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This article is devoted to the study of the metonymic expressions “urban” and “rural” in the American media discourse. In this article, we tried to study metonymy within the framework of the modern scientific paradigm of cognitive linguistics. It is known that in cognitive linguistics there are three approaches to metonymy, which consider metonymy as a conceptual phenomenon, a fundamental method of understanding reality and one of the mechanisms of cognitive modeling: 1) the theory of prototypes and idealized cognitive models; 2) the theory of frame semantics; 3) the theory of conceptual semantics. In studying metonymy on the basis of these theories, the views of linguists such as J. Lakoff, M. Johnson, Z. Kövecses, Y.V. Paducheva were referred to. The article cites and explores newspaper examples to illustrate the metonyms “urban” and “rural” in American media discourse.

Introduction. As one of the main linguistic phenomena, metonymy has been thoroughly studied in almost all fields of linguistics. Metonymy is defined as a means of creating artistic speech in stylistics (Aristotle, I.V. Arnold, M.P. Brands, I.R. Galperin, etc.), as the method of semantic derivation in semasiology (V.V. Vinogradov, E.L. Ginzburg, D.N. Shmelev, Y.V. Paducheva, etc.), as a means of secondary nomination in onomasiology (VGGak, VNTelia, etc.), as the use of one concept instead of another with adaptation based on associative relationships from the point of view of psychological approach (G. Paul, M.M. Pokrovsky, etc.), as copying a name according to the logical connections between objects that actually exist from the point of view of logical approach (V.G. Gak, A.A. Potebnya, etc.) [7, p. 33].

What is metonymy? Metonymy is the Greek word for "metōnymía", which means "renaming". The first approach to metonymy in cognitive semantics was developed in 1980 by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson. Metonymy is a cognitive phenomenon that has a different basis from metaphor. Thus, if in metaphor two concepts belonging to different fields replace each other, in metonymy two concepts belonging to the same field are replaced.

Metonymy is one of the means of storing a certain knowledge in the mind under another name through associative selection of information.

The study of metonymy by many linguists has led to the study of its cognitive properties, which are considered relevant today.

With the development of cognitive linguistics, the process of distinguishing language metonyms from cognitive metonyms, which act as a mechanism for the interpretation of metonymy and the semantic mechanism of development of word meaning, acts as a mechanism for conceptualization of reality. Lakoff and Johnson note in this regard:

“Metonymy is not only a poetic or rhetorical tool, it does not refer only to language, it is also a tool that allows us to focus on certain aspects of what is defined. [2, p. 62].
G. Radden and Z. Koveches give the following definition of metonymy: “Metonymy is such a cognitive process in which one concept is mentally replaced by another within the same domain or idealized cognitive model”. [10, p. 37].

The cognitive and pragmatic functions of metonymy are as follows:
1. Cognitive operation of results, which allows to model the components of meaning;
2. The principle of actualizing or profiling a concept within a conceptual field and replacing it with another concept that is the whole conceptual field or part of it;
3. Creation of prototype effects;

In other words, from the point of view of cognition, metonymy is interpreted as another complex mental mechanism to represent knowledge. The essence of this mechanism is that any field of content serves to represent the whole concept in a single semantic way. At the same time, transformation takes place within a conceptual field. In other words, metonymic transformations are mental operations within a certain framework.

There are three approaches to metonymy in cognitive linguistics, which consider metonymy to be a conceptual phenomenon, a fundamental method of understanding real reality, and one of the mechanisms of cognitive modeling:
1) Prototypes and idealized cognitive models (Z. Koveches, J. Lakoff, G. Radden);
2) Frame semantics (A. Blank, P. Koch);
3) Conceptual semantics (M. Conson, C. Lakoff, Y.V. Paducheva) [7, p. 33].

One of the supporters of the first approach is the American linguist-cognitologist J. Lakof. From his point of view, “we organize our knowledge through certain structures - idealized cognitive models” [3, p. 99]. ICM (idealized cognitive model) is a whole gestalt with a complex structure. Four universal models of cognitive apparatus are involved in the formation of ICM:
1) Propositional models that isolate elements from a situation, reflect their properties, and define the relationships between them;
2) Schematic models of images, i.e. trajectories, shapes, containers, and other special schematic descriptions of images;
3) Metaphorical models, which are models of the transition from the propositional or schematic models of descriptions of one field to the corresponding structure of another field;
4) Metonymic models covering one or more models [3, p. 31-32].

According to Lakoff, metonymic models have the following features:
- There is a concept for a specific purpose, understood in a certain context - "target" A;
- There is a conceptual structure, including concepts A and B. B is part of or closely related to A in a particular conceptual structure. Accordingly, B is used instead of A within the same conceptual field.
- B is easier to understand and remember than A, and can be used directly in a given context.

Thus, a metonymic model is a conceptual model of the relationship between A and B. [3, p. 120].

When a conventional metonymic model is part of a conceptual system, "B" can be used metonymically instead of "A". Lakoff explores metonymic models on the example of the "mother-house-wife" category-stereotype. According to him, the stereotype "mother-house-wife" is a subcategory of "mother" category. “Each time a subcategory is developed instead of a category, it becomes a potential source of prototypical effects,” - writes Lakoff [3, p. 120].

The development of ICM as a cognitive representation of the reality was studied by Z. Koveches, G. Radden and was reflected in other research works.

The basic concept of the second approach to metonymy (frame semantics) is the frame. A frame collects stereotypical information or subframes grouped into slots or subframes. The framework is a linguo-cognitive concept and has a linguistic connection (M. Minsky, T. van Deyck, etc.). Framework theory finds its use in describing the meaning of a word. It is believed that in lexical semantics it is sometimes more economical to describe the meaning of words through related frameworks and scenarios, and that some new truths have emerged that are not found in traditional usage [1, p. 239]. Fillmore argues that the approach to meaning is more encyclopedic, especially from the point of view of the semantics of frames, because it stems from the truth. In addition, frame semantics deals with the study of the causes of metonymy [8, p. 68].

The approach to metonymy from the point of view of conceptual semantics can be found in the works of Y.V. Paducheva. Linguist presents metonymy as a cognitive process (change in focus) and result (conceptual metonymy, metonymic concept). Metonymy is accepted in the context of the concept of "denotative situation", which he understands as part of the reality to be conceptualized.
Y. V. Paducheva notes that the same denotative situation can be expressed in different concepts in language. In addition, “the share of differences between different conceptualizations of a situation falls on two parameters - the assessment and the focus” [5, p. 156]. Claiming that the main mechanism of the process of metonymy is a change in the focus of attention, Y. V. Paducheva builds a cognitive theory of metonymy and writes the following:

“The proposed model of metonymy is based on the concept of metonymy as a change in focus, and in this sense can be called cognition” [6, p. 239].

Referring to L. Talmi, Y. V. Paducheva sees the basis of metonymic changes in the selectivity of human perception. In the process of conceptualizing any part of reality, some aspects of reality are highlighted and actualized, while others remain obscure and fade into the background. [5, p. 157]. However, in the conceptualization of reality, these “backward, dark” parties exist in context as implicit. The dark aspects "part - whole", "parameter - value", "cause - result" are associated with actualized aspects, or the concept of metonymy is remembered here [5, p. 157].

As with all language media discourses, many metonyms are used in American media discourses. These metonyms can be found in examples of publications published in both urban and rural areas. Given that the urban and rural environment, the level of education and culture of the people living there, are different, the metonyms used in the American media discourse are also different in terms of their functional purpose.

As we know, the main political, economic and cultural life of the country takes place in an urban environment. That is why the metonyms used in newspapers and magazines published in the city are expressions used directly in the political, economic and cultural life of the country. Let's look at these metonyms on the basis of some examples from the American media discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word or expression</th>
<th>Original / literal use</th>
<th>Metonymic use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The White House</td>
<td>Official residence of the President of the United States</td>
<td>Executive Office of the President of the United States of America (President of the United States and the staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>The capital of the United States</td>
<td>United States federal government or established career politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street</td>
<td>Manhattan, a street in New York City</td>
<td>American financial markets or &quot;big business&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>a district of Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>American film industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar</td>
<td>The bar separates the judges and lawyers in the courtroom from ordinary people</td>
<td>All lawyers licensed to practice law in a particular court or jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>Tongue, mouth muscle</td>
<td>A language or dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweat</td>
<td>Sweat (sweating)</td>
<td>Hard (physical) work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let's consider some of the metonyms used in city newspapers in the United States. Mitt Romney uses metonymic expressions in his speech.

“Washington is badly broken. I think we recognize that. Washington has not dealt with the problems that we have in this nation”. Here “Washington” is not the capital of the United States, it is used in the meaning of “Federal Government of the United States”.

Mike Allen's article in the Washington Post, October 26, 2008, contains the following sentences:

“Congress spends too much money”, or Congress has sent us to war”. “Things are trending back for McCain. His numbers are rising and Obama's are dropping on a daily basis”. Here “Congress” does not mean building, and “federal government”, “numbers” mean “rating collected by the presidential candidate” [11].

In an article published in the Guardian on April 25, 2011 by Jonathan Sweet “the Pentagon” used in “Stretched close to the limit by combat in Afghanistan and determined not to get into a ground war in Libya, the Pentagon is stepping up the pressure to maintain a huge US troop presence in today's largely peaceful Iraq” does not mean a "military base" in the United States, it means "Officials leading the US military" [12].

Declan Walsh and Even Makaskil in an article published in the May 3, 2011 issue of the “Guardian”:

“One of the most recent events, the death of Osama Bin Laden, has received a lot of media attention. In the article we can read, that America accuses Pakistan of hiding Bin Laden, and Pakistan denies”.

Here “America” and “Pakistan” are not country names, they are used in the meaning of “government officials of these countries” [13].
Andrew Clark's article in the Guardian of April 17, 2011, entitled "BP creates another fine mess as it bars Deepwater protesters," contained a number of metonymic expressions on political and economic issues. If we pay attention to the title of the article, we will see that the term "BP" means "its leaders" and not "British Petroleum Company".

“When the oil company refused to let five US activists into its annual meeting, it rubbed salt in the wounds of the Gulf of Mexico disaster. In this sentence “it rubbed salt in the wounds of the Gulf of Mexico disaster” s used as a linguistic metonymy. Here – the literal meaning of “to rub salt in the wounds” is “to pour salt into the wound”, but is used in the meaning “to worsen the situation”. The expression “The Gulf of Mexico disaster” is not used in the literal meaning of “Disaster in the Gulf of Mexico”, but in a metonymic meaning, i.e. “Economic problems in the Gulf of Mexico” [14].

Robin Dixon wrote in an article published in the “Washington Post” on April 16, 2021: Moscow is weighing how to respond to Washington’s sanctions and planned expulsions of Russian diplomats in a tit-for-tat fashion, the Kremlin spokesman said Friday, but noted that President Vladimir Putin has not decided what course to take.

Here through Moscow and Washington the author did not mean the capitals of Russia and the United States, but the officials of those states. In the same article, we witness another metonymy [15].

Washington also banned U.S. financial institutions from buying Russian bonds from Russia’s central bank, Finance Ministry or national wealth fund. The move could deter investment in the bonds and increase Russian borrowing costs. Here Washington is used as the presidential administration, not the US capital [15].

Commenting on the relations between the United States and Russia, the journalist later used the following metonymic expressions:

“Russia studies ‘reciprocity’ action against U.S. After latest sanctions The United States said Thursday it would expel 10 Russian diplomats and place sanctions on 32 individuals and companies accused on interfering in the 2020 presidential elections” [15].

Russia and The United States are metonyms used by the author in this part of the article. Russia and The United States do not mean Russia and the United States, but the government officials of those countries.

The Washington Post's Cara Anna later wrote in an article commenting on US foreign policy: “The U.S. says it is imposing visa restrictions on “those believed to be responsible for, or complicit in undermining the democratic process in Uganda including the election in January and the campaign period”. Here the U.S. does not mean the state, but the president administration.

It is known since the main occupation in most villages is agriculture, the metonyms used in this topic in the newspapers published in those places prevail. Let’s consider some examples from "The Land' newspaper.

“Orange played host to NSW Farmers executive council meeting”. Here the “orange” is not the name of the fruit, it means “company executives” [16].

Let’s look through another sentence from ”The Land'.

“Wool industry wants the truth told to customers”. Here “the industry itself” is not considered, but “its managers”.

From the article titled “Can wool prices hold the Merino,” of “The Land” newspaper, not “wool prices”, but “benefit from it” is considered, and the word “hold” does not mean “to keep”, but “to provide”.

Mark Griggs writes in the article published in “The Land” newspaper: “Merino flocks may have started something big in the New England by joining the expanding commercial maiden Merino ewe competition fixtures in NSW”. It is known that Merino is a type of sheep, mainly bred in Wales. Here the word is used both in the sense of sheep (Merino flocks) and as a metonymy in the sense of those who keep these sheep (Merino flocks may have started something big ....). In the expression Maiden Merino ewe, Merino is developed in its original nominative sense by performing the assignment function [16].

In another article published in "The Land", let’s consider the following sentence: “Toyota getting more serious about hydrogen cars in Australia. Toyota has launched the second-generation hydrogen-powered Mirai sedan in an extended demonstration program that will see 20 of the cars leased by pioneering organizations and businesses” [16]. Here this is not a Toyota car brand, but a company that produces this car.

It should be noted that in "Metonymy: Developing a cognitive linguistic view" of G. Radden and Z. Koveches many examples of the development of metonyms in English are given. Many of these examples can be found in both urban and rural media courses. For example:

1) The kettle is boiling. 2) The buses are on strike. 3) I am parked over there. 4) Let’s go to the theatre.
In the first sentence "kettle is not boiling", it is water that is actually boiling. In the second sentence it is not the "buses" that are on strike, but "bus drivers". In the third sentence is not "me" who is parked, but "my car". In the fourth sentence, not "play" but the "theater building" is considered.

Examining the metonymic expression of the "urban" and "rural" interrelation in the American media discourse, we came to the conclusion that the use of metonyms not only in the American media discourse, but also in other media discourses attracts a wide readership, as well as it serves to the principle of saving, in other words "to express more ideas using less words".
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