



UDK: 801.85:97.36

Kumush M. NORALIYEVA,

Teacher of national university of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: kumushnuraliyeva9@gmail.com, Orcid: 0009-0003-0203-7915

Based on the review by N. Madalov, PhD, Lecturer at Termiz State Pedagogical Institute

MORE THAN A NAME: ANTONOMASIA AND COGNITION IN TRANSLATING ULYSSES

Annotation

This article examines the stylistic device of antonomasia in James Joyce's *Ulysses* and analyzes how it is rendered in the Russian and Uzbek translations. Through close reading of two examples, "Chrysostomos" and "the Sassenach", the study compares the English source text with the Russian translation by Khinkis and Khoruzhy and the Uzbek translation by Ibrohim G'ofurov. The findings show that the Russian translation largely preserves the cognitive and ironic effect of the original through culturally equivalent terms, while the Uzbek translation loses it at the point of cultural transfer.

Keywords: antonomasia, stylistic device, James Joyce, *Ulysses*, literary translation, Uzbek translation, cognitive frame, cultural translatability, translation strategies.

NOM ORTIDAGI MA'NO: "ULISS" TARJIMASIDA ANTONOMAZIYA VA KOGNITIV MUAMMO

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqola Jeyms Joysning "Ulyss" romanidagi antonomaziya stilistik vositasini va uning rus hamda o'zbek tillaridagi tarjimalarida qanday ifodalanganini tahlil qiladi. "Chrysostomos" va "the Sassenach" misollarini qiyosiy tahlil qilish orqali inglizcha asl manba-matn, Xinkis va Xoruzhiy tomonidan amalga oshirilgan rus tarjimasi va Ibrohim G'ofurov tomonidan tarjima qilingan o'zbek tarjimasi bilan solishtiriladi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko'rsatadiki, rus tarjimasi asliyatning kognitiv va ironik ta'sirini madaniy ekvivalent vositalar orqali asosan saqlab qolgan bo'lsa, o'zbek tarjimasida bu ta'sir madaniy o'tkazish bosqichida yo'qolgan.

Kalit so'zlar: antonomaziya, stilistik vosita, Jeyms Joys, "Ulyss", badiiy tarjima, o'zbek tarjimasi, kognitiv chegara, madaniy tarjima imkoniyati, tarjima strategiyalari.

БОЛЬШЕ, ЧЕМ ИМЯ: АНТОНОМАЗИЯ И КОГНИЦИЯ В ПЕРЕВОДЕ «УЛИССА»

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается стилистический приём антономазии в романе Джеймса Джойса "Улисс" и анализируется его передача в русском и узбекском переводах. На основе анализа двух примеров: "Chrysostomos" и "the Sassenach" английский оригинал сопоставляется с русским переводом В. Хинкиса и С. Хоружего и узбекским переводом Иброхима Гафурова. Результаты показывают, что русский перевод сохраняет когнитивный и иронический эффект оригинала посредством культурно эквивалентных единиц, но в узбекском переводе он утрачивается на этапе культурного переноса.

Ключевые слова: антономазия, стилистический приём, Джеймс Джойс, "Улисс", художественный перевод, узбекский перевод, когнитивный фрейм, культурная переводимость, стратегии перевода.

Introduction. There are names that do not need explanation, because the story is already built into them. When a man is called "Romeo" listeners do not need to be told the plot of that popular play, nor do they ask where the name comes from as the word has already absorbed Shakespeare's entire narrative of youth and passion and now carries the meaning of "a passionate young lover". This is the defining feature of antonomasia: a stylistic device in which a proper name replaces a person's real name in order to emphasize certain qualities or characteristics. At first glance, antonomasia may resemble allusion, since both devices draw on readers' external cultural knowledge, but they function differently. Allusion points towards an outside source; a story, a character, or a historical event, expecting readers to recognize the reference and draw meaning from it. Antonomasia, by contrast, does not point outward; it absorbs. The borrowed name stops being a reference to its original source and becomes an independent word with its own meaning. Just as calling someone "Sherlock" no longer requires a reader to have read Arthur Conan Doyle as the name has already become the universal word for "an excellent detective" and antonomasia completes its journey

when the name stands entirely on its own. That is why, antonomasia is best treated not as an intertextual signal (linking texts), but as a stylistic device of naming in its own right, even though, like allusion, it often grows out of literary or cultural sources. James Joyce's *Ulysses* is especially rich in such devices, using names and epithets throughout the novel to encode entire histories, religious associations and cultural judgments into a single word. This article asks a simple but largely unexplored question: what happens to this kind of compressed meaning when "Ulysses" is translated into Uzbek? Drawing on cases collected from the novel, the analysis examines moments where the cultural shortcut built into a name survives translation, where it shifts and where it disappears altogether.

Literature review. Antonomasia has been studied as a stylistic device for many decades. Scholars define it as a figure of speech in which a proper name is used to represent a general type of person, or a descriptive phrase replaces someone's actual name. Galperin describes it as a device in which the individual naming function of a proper noun gives way to a broader classifying function, allowing a single name to stand for an entire human category [5]. In recent years, research has

shown that antonomasia also carries a cognitive dimension: when readers encounter such a name, they do not simply read a word as they activate an entire cultural frame associated with it, drawing on shared historical, literary or religious knowledge to complete the meaning. This cognitive process depends entirely on whether the reader belongs to the cultural tradition from which the name originates. This cognitive dimension of antonomasia has been explored within the broader framework of translation and cognition studies [4]. When a literary work rich in such devices is translated into a culturally distant language that cognitive frame may not transfer and meaning is lost not at the level of words, but at the level of cultural memory. Despite growing scholarly interest in cognitive approaches to literary translation, antonomasia in Joyce's *Ulysses* and its uzbek translation has not previously been examined from this perspective, which represents the central gap this article addresses.

Research methodology. This study uses a qualitative close-reading approach. The primary source is James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and the comparative texts are its russian and uzbek translations. Examples of antonomasia were identified with the help of Gifford and Seidman's *Ulysses Annotated* [1]. Each identified case was first analyzed in its english context specifically, what cultural frame it activates for an english-speaking reader and then compared with its russian and uzbek translations in order to determine whether that frame is preserved, adapted or lost altogether. Cases were classified into two types: a proper name used to represent a human category and a descriptive label used instead of a character's actual name.

Analysis and results. The analysis identifies two main types of antonomasia in *Ulysses*: descriptive epithets replacing a character's name and evaluative labels replacing a personal identity. Two clear examples are presented below.

"Chrysostomos" – epithet, replacing a name (Episode 1: "Telemachus")

In the opening episode of *Ulysses*, Joyce introduces Buck Mulligan as a talkative, charming and irreverent medical student through the silent observations of Stephen Dedalus. As Stephen watches Mulligan shave and speak with effortless confidence, Joyce does not describe him directly. Instead, he places a single italicized greek word in the text: "Chrysostomos"[2]. The word means "golden-mouthed" and was the honorary title of St. John Chrysostomos, one of the most celebrated preachers of the early christian church, admired for his extraordinary eloquence. By applying this ancient honorific to Mulligan, Joyce uses antonomasia: a single borrowed name replaces direct description and activates an entire frame of religious authority and rhetorical excellence. The effect is sharply ironic as Mulligan is not a saint, actually, he is witty, performative and morally careless and the gap between the sacred title and the character it describes is precisely where Joyce's satire lives.

In the russian translation by Khinkis and Khoruzhy, the word is rendered as "златоуст" the established russian name for St. John Chrysostomos himself, familiar to russian readers through the Orthodox christian tradition[6]. This choice preserves both layers of the original: the literal meaning of "golden-mouthed" is ecclesiastical irony, since a russian reader immediately recognizes the sacred title and feels the satirical contrast.

In the uzbek translation by Ibrohim G'ofurov, however, the word becomes "tillazabon", a native uzbek compound meaning "golden-tongued" (tilla = gold, zabon = tongue). G'ofurov's strategy is semantic substitution: he replaces the culturally loaded greek title with a descriptive uzbek equivalent that recovers the literal meaning and remains natural for the

uzbek reader. While this ensures basic comprehension, "tillazabon" carries no religious associations and no connection to St. John Chrysostomos in uzbek cultural tradition [6]. The antonomasia survives in form but loses its ironic depth. As a result, the literal compliment reaches the reader, but the satirical contrast between a revered Church father and an irreverent student does not. This loss does not occur at the russian stage, where the irony is fully preserved, but in uzbek rendering it happens as the language does not include culturally equivalent term.

"The Sassenach" — evaluative label replacing a personal identity (Episode 1: "Telemachus") In the same episode of the book, Buck Mulligan makes a casual but pointed remark: "The Sassenach wants his morning rashers" [7]. He does not use a name instead, he reaches for a word loaded with history. "The Sassenach" is a term from scottish and irish gaelic literally meaning "saxon" or "englishman", but it is not an ordinary label. For centuries, irish and scottish speakers used this word to refer to the english with a clear sense of distance, disdain and cultural resistance. Calling someone "the Sassenach" is not simply identifying where they are from, it passes a judgment, marking them as an outsider, a colonial presence that does not belong. This is exactly what makes it a case of antonomasia: Mulligan replaces the person's actual name with a culturally charged label, and that single word quietly carries an entire history of Irish-British tension. The russian translation renders the line as "Наш сакс поджидает уже свой бекон" meaning in English "Our saxon is already waiting for his bacon" replacing "the Sassenach" with "сакс", the russian word for saxon[6]. This is a reasonable cultural substitution as the word "сакс" has a similarly archaic and distancing quality in russian, keeping the sense that the person is marked as a historical outsider. The antonomasia survives, and the russian reader still senses that Mulligan's remark is far from warm. As to the uzbek translation, it tells a very different story. G'ofurov renders the line as "Muhtaram ingliz nonushtasini talab qilyapti" meaning, "the respected englishman is demanding his breakfast" [3]. The word "muhtaram" means honourable or respected, and "ingliz" simply means englishman. Where Joyce's "Sassenach" was sharp ironic and culturally hostile, the uzbek version sounds different as the critical edge disappears entirely and with it the antonomasia itself. This is not a failure of translator's competence but a structural problem. The word "Sassenach" belongs to a very specific irish and scottish cultural memory, and uzbek language simply has no equivalent term that carries the same historical weight and emotional charge.

The two examples analyzed in this study reveal a clear and consistent pattern. Antonomasia in Joyce's *Ulysses* is a highly compressed stylistic device as it delivers meaning, irony, and cultural judgment in a single word or phrase. But for that compression to work, the reader must already carry the cultural knowledge that unlocks it. When a reader encounters "Chrysostomos" or "the Sassenach", the meanings are not decoded word by word as it is retrieved instantly from memory as a complete cultural package. Cognitive linguists refer to this as frame activation: a single word triggers a whole network of associated knowledge, emotions and judgments that a reader does not need to consciously reconstruct. When the frame does not exist in the target culture, there is nothing to activate. This is precisely what makes antonomasia cognitively powerful and equally what makes it so vulnerable in translation and the device arrives in the target text as an empty signal.

The first example "Chrysostomos" demonstrates this with particular clarity. The russian translation preserves the cognitive and ironic effect successfully "златоуст" is the established russian name for St. John Chrysostomos, deeply

familiar through the Orthodox christian tradition, and so both the compliment and the irony survive the transfer. In the uzbek translation, "tillazabon" captures the literal sense but carries no religious or historical associations. The uzbek reader understands that someone is being praised for their speech, but the satirical contrast between a church father and a careless student remains invisible.

The second example "the Sassenach", shows a different but related challenge. The problem here is not religious knowledge but political and historical memory. The russian substitution "как" keeps the sense of otherness alive for the russian reader. The uzbek rendering "muhtaram ingliz" however, removes the cultural hostility entirely. What was sharp and contemptuous in the original becomes polite and neutral in translation and as a result, both the antonomasia and the satirical edge of Mulligan's remark are lost.

These findings suggest that the challenge of translating antonomasia is not primarily a linguistic one, it is a cultural one. The translator faces a choice between three possible strategies: preserving the original form and accepting that some meaning will be lost; finding a culturally equivalent term that produces a similar effect on the target reader; or adding an explanatory note that gives the target reader access to the cultural frame the source reader activates automatically. Each strategy involves a

compromise. Preserving the original form respects the author's style but may leave the reader without the tools to understand it. Finding a cultural equivalent protects the reading experience but inevitably changes the author's specific voice. Adding an explanatory note keeps both form and meaning intact but interrupts the natural flow of the text. This tension is especially significant in the case of Ulysses, widely regarded as one of the most culturally dense novels in the english language. Its uzbek translation is a rare and ambitious undertaking, an attempt to carry a work rooted in irish catholic and classical European tradition into a language and culture with a very different historical background. The examples examined here show that G'ofurov made deliberate choices under genuinely difficult conditions and those choices are not simply translation decisions as they are windows into the limits of cultural translatability itself. These findings align with cognitive approaches to translation which argue that meaning in literary texts is not stored in words alone but in the cultural frames those words unlock. Such frames are, by definition, language and culture specific and therefore cannot always be carried across linguistic boundaries without loss. For translation studies, these limits are not a problem to be solved but a finding worth understanding.

REFERENCES

1. Gifford Don., Robert J. Ulysses Annotated. Revised Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
2. Joyce James. Ulysses. Edited by Hans Walter Gabler. New York: Vintage Books, 1986.
3. Joys Jeysms. Uliss. Tarj. G'ofurov I. – Toshkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2024.
4. Schwieter J.W. and Ferreira, A. (eds.) The Handbook of Translation and Cognition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.
5. Гальперин И.Р. Стилистика. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1977.
6. Джойс Джеймс. Улисс. Пер. Хинкис В., Хоружий С. – Москва: Азбука-Аттикус, 2014.