuses on examples of metonymy to confirm the close relationship between metonymy and cognitive linguistics, particularly when precise mental operations are required to interpret intended meanings. One example is the metonymy of quality, as illustrated by the phrase, "Muhammad is of much hospitality." This expression reflects cultural and social customs, where "ashes" metaphorically denote remnants of firewood. An individual described as having a lot of ash signifies an abundance of coals, which represents a large quantity of food and a high number of guests. Thus, this abundance of guests translates into the characterization of generosity and hospitality. The intended meaning is not directly evident but requires filtering through successive stages, involving cognitive operations that connect each stage until the meaning is fully understood. Metonymy can thus be described as an intricate cipher, providing the recipient with the pleasure of tracing meaning through its stages to uncover the intended significance (Al-Sakaki, 1987). The intended meaning was not immediately apparent but was revealed through a process of successive stages, necessitating cognitive operations that connected each stage until the final interpretation was achieved. Metonymy can thus be characterized as an intricate cipher, wherein the recipient derives satisfaction from tracing the meaning through its progressive stages to uncover the intended significance.

These mental and emotional processes are intrinsically linked to the cultural and social contexts of both the speaker and the recipient. Metonymy, being inherently imaginative, does not convey meaning directly but instead uses words or phrases to indirectly reference the intended meaning. The recipient must transition from the literal interpretation to the concealed, intended meaning. When a humble lady asks a giving guy, "I complain to you about the absence of rats in my home," for example, he answers, "What a great question! I shall load your home with rats," (Al-Jahiz, 1992), the first literal sense addresses the lack of rodents. Through a sequence of cognitive processes, this results in a more complicated interpretation. The receiver has to realize that the absence of rats indicates a shortage of food, thereby suggesting poverty. Following cultural standards and polite conversation, the woman's indirect declaration of poverty via metonymy avoids direct reference to her financial situation.

Metonymy is a rhetorical device depending on a strong awareness of language. For metonymy to be properly used, the speaker and the receiver both need to be advanced in language, social, and environmental knowledge. Metonymy loses its intended meaning when the speaker recognizes the subtleties of language and the receiver does not. Navigating through intermediate phases, the shift from the literal to the intended meaning requires cognitive and emotional processes demanding mental involvement, deep thought, and the decoding of underlying meanings. This emphasizes the strong relationship among metonymy and cognitive linguistics. The work of the poet is a beautiful example of metonymy needing consecutive mental processes to understand the intended meaning(Ibn Rashiq, 1981):

<div dir="rtl">

مشاه شمسعدشملعمواهبوا   فبعيدة مهوىالقرط إملالوفل بعيدة
</div>

(Far away from the earring, either descended from her father Nawfal, or belongs to Abd Shams and Hashem)

The poet's expression, "far from the earring vent," employs metonymy to evoke the imagery of a long neck and the attractive distance between the girl's shoulder and the ear that holds the earring. This initial meaning alludes to the second, more profound meaning—the desirability of a long neck, which is considered an aesthetic trait in Arab culture. The poet's use of this imagery reflects a sophisticated understanding of language and cultural norms. Furthermore, the poet suggests her aristocratic heritage by linking the sensory element of the girl's physical feature with a moral component, thereby improving this picture. The poet builds a metonymic connection between sensuous appeal and reputational dignity by linking the physical beauty with moral honor and lineage. Deciphering this metonymy, as shown, calls both great cognitive involvement and accuracy to get the intended meaning. This illustration emphasizes how complexly metonymy and cognitive linguistics interact:

فـمـايـلفـيّ من عيـبـفـلاي   جـالـلـكلـب م عز والـفـصـيـل

(What is wrong with me is that I have a coward dog and a lean camel son)

Two different metonymies used in the lyrical line express a comparable sense. The poet's character of himself as a "cowardly dog" that neither barks nor bites and lets everyone inside the home without opposition reflects the first metonymy. As the poet often offers free food and money, this picture acts as a metonymy for his generosity, implying a big number of visitors and open hospitality. To get the intended phrase from this metonymy, one must pay close attention and use exactness in negotiating many levels of meaning. The second metonymy is expressed in the phrase "the lean camel's son," which first describes a weak and malnourished camel. To get its deeper meaning, this description needs further interpretation. The camel's leanness is ascribed to its deprivation of milk brought on by the murder of its mother. The second interpretation so demonstrates that the poet's acts—slaughtering camels despite their utility and leaving their calves hungry—are driven by his kindness in cooking meals for visitors. This reading accentuates the poet's hospitality and fits the first metonymy of the "cowardly dog". The researchers note that the understanding of metonymy requires complex cognitive processes, which may be especially difficult for those outside of the speaker's language and cultural setting. This intricacy emphasizes the cognitive effort needed to perceive the intended meanings in the same social and linguistic context, hence stressing the need of cognitive linguistics in understanding metonymy.

Conclusion

According to the results, metonymy is a sophisticated rhetorical tool and a fundamental topic of research on eloquence. The analysis exposes clear variations in the forms and kinds of metonymy between English and Arabic. Whereas in English the concept of adjacency guides metonymy, in Arabic it is based on the conjunction principle, which causes great uncertainty between metonymy and metaphor. As such, many English metonyys are seen as Arabic standards' metaphors. Arabic clarifies this uncertainty by grouping metonymy into many forms including quality, description, and attribution. Arabic metonymy is mostly based on the obvious difference between metonymy and metaphor. The study also highlights the close connection between metonymy and cognitive linguistics in Arabic, emphasizing that understanding the intended meaning involves intricate and precise cognitive processes. This complexity is not easily navigated even by native speakers, given the linguistic, cultural, and social variations. Furthermore, the research points out the interest of Western scholars in exploring the relationship between metonymy and cognitive linguistics, a focus that has been relatively underexplored by Arab researchers. This study thus underscores the need for greater attention to this relationship in Arabic linguistic research.

Implications of the Study

Linguists and rhetoricians have long studied the complex link between metonymy and cognitive linguistics in English, looking at how this link shapes our knowledge of both phenomena. According to the theoretical results of this research, metonymy—as a cognitive phenomenon—has a position either equal to or even better than that of the fundamental metaphor. According to cognitive linguists, metonymy clarifies the way in which one entity refers to another by means of natural linkages, therefore transcending simple symbolic representation of entities. The current research also suggests that metonymy may lose its inherent worth and the aspect of novelty that usually goes along with it when detached from its cognitive underbounds. Thus, metonymy may be seen as a cognitive activity showing the dependence of cognitive sciences on mental mechanisms by means of which mental processes interact. This knowledge calls for a thorough study of metonymy, rhetoric, and cognitive linguistics using Arabic and English instances and patterns to clarify the parallels and variations in metonymic use across these languages.

Furthermore important consequences of this research include the extensive usage of metonymy as both a semantic and lexical tool in English and Arabic. The results illustrate the uniqueness of metonymy in every language and show its function as a cultural bound phenomena. The main contribution of the research is in pointing out the parallels and contrasts in metonymic phrases between the two languages. It shows that whereas in English metonymy is commonly confused with other rhetorical techniques, Arabic metonymic statements can be precisely distinguished from other figures of speech like metaphor and synecdoche. This study has important ramifications for translators handling metonymic phrases unique to a culture. This emphasizes the need of translators understanding the cultural background of metonymic expressions to guarantee correct and meaningful translations as this reveals possible problems in translating metonymic language across far-off languages like Arabic and English.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

One potential limitation of this study is the variability in the contextual interpretation of metonymic expressions. The intended meaning of a single metonymic expression can differ based on contextual cues.

Additionally, it is impractical to analyse every possible metonymic expression within a language through a single study. Given the ongoing advancements in research on the creative application of metonymy, future investigations could further explore additional innovative uses of metonymy.

Acknowledgments

References

Al-Buhturi. *His Poetry. Sharh Hanna Al-Fakhouri*. Dar Al-Jeel.

Al-Jahiz, A. (1992). *Al-Hayyal. investigated by Abdel Salam Haroun*. Dar Al-Jeel.

Al-Jurjani, A. (1983). *Secrets of Eloquence*. Dar al-Ma'rifah.

Al-Jurjani, A. (1992). *Dala'il Al-Aijaaz*. Al-Madani Press.

Al-Mutanabbi. (2012). *His poetry, investigated by Shihab Abo Amr*. Dar al-Kutub al-Watania.

Al-Sakaki, A. (1987). *Miftah Al-Ulum* (2nd ed.). Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya.

Arutyunova, N. (1990). *Metaphor Theory: collection*. Moscow.

Bybee, J. (2015). *Language Change*. Cambridge University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139096768

Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108528931

Dąbrowska, E., & Divjak, D. (2019). *Cognitive Linguistics-Foundations of Language*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110626476

Eid, O. A. A.-H., Abu-Gub, M. N., & Shureteh, H. (2023). A Comparative and Contrastive Study of Arabic and English Metonymic Expressions. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 15*, 3. doi: https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v15n3.14

Ellis, J. (2021). *Towards a General Comparative Linguistics* (Vol. 52). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112414804

Hartmann, R. R. K., & Stork, F. C. (1972). *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Applied Science Publishers, Essex.

Ibn Rashiq, A. (1981). *Beauties of Poetry, Literature and Criticism, investigated by Muhammad A* (5th ed.). Dar Al-Jeel.

Jenabagha, N., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2022). Using Metaphor and Metonymy in Writing Classes through Dialogic Interaction. *Journal of Language and Translation, 12*(2), 149-161. doi: https://doi.org/10.30495/ttlt.2022.690746

Johnson, M., & Lakoff, G. (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*. University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3637992.html

Khalil, B. (2004). *Metonymy in Arabic Rhetoric*. Library of Arts. Retrieved from https://www.noor-book.com/en/book/review/506123

Langacker, R. W. (1993). *Reference-Point Constructions*. De Gruyter Mouton. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1993.4.1.1

Moisiuk, V., Dziubina, O., Liliia, S., Sokol, M., Konovalchuk, S., & Rudenko, M. (2022). The Differentiation of Metonymy and Metaphor Concepts in Modern Linguistics. *Revista de Investigaciones Universidad del Quindío, 34*(S2), 144-151. doi: https://doi.org/10.33975/riuq.vol34n2.907

Ruzibaeva, N. R. (2021). Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Concepts. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences, 2*(1), 438-446. Retrieved from https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/cognitive-linguistics-basic-concepts

Sapir, E. (1921). An Introduction to the Study of Speech. *Language, 1*, 15. Retrieved from https://www.daimon.org/lib/ebooks/Language-Study-Speech.pdf

Saussure, F. D. (2016). *Course in General Linguistics*. Columbia University Press. Retrieved from https://cup.columbia.edu/book/course-in-general-linguistics/9780231157261

Sokol, M., Tsaryk, O., Rozlutska, G., Hupka-Makohin, N., & Horenko, I. (2020). The System of Pedagogical Concepts in Globalization Conditions. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology, 9*(4), 43-52. Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/openview/64aa2598ab579fc4f95b647f5512e045

Strathern, A. J., & Stewart, P. J. (2020). *Language and Culture in Dialogue*. Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003085850

Tóth, M. (2018). *Linguistic metonymy: Implicitness and co-activation of mental content*. Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften. Retrieved from https://www.peterlang.com/document/1055820

Trask, R. L. (1999). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. Psychology Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford University Press Oxford.

Yan, C., & Longfeng, S. (2020). The Differences between Metaphor and Metonymy on the Cognitive Level and the Cases Study. *Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature, 3*(03), 61-66. doi: https://doi.org/10.36348/sijll.2020.v03i03.002

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757754

Zhou, L., & Li, M.-Y. (2021). A Comparative Study of Conceptual Structures of Metaphor and Metonymy From a Cognitive Perspective. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies, 11*(11), 887-894. doi: https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2021.11.008