



UDK:81'276.6:355.

Durdona SULTANOVA,

The teacher is a trainee of the Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute

E-mail: abulnasovadurdona@gmail.com

Based on the review of Doctor of Pedagogy, Associate Professor D. Jabborova

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF METAPHOR AND METONYMY

Annotation

The article addresses the issues related to the cognitive essence of metaphor and metonymy. The author gives a brief review of studies on metaphor and metonymy, stresses the continuity of different paradigms in the exploration of these phenomena, reveals the dynamic character of metaphorization and metonymization, points out and describes the common and differential features which help to distinguish these cognitive phenomena.

Key words: Metaphor, metonymy, mental space, conceptual integration, change of focus.

METAFORA VA METONIMIYANING LINGVISTIK JIHATLARI

Annotatsiya

Maqola metafora va metonimiyaning kognitiv mohiyati bilan bog'liq masalalarga bag'ishlangan. Muallif metafora va metonimiya bo'yicha tadqiqotlarning qisqacha sharhini keltiradi, ushbu hodisalarni o'rganishda turli paradigmalar uzviylikini ta'kidlaydi, metaforizatsiya va metonimizatsiyaning dinamik xarakterini ochib beradi, ushbu kognitiv hodisalarni farqlashga yordam beruvchi umumiy va farqlovchi xususiyatlarni aniqlab, tavsiflaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: Metafora, metonimiya, mental makon, konseptual integratsiya, diqqatni o'zgartirish.

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ МЕТАФОРЫ И МЕТОНИМИИ

Аннотация

Статья посвящена вопросам, связанным с когнитивной сущностью метафоры и метонимии. Автор дает краткий обзор исследований по метафоре и метонимии, подчеркивает преемственность различных парадигм в изучении этих явлений, раскрывает динамический характер метафоризации и метонимизации, выделяет и описывает общие и дифференциальные признаки, которые помогают различать эти когнитивные явления.

Ключевые слова: Метафора, метонимия, ментальное пространство, концептуальная интеграция, изменение фокуса.

Introduction. Despite the truly huge number of works devoted to metonymy and metaphor (see the review in (Oparina 2000)), the interest of researchers in studying these phenomena does not weaken, but rather increases: their specificity in various types of discourse, their cultural conditioning, their pragmatic potential, their ability to influence our perception and assessment of events are considered etc. At the same time, many issues related to the study of metaphor and metonymy continue to be debatable. In our opinion, one of such controversial issues is the issue of a clearer differentiation of these processes.

Materials and methods. Issues related to the commonality and difference of metaphor and metonymy have been considered by many researchers (Lakoff, Johnson 2004; Paducheva 2004; Kövecses 1998; Panther 2003; Ruis de Mendoza Ibáñez 2003; Ungerer, Schmid 1996, etc.), whose works consider both the commonality and the differences between these processes. However, differentiations of these phenomena are still out of the field of view of researchers.

The processes of metaphorization and metonymization are among the basic cognitive mechanisms that ensure the conceptualization and categorization of objects and phenomena of the external and internal human world. Considering the cognitive foundations of linguistic categorization, J. Lakoff introduces the concept of idealized cognitive models (ICMS), understanding them as special cognitive entities that underlie language categories, and identifies four types of such ICMS: propositional, defining the nature of the elements of the category, their properties and relationships between them; image-schematic models reflecting the main figurative representations that form categorical classes; metaphorical models that allow us to represent some abstract area by identifying it with another area, usually more specific and accessible to empirical observation; metonymic models that act together with the first three and ensure the transfer of characteristics of one element of the set to the entire set (Lakoff 1987: 68-76).

Results and discussion. Obviously, it is the importance of the processes of metaphorization and metonymization for the conceptualization and verbalization of phenomena of the external and internal world that explains the place occupied by the study of metaphor and metonymy at all stages of the development of linguistics, despite the fact that at different stages of this development, the focus of research, in accordance with the dominant paradigm of the era, were different aspects of these complex and multifaceted phenomena.

The origins of the theory of metaphor and metonymy, as well as many linguistic theories, lie in ancient teachings. The theory of metaphor was born in the depths of rhetoric, which considered metaphor primarily as a means of influencing the audience. It was Aristotle who raised the question of the heuristic possibilities of metaphor. Considering metaphor in the context of rhetoric as a technique of oratorical and poetic art, he at the same time drew attention to the logical mechanism of metaphor, i.e. the mechanism that underlies the ability of metaphor to express knowledge about the world, i.e., speaking in modern metalanguage, to participate in the processes of conceptualization. He also expressed an important idea about the need for a metaphorical nomination, emphasizing that before the metaphorical name in the language there was no exact nomination of the described concept. Aristotle also goes back to establishing the relationship between metaphor and comparison, metaphor is defined by him as an abbreviated or hidden comparison (Aristotle, 1978).

The works of A.A. Potebnya also made a significant contribution to the development of the theory of metaphor (namely, its conceptual essence). Discussing with Aristotle and Gerber about the possibility of rearranging the members of a proposition in a metaphor, A.A. Potebnya writes that such a rearrangement would be possible if the language of science and poetry did not reflect the direction of the processes of cognition – from the previously known to the new, unknown (e.g. with the

description of the essence of conceptual metaphor in the works of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson) (Potebnya, 1990).

It should be recognized that the conceptual areas of the source and purpose, which serve as the basis for describing the cognitive essence of metaphor in the Lakoff-Johnson theory, appear as formed, static formations, which somewhat limits the applicative potential of this theory to describe the processes of generating new meanings and creating author's metaphors in the process of metaphorization. This limitation has been overcome in the works on conceptual integration, which represent a further development of the cognitive theory of metaphor. A distinctive characteristic of the theory of conceptual integration, the main provisions of which are presented in the works of J. Fauconnier, M. Turner, E. Sweetser (Fauconnier & Turner 1998; Sweetser & Fauconnier 1996, etc.), is that it focuses on the creative, dynamic nature of the process of meaning generation in general and metaphorization in particular.

The theory of conceptual integration is based on the concept of mental space, which is not a static, but a dynamic entity. Mental spaces are not given in advance, but represent packages of information that arise on-line in the process of comprehension, conceptual processing of a past or current situation based on existing knowledge. The process of conceptual integration involves the interaction of four mental spaces: two initial spaces, a common space (created as a result of their intersection based on common features) and a combined, integral space, the so-called blend, which, in fact, is the result of conceptual integration. The advantage of this theory is that it represents the process of metaphor formation, as well as the process of meaning formation in general, as dynamic entities. As N.K. Ryabtseva emphasizes, the concept of conceptual integration is fundamentally important for the language as a whole, since the language itself is integral, syncretic, and ambiguous (Ryabtseva, 2005). O.K. Iriskhanova, noting the great explanatory potential of this theory, indicates that it can be used in the study of the semantics of syntactic constructions, phraseological units, the construction of artistic texts, and various stylistic techniques (Iriskhanova, 2000).

It should be emphasized that, despite the presence of a conventional metaphor, which is based on a stable association of a graceful woman with a swan, this metaphor is the author's, generated in this text. Her individuality lies primarily in the fact that, unlike the existing conventional metaphor based on the comparison of a woman with a swan and having positive connotations, this metaphor also includes negative connotations that are clearly present in the combination to swallow Coca-Cola. In addition, this metaphor, as it seems to us, carries a certain culturally specific flavor, which is indirectly indicated by such details as the loudness of her husband's belch, emphasizing the place and purpose of a woman in China at that time, as well as swan feather – a swan feather, indirectly associated with lightness, weightlessness oriental women.

The consequence of a kind of metaphorological boom was that, firstly, the study of metonymy from a cognitive perspective was somewhat postponed in time, and, secondly, that some cases of transfer of meaning of an obviously metonymic nature began to be described as metaphorical. So, for example, when considering cases like Ten dollars later... some researchers attribute them to varieties of conceptual metaphor (Gileva, 2002) based on the basic metaphorical model of TIME IS MONEY. Of course, there is a certain temptation to treat these cases as metaphorical, but then how to consider such cases when the units of measurement of time are not the names of monetary units, but the names of other entities, such as: He put on an apron and began to peel. One potato later, Sheila mentioned:

"Evelyn called" (E.Segal) or a thousand years ago, when I was a lonely child... (A.Sexton), which is clearly not reducible to a mathematical model, TIME IS MONEY.

It seems to us that there are much more reasons to consider these cases as metonymic in their basis, i.e. based on the adjacency transfer of "an action occurring in time, an object of an action occurring in time" → "a unit of measurement of time", i.e.

an event, object or other entities associated with an action occurring in time can become units of measurement of time, as K. once demonstrated. Vonnegut in the classic phrase "When I was a young man – two wives ago, 250,000 cigarettes ago, 3,000 quarters of booze ago" (Vonnegut K.).

Based on the above, we believe that the essential difference between metaphor and metonymy is that for metonymy, a shift in focus of attention is essential, and for metaphor, the presence of common features, on the basis of which a combined, integral space – blend is formed. In the process of metaphorization, two mental spaces are involved, having a common feature, on the basis of which an integrated space underlying the metaphor is created. In this regard, metaphor turns out to be much closer to comparison, which is also based on the conceptual integration of two different mental spaces, which allows us to consider metaphor and comparison as members of the same cognitive category (Fludernick, Freeman & Freeman, 1999). The mental processes involved in the process of metonymization occur "on the territory" of one mental area, within the framework of which the refocusing of attention takes place. The result of such refocusing, which occurs at the mental level, at the linguistic level, is the saving of linguistic resources, a kind of semantic ellipsis, when time, place, object and other characteristics become signs of the event itself. Thus, metonymy as a mental operation acts as a way of cognitive economy, focusing the main thing, which also distinguishes it from metaphor, which is not related to economy.

Conclusion. Let's summarize what has been said. Metaphor and metonymy, as cognitive operations and as semantic processes taking place in the field of linguistic semantics, are characterized by both elements of similarity and difference. Their similarity lies in the fact that they:

- a) are fundamentally cognitive;
- b) increase the resources of our consciousness and language;
- c) they can be both conventional and individual, creative in nature and have significant pragmatic potential;
- d) are explained in the theory of semantics in terms of transfer, or shift of meaning.

The difference between metaphor and metonymy is that:

- a) for metonymy, a shift in the focus of attention is essential, and for metaphor, the presence of common features, on the basis of which a combined, integral space is formed – a blend;
- b) metaphor is based on the interaction of two mental spaces, metonymy as a cognitive operation takes place within the boundaries of one mental space;
- c) at the mental level, metonymy is associated with the principle of cognitive economy, and at the linguistic level – with a kind of semantic ellipsis; metaphor is not related to economy;
- d) at the linguistic level, metaphor is primarily associated with a noun, the metaphorization of the verb occurs through an associative connection with the subject of an action called a verb; metonymy can take place both in the sphere of nouns and verbs, while the verb is metonymized independently, due to the operation of shifting the focus of attention.

In conclusion, it should be recognized that, despite these differences, metaphor and metonymy may in some cases overlap, overlap each other, which makes their differentiation quite difficult. Such cases often occur in the field of linguistic representation of temporal and spatial relations, which is primarily due to the complexity of the nature of the relationship between the basic concepts of SPACE and TIME, as well as in the field of linguistic representation of emotions. The facts of crossing the boundaries between metaphor and metonymy indicate the continuity of our thinking and the diffuse boundaries between different mental processes.

Figurative and expressive means of speech play an important role in the study of modern Russian language. They add vividness to speech, enhance its emotional impact, and draw the reader's or listener's attention to the statement (Sultanova D, 2024).

REFERENCES

1. Fauconnier G., Turner M. Conceptual Integration Networks // *Cognitive Science* 1998. №22. P. 133–187.
2. Fludernik M., Freeman D.C., Freeman M.H. Metaphor and Beyond // *Poetics Today* 1999, 20. 3. P. 383–396.
3. Kövecses Z. Metonymy: Developing a Cognitive Linguistic View // *Cognitive Linguistics* 1998, #9-10. P. 37–77.
4. Lakoff, G., *Women Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and L.: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.
5. Panther K.U. Introduction: on the Nature of Conceptual Metonymy // *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins 2003. P. 1–20.
6. Ponterotto D. Metaphors We Can Learn by: How Insights from Cognitive Linguistic Research Can Improve the Teaching/Learning of Figurative Language // *English Teaching Forum*, vol. 32. Number 3. July 1994. P. 2–8.
7. Ruis de Mendoza Ibáñez F.J. The Role of Mappings and Domains in Understanding Metonymy // *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: a Cognitive Perspective* / Ed. by A. Barcelona. B. and N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. P. 109–132.
8. Алексеева Л.М. Метафоры, которые мы вы-бираем // *Слововыюязыку*. М.; Воронеж: Во-ронеж. гос. ун-т, 2002. С. 288–298.
9. Аристотель Сочинения: в 4 т. Т. 2. М.: Мысль, 1978.
10. Арутюнова Н.Д. *Язык и мир человека*. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1998.
11. Султанова Д. А. Роль изобразительно-выразительных средств в русском языке. // *Ilm-ma'rifat nashriyoti*, 2024. URL: https://scholar.google.ru/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=LhpU0foAAAAJ&citation_for_view=LhpU0foAAAAJ:W7OEmFMylNYC